DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

12-13 GEORGE V, 1922

IN FOUR VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1015
Volume II: Pages 1017-2033
Volume III: Pages 2035-3039
Volume IV: Pages 3041-3619

VOLUME CLI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH, 1922, TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL, 1922, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1922

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HON. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING,

C.M.G., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1922

THE MINISTRY

Prime Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs, President of the Privy Council	Right Hon. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING, C.M.G., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.
Minister of Finance	Hon. WILLIAM STEVENS FIELDING, LL.D., D.C.L.
Minister of Militia and Defence and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. GEORGE PERRY GRAHAM.
Postmaster General	Hon. CHARLES MURPHY, B.A., K.C.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND, LL.D., K.C.
Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Minister in charge of and to administer the Department of Health	Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN BÉLAND, B.A., M.D.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General	Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Customs and Excise	Hon. JACQUES BUREAU, LL.B.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE, B.A., LL.B., K.C.
Solicitor General	Hon. DANIEL DUNCAN MCKENZIE.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. JAMES ALEXANDER ROBB.
Minister without portfolio	Hon. THOMAS ANDREW LOW.
Secretary of State	Hon. ARTHUR BLISS COPP, LL.B.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. WILLIAM COSTELLO KENNEDY.
Minister of the Interior; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Minister of Mines	Hon. CHARLES STEWART.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. WILLIAM RICHARD MOTHERWELL.
Minister of Labour	Hon. JAMES MURDOCK.
Minister without portfolio	Hon. JOHN EWEN SINCLAIR.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. JAMES HORACE KING, M.D., C.M., F.A.C.S.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., B.C.L., LL.D.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees ..... GEORGE NEWCOMBE GORDON, K.C.

Clerk of the House ..... W. B. NORTHRUP, M.A., K.C.

Clerk Assistant ..... ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE, B.A., K.C.

Sergeant-at-Arms ..... Lieutenant-Colonel H. W. BOWIE.

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms ..... L. C. PANET.

Editor of Debates ..... A. C. CAMPBELL.

Associate Editor of Debates ..... GEORGE SIMPSON.

Official Reporters of Debates:—

English: Earl C. Young, F. W. S. Galbraith, H. E Oliver, W. H. Dickson, Frederick Berryman, T. S. Hubbard, M. F. Johnston.

French: Associate Editor, Marcel Gabard, J. H. Mackay.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES:

Messieurs: Boivin, Ethier, Fansher, Gardiner, Garland (Bow River), Hocken, MacKelvie, McGiverin, Marcil (Bonaventure), Prévost, Rinfret, Robinson and Ross (Kingston)

Chairman: G. H. Boivin, B.A., K.C.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Fourteenth Parliament

1922

ANDERSON, ROBERT KING—Halton.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Verchères.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead.
BANCROFT, LELAND PAYSON—Selkirk.
BAXTER, HON. JOHN B. M.—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
BEAUBIEN, ARTHUR LUCIEN—Provencher.
[1]BEATTIE, ROBERT ETHELBERT—Kootenay East.
BÉLAND, HON. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BINETTE, JOSEPH—Prescott.
BIRD, THOMAS WILLIAM—Nelson.
BLACK, GEORGE—Yukon.
BLACK, WILLIAM—Huron, S. Riding.
[2]BLACKADDER, EDWARD—Halifax.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.
BOUCHER, WILFRID E. E. AIMÉ—Yamaska.
[3]BOUCHARD, GEORGE (JOSEPH)—Kamouraska.
BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWEN, FRED W.—Durham.
[4]BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRETHEN, GEORGE ARTHUR—Peterborough, E. Riding.
BRISTOL, HON. EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BROWN, JOHN LIVINGSTONE—Lisgar.
BUREAU, HON. JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

CAHILL, FRANK S.—Pontiac.
CALDWELL, THOMAS W.—Victoria and Carleton (N.B.).
CAMPBELL, MILTON N.—Mackenzie.
CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.
CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARMICHAEL, ARCHIBALD M.—Kindersley.
CARROLL, WLLIAM F.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.
CARRUTHERS, JOHN—Algoma, E. Riding.
CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANÇOIS—Charlevoix-Montmorency.
[5]CASSELMAN, ORREN D.—Grenville.
CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln.
CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.
CHEVRIER, EDGAR RODOLPHE EUGENE—Ottawa.
CHEW, MANLEY—Simcoe, E. Riding.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CHURCH, THOMAS LANGTON—Toronto, North.
CLARK, JOHN ARTHUR—Burrard.
CLIFFORD, LAWSON OMAR—Ontario, S. Riding.
COOTE, GEORGE GIBSON—Macleod.
COPP, HON. ARTHUR BLISS—Westmoreland.
CRERAR, HON. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.

D'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.
DAVIES, CLAUDIUS CHARLES—North Battleford.
DÉCHÊNE, AIMÉ MIVILLE—Montmagny.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
[6]DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.
DENIS, J. ARTHUR—St. Denis.
DENIS, JEAN JOSEPH—Joliette.
DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.
DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.
DESROCHERS, EUGENE—Maskinongé.
DICKIE, CHARLES HERBERT—Nanaimo.
DRAYTON, HON. SIR HENRY L., KT.—York, W. Riding.
DRUMMOND, JOHN DOUGLAS FRASER—Middlesex, W. Riding.
DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenburg.
DUNCAN, MATTHEW ROBERT—Grey, N. Riding.

ELLIOTT, PRESTON—Dundas.
ELLIOTT, WILLIAM—Waterloo, S. Riding.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.
EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.
EVANS, JOHN—Saskatoon.

FAFARD, J. FERNAND—L'Islet.
FANSHER, BURT WENDELL—Lambton, E. Riding.

[1] Resigned, February 8, 1922.
[2] Died, October 22, 1922.
[3] Elected, May 15, 1922.
[4] Resigned, March 11, 1922.
[5] Resigned, December 27, 1921.
[6] Resigned, July 22, 1922.

FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queens.
FINDLAY, JOHN WALTER—Bruce, S. Riding.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORKE, ROBERT—Brandon.
FORRESTER, WILLIAM—Perth, S. Riding.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADÉLARD—Labelle.
FOURNIER, CHARLES ALPHONSE—Bellechasse.

GARDINER, ROBERT—Medicine Hat.
GARLAND, EDWARD J.—Bow River.
GARLAND, WILLIAM FOSTER—Carleton.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GENDRON, ROMUALD M.—Wright.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GERVAIS, THÉODORE—Berthier.
GOOD, WILLIAM CHARLES—Brant.
GORDON, GEORGE NEWCOMBE—Peterborough, W. Riding.
GOUIN, HON. SIR LOMER, K.C.M.G.—Laurier-Outremont.
GOULD, OLVER ROBERT—Assiniboia.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE PERRY—Essex, S. Riding.
GRIMMER, ROBERT WATSON—Charlotte.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALBERT, ROBERT HENRY—Ontario, N. Riding.
HAMMELL, WILLIAM JAMES—Muskoka.
HANSON, RICHARD B.—York-Sunbury.
HARRIS, JOSEPH HENRY—York, E. Riding.
HATFIELD, PAUL LA COMBE—Yarmouth and Clare.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, West.
HODGINS, ARCHIE LATIMER—Middlesex, E. Riding.
HOEY, ROBERT ALEXANDER—Springfield.
HUBBS, JOHN—Prince Edward, O.
HUDSON, ALBERT BLELLACK—Winnipeg, South.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUMPHREY, LEVI WILLIAM—Kootenay, West.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

IRVINE, WILLIAM—Calgary, East.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JELLIFF, LINCOLN HENRY—Lethbridge.
JOHNSON, R. M.—Moosejaw.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.
JONES, GEORGE BURPEE—Royal.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERIC—Missisquoi.
KELLNER, DONALD F.—Edmonton, East.
KENNEDY, DONALD M.—Edmonton, West.
KENNEDY, DOUGALD—Port Arthur and Kenora.
KENNEDY, JOHN WILFRED—Glengarry and Stormont.
KENNEDY, HON. WILLIAM COSTELLO—Essex, N. Riding.
[1]KING, HON. JAMES H.—Kootenay, East.
KING, JOHN WARWICK—Huron, N. Riding.
KING, HON. W. L. MACKENZIE—York, N. Riding.
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

LADNER, LEON JOHNSON—Vancouver, South.
LAFLAMME, J. NAPOLÉON K.—Drummond-Arthabaska.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
[2]LAFORTUNE, DAVID ARTHUR—Jacques Cartier.
LAPIERRE, EDMOND ANTHONY—Nipissing.
LAPOINTE, HON. ERNEST—Quebec, East.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec County.
LEADER, HARRY—Portage la Prairie.
LEGER, AUGUSTE THÉOPHILE—Kent, N.B.
LESUEUR, RICHARD VRYLING—Lambton, W. Riding.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LEWIS, ARTHUR JOHN—Swift Current.
LOGAN, HANCE JAMES—Cumberland.
LOVETT, LEWIS JOHNSTONE—Digby-Annapolis.
LOVIE, WILLIAM JAMES—Macdonald.
LOW, HON. THOMAS ANDREW—Renfrew, S. Riding.
LUCAS, WILLIAM THOMAS—Victoria (Alta.)

MACDONALD, EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACKELVIE, JOHN A.—Yale.
MACKINNON, DONALD ALEXANDER—Queens, P.E.I.
MACLAREN, MURRAY—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
MACLEAN, HON. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, ALFRED EDGAR—Prince, P.E.I.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACPHAIL, AGNES C.—Grey, Southeast Riding.
MCBRIDE, THOMAS GEORGE—Cariboo.
[3]MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, Ont.
MCCONICA, THOMAS HENRY—Battleford.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCDONALD, ANGUS—Timiskaming.
[4]MCGIBBON, PETER ROBERT—Argenteuil.
MCGIVERIN, HAROLD BUCHANAN—Ottawa.
MCISAAC, COLIN FRANCIS—Antigonish-Guysborough.
MCKAY, MATTHEW—Renfrew, N. Riding.
MCKENZIE, HON. DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCKILLOP, HUGH C.—Elgin, W. Riding.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCMURRAY, EDWARD JAMES—Winnipeg, North.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
MCTAGGART, NEIL HAMAN—Maple Creek.
MALCOLM, JAMES—Bruce, N. Riding.
MANION, HON. ROBERT JAMES—Ft. William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARLER, HERBERT—St. Lawrence-St. George.
MARTELL, LEWIS HERBERT—Hants.
MAYBEE, MILTON EDGAR—Northumberland (Ont.)

[1] Elected, March 14, 1922.
[2] Died, October 19, 1922.
[3] Resigned, January 4, 1922.
[4] Died, December 18, 1921.

[1]MEIGHEN, RT. HON. ARTHUR—Grenville.
MERCIER, PAUL—Westmount-St. Henri.
MEWBURN, HON. SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MILLAR, JOHN—Qu'Appelle.
MILNE, ROBERT—Neepawa.
MITCHELL, WALTER G.—St. Antoine.
MORIN, L. S. RENE—St. Hyacinthe-Rouville.
MORRISON, JOHN—Weyburn.
MORRISSY, JOHN—Northumberland (N.B.)
MOTHERWELL, HON. WILLIAM R.—Regina.
MUNRO, ELGIN ALBERT—Fraser Valley.
[2]MURDOCK, HON. JAMES—Kent, O.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NEILL, ALAN WEBSTER—Comox-Alberni.

[3]OUIMET, JOSEPH R.—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.

[4]PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, West.
PELLETIER, FRANCOIS JEAN—Matane.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, South.
PREVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PRITCHARD, JOHN—Wellington, N. Riding.
PUTNAM, HAROLD—Colchester.

RANKIN, JAMES PALMER—Perth, N. Riding.
RAYMOND, WILLIAM G.—Brantford.
REED, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Frontenac.
RINFRET, FERNAND—St. James.
ROBB, HON. JAMES ALEXANDER—Chateauguay-Huntingdon.
ROBINSON, ERNEST WILLIAM—Kings (N.S.)
ROBITAILLE, CLÉMENT—Maisonneuve.
ROSS, ARTHUR EDWARD—Kingston.
ROSS, THOMAS EDWIN—Simcoe, N. Riding.
RYCKMAN, EDMOND BAIRD—Toronto, East.

ST. PÈRE, EDOUARD CHARLES—Hochelaga.
SALES, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
SAVARD, EDMOND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SENN, MARK CECIL—Haldimand.
SEXSMITH, EDWARD JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
SHAW, JOSEPH T.—Calgary, West.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, South.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, DUNCAN JAMES—Oxford, N. Riding.
SINCLAIR, HON. JOHN EWEN—Queens (P.E.I.)
SPEAKMAN, ALFRED—Red Deer.
SPENCE, DAVID—Parkdale.
SPENCER, HENRY ELVINS—Battle River.
STANSELL, JOHN LAWRENCE—Elgin, E. Riding.
STEEDSMAN, JAMES—Souris.
[5]STEIN, ADOLPHE—Kamouraska.
STEVENS, HON. HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver, Centre
[6]STEWART, HON. CHARLES—Argenteuil.
STEWART, C. WALLACE—Humboldt.
STEWART, HUGH ALEXANDER—Leeds.
[7]STEWART, HON. JOHN A.—Lanark.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, W. Riding.
STORK, ALFRED—Skeena.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.
THURSTON, JOHN J.—Victoria, (O.)
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, HON. SIMON FRASER—Victoria City (B.C.)
TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.
[8]TURGEON, ONESIPHORE—Gloucester.

VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbinière.

WALLACE, JOHN ALEXANDER—Norfolk.
WALSH, JOSEPH C.—St. Ann.
WARD, WILLIAM JOHN—Dauphin.
WARNER, DANIEL WEBSTER—Strathcona.
WHITE, JOHN FRANKLIN—London.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WOODS, ROBERT JOHN—Dufferin.
WOODSWORTH, JAMES S.—Winnipeg, Centre.

[1] Elected, January 26, 1922.
[2] Elected, January 19, 1922.
[3] Elected, March 21, 1922.
[4] Resigned, October 26, 1922.
[5] Resigned, May 5, 1922.
[6] Elected, February 28, 1922.
[7] Died, October 7, 1922.
[8] Resigned, October 26, 1922.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

Constituencies of the House of Commons

First Session—Fourteenth Parliament

1922

ALGOMA, E. RIDING—Carruthers, John.
ALGOMA, W. RIDING—Simpson, Thomas Edward.
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—McIsaac, Colin Francis.
ARGENTEUIL—[1]McGibbon, Peter Robert.
[2]Stewart, Hon. Charles.
ASSINIBOIA—Gould, Oliver Robert.

BAGOT—Marcile, Joseph Edmond.
BATTLEFORD—McConica, Thomas Henry.
BATTLE RIVER—Spencer, Henry Elvins.
BEAUCE—Béland, Hon. Henri Sévérin.
BEAUHARNOIS—Papineau, Louis Joseph.
BELLECHASSE—Fournier, Charles Alphonse.
BERTHIER—Gervais, Théodore.
BONAVENTURE—Marcil, Hon. Charles.
BOW RIVER—Garland, Edward J.
BRANDON—Forke, Robert.
BRANT—Good, William Charles.
BRANTFORD—Raymond, William G.
BROME—McMaster, Andrew Ross.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Malcolm, James.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Findlay, John Walter.
BURRARD—Clark, John Arthur.

CALGARY, EAST—Irvine, William.
CALGARY, WEST—Shaw, Joseph Tweed.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—McKenzie, Hon. Daniel D.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—Carroll, William F., Kyte, George W.
CARIBOO—McBride, Thomas George.
CARLETON—Garland, William Foster.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Archambault, Joseph.
CHAMPLAIN—Desaulniers, Arthur L.
CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY — Casgrain, Pierre François.
CHARLOTTE—Grimmer, Robert Watson.
CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—Robb, Hon. James Alexander.
CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Savard, Edmond.
COLCHESTER—Putnam, Harold.
COMOX-ALBERNI—Neill, Alan Webster.
COMPTON—Hunt, Aylmer Byron.
CUMBERLAND—Logan, Hance James.

DAUPHIN—Ward, William John.
DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Lovett, Lewis Johnstone.
DORCHESTER—Cannon, Lucien.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Laflamme, J. Napoléon K.
DUFFERIN—Woods, Robert John.
DUNDAS—Elliott, Preston.
DURHAM—Bowen, Fred W.

EDMONTON, EAST—Kellner, Donald F.
EDMONTON, WEST—Kennedy, Donald M.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—Stansell, John Lawrence.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—McKillop, Hugh C.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Kennedy, Hon. William Costello.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Graham, Hon. George Perry.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Manion, Hon. Robert James.
FRASER VALLEY—Munro, Elgin Albert.
FRONTENAC—Reed, William Samuel.

GASPÉ—Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe.
GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Jacobs, Samuel William.
GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—Kennedy, John Wilfred.
GLOUCESTER—[3]Turgeon, Onésiphore.
GRENVILLE—[4]Casselman, Orren D.
[5]Meighen, Rt. Hon. Arthur.
GREY, N. RIDING—Duncan, Matthew Robert.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Macphail, Agnes C.

HALDIMAND—Senn, Mark Cecil.
HALIFAX—[6]Blackadder, Edward.
Maclean, Hon. A. K.
HALTON—Anderson, Robert King.
HAMILTON, E. RIDING—Mewburn, Hon. Sydney Chilton.
HAMILTON, W. RIDING—Stewart, Thomas Joseph.

[1] Died, December 18, 1921.
[2] Elected, February 28, 1922.
[3] Resigned, October 26, 1922.
[4] Resigned, December 27, 1921.
[5] Elected, January 26, 1922.
[6] Died, October 22, 1922.

HANTS—Martell, Lewis Herbert.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thompson, Thomas Henry.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Porter, Edward Guss.
HOCHELAGA—St. Père, Edouard Charles.
HULL—Fontaine, Joseph Eloi.
HUMBOLDT—Stewart, C. Wallace.
HURON, N. RIDING—King, John Warwick.
HURON, S. RIDING—Black, William.

INVERNESS—Chisholm, Alexander W.

JACQUES CARTIER—[1]Lafortune, David Arthur.
JOLIETTE—Denis, Jean Joseph.

KAMOURASKA—[2]Stein, Adolphe.
[3]Bouchard, Georges (Joseph)
KENT (N.B.)—Léger, Auguste Théophile.
KENT (O.)—[4]McCoig, Archibald Blake.
[5]Murdock, Hon. James.
KINDERSLEY—Carmichael, Archibald M.
KING'S (N.S.)—Robinson, Ernest William.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Hughes, James J.
KINGSTON—Ross, Arthur Edward.
KOOTENAY, EAST—[6]Beattie, Robert Ethelbert.
[7]King, Hon. James H.
KOOTENAY, WEST—Humphrey, Levi William.

LABELLE—Fortier, Hyacinthe Adélard.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Fansher, Burt Wendell.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—LeSueur, Richard Vryling.
LANARK—[8]Stewart, Hon. John A.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Lanctôt, Roch.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Séguin, Paul Arthur.
LAST MOUNTAIN—Johnston, J. Fred.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer, K.C.M.G.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Ethier, Joseph Arthur Calixte.
LEEDS—Stewart, Hugh Alexander.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Sexsmith, Edward James.
LETHBRIDGE—Jelliff, Lincoln Henry.
LÉVIS—Bourassa, Joseph Boutin.
LINCOLN—Chaplin, James Dew.
LISGAR—Brown, John Livingstone.
L'ISLET—Fafard, J. Fernand.
LONDON—White, John Franklin.
LOTBINIÈRE—Vien, Thomas.
LUNENBURG—Duff, William.

MACDONALD—Lovie, William James.
MACKENZIE—Campbell, Milton M.
MACLEOD—Coote, George Gibson.
MAISONNEUVE—Robitaille, Clément.
MAPLE CREEK—McTaggart, Neil Haman.
MARQUETTE—Crerar, Hon. Thomas Alexander.
MASKINONGÉ—Desrochers, Eugene.
MATANE—Pelletier, François Jean.
MEDECINE HAT—Gardiner, Robert.
MEGANTIC—[9]Pacaud, Lucien Turcotte.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Hodgins, Archie Latimer.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Drummond, John Douglas Fraser.
MISSISQUOI—Kay, William Frederic.
MONTMAGNY—Déchêne, Aimé Miville.
MOOSEJAW—Johnson, R. M.
MUSKOKA—Hammell, William James.

NANAIMO—Dickie, Charles Herbert.
NEEPAWA—Milne, Robert.
NELSON—Bird, Thomas William.
NEW WESTMINSTER—McQuarrie, William Garland.
NICOLET—Trahan, Arthur.
NIPISSING—Lapierre, Edmond Anthony.
NORFOLK—Wallace, John Alexander.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Davies, Claudius Charles
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Morrissy, John.
NORTHUMBERLAND (ONT.)—Maybee, Milton Edgar.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Halbert, Robert Henry.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—Clifford, Lawson Omar.
OTTAWA—Chevrier, Edgar Rodolphe E.
McGiverin, Harold Buchanan.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Sinclair, Duncan James.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Sutherland, Donald.

PARKDALE—Spence, David.
PARRY SOUND—Arthurs, James.
PEEL—Charters, Samuel.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Rankin, James Palmer.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Forrester, William.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—Brethen, George Arthur.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—Gordon, George Newcombe.
PICTOU—Macdonald, Edward Mortimer.
PONTIAC—Cahill, Frank S.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Leader, Harry.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Kennedy, Dougald.
PORTNEUF—Delisle, Michel Simeon.
PRESCOTT—Binette, Joseph.
PRINCE ALBERT—Knox, Andrew.
PRINCE EDWARD—Hubbs, Jonn.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)—MacLean Alfred Edgar.
PROVENCHER—Beaubien, Arthur Lucien.

QU'APPELLE—Millar, John.
QUEBEC COUNTY—Lavigueur, Henri E.
QUEBEC, EAST—Lapointe, Hon. Ernest.
QUEBEC, SOUTH—Power, Charles Gavin.
QUEBEC, WEST—Parent, George.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—Sinclair, Hon. John Ewen.
Mackinnon, Donald Alexander.

[1] Died, October 19, 1922.
[2] Resigned, May 5, 1922.
[3] Elected, May 15, 1922.
[4] Resigned, January 4, 1922.
[5] Elected, January 19, 1922.
[6] Resigned, February 8, 1922.
[7] Elected, March 14, 1922.
[8] Died, October 7, 1922.
[9] Resigned, October 26, 1922.

RED DEER—Speakman, Alfred.
REGINA—Motherwell, Hon. William R.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—McKay, Matthew.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Low, Hon. Thomas Andrew.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Michaud, Pius.
RICHELIEU—Cardin, Pierre Joseph Arthur.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Tobin, Edmond William.
RIMOUSKI—d'Anjou, Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel.
ROYAL—Jones, George Burpee.
RUSSELL—Murphy, Hon. Charles.

ST. ANN—Walsh, Joseph C.
ST. ANTOINE—Mitchell, Walter G.
ST. DENIS—Denis, J. Arthur.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Morin, L. S. René.
ST. JAMES—Rinfret, Fernand.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Baxter, Hon. John B. M.
MacLaren, Murray.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—[1]Demers, Marie Joseph.
[2]Benoit, Aldéric Joseph.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ST. GEORGE—Marler, Herbert.
ST. MARY—Deslauriers, Hermas.
SALTCOATS—Sales, Thomas.
SASKATOON—Evans, John.
SELKIRK—Bancroft, Leland Payson.
SHEFFORD—Boivin, George Henry.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fielding, Hon. William Stevens.
SHERBROOKE—McCrea, Francis N.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—Chew, Manley.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Ross, Thomas Edwin.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Boys, William Alves.
SKEENA—Stork, Alfred.
SOURIS—Steedsman, James.
SPRINGFIELD—Hoey, Robert Alexander.
STANSTEAD—Baldwin, Willis Keith.
STRATHCONA—Warner, Daniel Webster.
SWIFT CURRENT—Lewis, Arthur John.

TÉMISCOUATA—Gauvreau, Charles Arthur.
TERREBONNE—Prevost, Jules Edouard.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Bureau, Hon. Jacques.
TIMISKAMING—McDonald, Angus.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Bristol, Hon. Edmund.
TORONTO, EAST—Ryckman, Edmond Baird.
TORONTO, NORTH—Church, Thomas Langton.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Sheard, Charles.
TORONTO, WEST—Hocken, Horatio Clarence.

VANCOUVER, CENTRE—Stevens, Hon. Henry Herbert.
VANCOUVER, SOUTH—Ladner, Leon Johnson.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—[3]Boyer, Gustave.
[4]Ouimet, Joseph R.
VICTORIA (ALTA.)—Lucas, William Thomas.
VICTORIA (O.)—Thurston, John J.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON (N.B.)—Caldwell, Thomas W.
VICTORIA CITY (B.C.)—Tolmie, Hon. Simon Fraser.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Euler, William D.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Elliott, William.
WELLAND—German, William Manley.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Pritchard, John.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Guthrie, Hon. Hugh.
WENTWORTH—Wilson, Gordon Crooks.
WESTMORLAND—Copp, Hon. Arthur Bliss.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRY—Mercier, Paul.
WEYBURN—Morrison, John.
WINNIPEG, CENTRE—Woodsworth, James S.
WINNIPEG, NORTH—McMurray, Edward James.
WINNIPEG, SOUTH—Hudson, Albert Blellack.
WRIGHT—Gendron, Romuald M.

YALE—MacKelvie, John A.
YAMASKA—Boucher, Wilfrid E. E. Aimé.
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Hatfield, Paul La Combe.
YORK, E. RIDING—Harris, Joseph Henry.
YORK, N. RIDING—King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie.
YORK, S. RIDING—Malean, William Findlay.
YORK, W. RIDING—Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L., Kt.
YORK-SUNBURY—Hanson, Richard B.
YUKON—Black, George.

[1] Resigned, July 22, 1922.
[2] Elected, August 31, 1922.
[3] Resigned, March 11, 1922.
[4] Elected, March 21, 1922.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, March 8, 1922.

This being the day on which Parliament is convoked by proclamation of the Governor General for the despatch of business, and the members of the House being assembled:

William B. Northrup, Esquire, M.A., K.C., the Clerk of the House, read the House a letter from the Governor General's Secretary, informing him that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber on Wednesday, the 8th of March, at 3 p.m., to open the session.

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Goverior General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber, when the Speaker of the Senate said:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have it in command to let you know that His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present Parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but to-morrow, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of calling this Parliament.

And the members being returned to the Commons Chamber:

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Northrup, we are assembled as members of the House of Commons, in virtue of a royal proclamation summoning the Fourteenth Parliament of Canada. We have just been reminded by the representative of the Crown that, with the commencement of a new Parliament, our first duty is to elect a Speaker. This obligation is in accordance with long established usage of Parliament. It comes down to us as a part of our inheritance of British Parliamentary institutions. It links our political liberties with those of ancient origin.

I need not remind the hon. members of the dignity and importance of the office of Speaker of the House of Commons. If I do so at all, it is because the gentleman whom I am about to propose and to ask hon. members to elect, possesses in such marked degree the qualities expected of the "First Commoner", that a mention of some of these requirements may serve to arouse a consciousness not less of the extent of our opportunity and obligation than of his merit.

I suppose the most venerable of the duties of the Speaker is that of being the channel of communication between the Commons and the Crown. There was a time when the discharge of this duty demanded not less of courage than of courtesy; to-day it has become the least arduous of all the Speaker's obligations. The relations between the Crown and the people were never happier than they are to-day, whether this be said of His Majesty the King and British citizens throughout the globe, or of His Majesty's representative in Canada and the representatives of the Canadian people here assembled. The adequate discharge of this honourable duty need cause us little concern.

It is as presiding officer of this House, and the custodian of its honour and rights and privileges, that the office of Speaker places upon its incumbent obligations and responsibilities of the highest order; and demands of him the noblest qualities of intellect, of temperament, and of heart. He must have a thorough knowledge and wide experience of the rules and procedure of the House. He must be possessed of calm judgment and of quick decision; he must combine firmness with impartiality and patience; and he should have, withal, a generous disposition and a goodly understanding of human nature. These are

REVISED EDITION

many virtues to be sought in one man; I believe they are all possessed by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux).

The hon. Mr. Lemieux has been a member of the House of Commons of Canada continuously for over a quarter of a century. If we except the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), who entered Parliament in 1892, and the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), who was also returned at the general elections of 1896, I think I am right in saying that this is a distinction not enjoyed by any other hon. member of this House as to-day composed. Seniority of itself does not always constitute a claim for recognition or preferment. Where, however, as in the case of the hon. member for Gaspé, it is combined with exceptional endowments and distinguished service, it becomes a first consideration.

It has been more or less a tradition in this House that in successive parliaments the speakers should be chosen alternately from representatives of English and French origin. In the last Parliament, the Speaker was of English descent. It is fitting, therefore, that on this occasion we should select as Speaker one whose ancestry links him with the great race who were the pioneers of early discovery and settlement in what is now our Canadian Dominion.

In this our practice has differed in an essential particular from that followed in the British House of Commons, where the Speaker, once elected, is honoured by being re-elected to the Chair at the beginning of every new Parliament, so long as he remains a member of the House of Commons. I think we would do well to consider carefully the obvious merit of the British practice. It has been established as the outcome of long years of parliamentary experience, and its advantages in many particulars are apparent. This, however, is a matter which the House must decide for itself, and which cannot be determined except by the decision of successive parliaments. For the present we will not err if we hold to the custom we have thus far followed.

Whilst there may be reasons why, on occasions, we should keep in mind differences which owe their origin to circumstances wholly beyond our own control, it is an infinitely finer conception of public duty which causes us to place the emphasis, in our national affairs, not on what we have of difference, but on what we hold in common; in other words, on what as Canadians we share of which we may be justly proud. May I remind hon. members, in this connection, that few public men in our history have served their country with rarer fidelity, with more distinction, or at greater sacrifice, than the hon. member for Gaspé. Whether it has been as an able parliamentarian upholding British traditions on the floor of this House, or as an administrator of important departments of the Government, or as our country's representative on ceremonial and diplomatic missions in different parts of the world, Mr. Lemieux at all times has fulfilled the trust reposed in him with credit to his fellow-countrymen and honour to himself. His only son, to whom with parental pride he had looked to bear his name in like distinction of public service, lies among the number of the immortal youth of our land whose lives were given in the cause of the world's freedom.

Where death has placed its hand, we cannot enter. At best we can do scant justice to public sacrifice of any kind; but we can cherish what we hold in remembrance of patriotic service alike of the living and the dead; and it is therefore with feelings of gratitude and pride that I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding:

The Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux, K.C., LL.D., member representing the electoral district of Gaspé, do take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The duties of Speaker have been well and, indeed, very gracefully defined by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who makes this motion. The qualifications of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) for this high office have also been well and amply defined by my hon. friend, and in his statement of those qualifications I desire to concur, rather than to differ. I rise not at all to make criticism of the choice of the Prime Minister, as a member of this House, of the hon. member for Gaspé as Speaker of the Fourteenth Parliament. Indeed, the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, associated as he has been with the House of Commons now for some twenty-five years, through most of that time in a position of high responsibility, always in a position of keen activity, and displaying throughout the entire period a marked knowledge of the history of our own land and of the Motherland, and particularly of parliamentary practice and of constitutional government, is, in point of experience and learning, undoubtedly amply

qualified for the position of Speaker of this House.

I desire to comment, however, on one aspect of the situation. The choice of Speaker is the choice of this House. The House chooses and elects its Speaker; he is in no sense the choice of the Government —in no sense the choice of the Prime Minister. In the British House this has been the practice since the earliest times; we have followed that custom in equal degree and with equal fidelity. Indeed, in the British Parliament it has never been the practice even for a member of the Government to move or second the selection of a Speaker; that is left to the private members. In our Parliament we have not in that special regard followed the British practice. No one would deny that a member acceptable to the Administration should be selected; but I do deny the right of the Administration—the right of the Prime Minister—to announce to this House and to the country in advance whom we shall select as Speaker. I know of no instance where that has been done in our previous history. But, when the present Government was chosen, when after long and laborious incubation the names came to the light of day, the Prime Minister issued a statement on December 30 last, in which he announced that the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux would be selected as Speaker of the House of Commons. That was assuming a function not his own, a function in no way appertaining to the Government. It was his function to choose his ministers; it was not his function to choose or announce a Speaker. Indeed, it was no less than a discourtesy to this House to say in advance whom we should select as our Speaker.

That is in no way meant in disparagement of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). I do not suppose he was a party to the announcement. I believe his knowledge of our traditions is such that he would not be a party to such an announcement; and I join in every word of commendation of him in so far as his personal qualifications go. But I do not want those words to be understood as exculpating him from the penalty which he must pay for some of the speeches he made in his own province in order to secure the result which took place there on December 6. This, however, is not the appropriate place to refer in terms of controversy to those speeches. It would be most inappropriate were I now to even make mention of discussions of legitimate topics, though I might differ, and wholly differ, from assertions contained therein though made as assertions of fact. But certain lines of discussion may be indulged in in this country which are beyond the pale of political propriety, because if the example were followed by others it would be incompatible with our national life. In such unwarranted discussion the hon. member for Gaspé undoubtedly indulged.

Reference was made by the Prime Minister to the fact that only two other hon. members, elected as far back as 1896, sit among us to-day. My attention had not been previously drawn to the realization of that sad truth. It illustrates the uncertainty of human life—and it illustrates as well the mortality of political existence.

When reference was being made to the qualifications of the hon. member for Gaspé, and when claim to fidelity to parliamentary practice was being made on the part of the Prime Minister, I could not help but think that one custom which we have followed for many years, if not back to Confederation, has been disregarded in this instance. It has been the practice to promote him who has occupied the post of Deputy Speaker, if he is so fortunate as to be returned, to the position of Speaker in the succeeding Parliament. That was followed in the case of one hon. gentleman still a member of this House whom we are glad to see among us, representing, I presume, his former constituency, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). That was also the case in respect to the Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur, who, having been Deputy Speaker for some years, succeeded in 1904 to the position of Speaker. It was followed in the case of the Hon. Albert Sevigny, who, having been Deputy Speaker, succeeded the Hon. T. S. Sproule as Speaker in 1917, and it was followed in the case of the late Speaker, Mr. Rhodes. That it has not been followed in the present instance cannot be attributed to lack of qualification on the part of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin). I doubt if this House has ever been favoured with a deputy speaker who possessed greater qualifications for the duties of the office and who in their discharge met in higher degree the favour of all sides of this House. In the course of the exercise of his duties he manifested that diligence and strength of character, that stern impartiality and

courage, that are so essential in a speaker of the House of Commons. The four years of his experience as Deputy Speaker would only add to his value were he now promoted to the position of Speaker. It is not for the Opposition to choose a Speaker; it is for Parliament as a whole. But I think it would have been most appropriate if the Prime Minister, in declining to follow the practice that has so long prevailed, had favoured the House with an explanation of why he had cast aside in this instance the hon. member for Shefford. We on this side, while offering no objection at all to the selection made—indeed, while honouring our fellow member, the hon. member for Gaspé—do feel that we are entitled to be told why the practice in the case that I have just mentioned, where the duties had been so conspicuously well fulfilled, has not been observed.

We open now the Fourteenth Parliament. One could not venture a desire for that Parliament the realization of which is more vital to us all than that the discharge of its functions will be characterized by that dignity, that devotion to the public interest, that regard for the public weal and for our traditions, our history, our past and our future, that has characterized the Parliaments that have gone. I believe that in the hon. member for Gaspé we start well on that path. I believe he will contribute well to our following it, and if it is the desire of the House that he be chosen as Speaker, I assure him that on our part we shall pay him the respect and deference that is his due and that is due to any who occupy that exalted post.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Leader of the Progressive Party): Mr. Northrup, this is one of the most important matters that can come before the House for consideration. The position of Speaker is, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has pointed out, one of very great responsibility; one that has attaching to it much of the tradition upon which our free parliamentary institutions have developed. It is indeed a very responsible post. I do not wish to associate myself with all that my right hon. friend the member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) has said; with some of his criticisms I would, perhaps, be inclined to agree. At any rate, I have to say this: the Government, of course, are entitled to the selection of the Speaker. That being the case, they have made an excellent choice in the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). He has been associated with this House for a great many years and is well acquainted with parliamentary procedure. In this Parliament, I am reminded, there are over one hundred new members; and I have no doubt that that excellent good humour, that patience and consideration which have always characterized the hon. member for Gaspé will enable him to assist these new members in the preparatory stages of their parliamentary work.

I agree entirely with the observation made by the Prime Minister, and also alluded to by my hon. friend from Grenville, who leads the official Opposition, that the British practice, whereby the speakership of the House of Commons does not change with the election of a new Parliament, might very well be introduced into our assembly. There is much to commend that practice. We were fortunate in the Speaker we had in the last House of Commons. We were fortunate, too, in the Deputy Speaker of that House, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin). I recall the facility with which the hon. member for Shefford could dispose of that multitude of Bills having to do with divorce which come from across the way, and I would like to have seen that energy applied to the conduct of the general business of this House. I have no doubt, however, that my hon. friend from Gaspé will do equally well, and I can promise him that so far as the "dilapidated annex" in this corner of the Chamber is concerned, we shall give him our very best support. I am sure that the choice will prove a happy one, and I have no doubt that the very important business of the House will, under the aegis of the hon. member for Gaspé, be conducted with due regard to all the traditions of the high office he is about to fill.

The Clerk of the House declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente, and Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux, member for the electoral division of Gaspé, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Honourable Mr. Lemieux was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT said: Madame; Fellow Members of the House of Commons: I must thank you from the bottom of my heart for the very high honour you have unanimously bestowed upon me. I know

full well my unfitness for this high office but I trust that with the loyal co-operation of both sides in this House I shall be able to maintain with firmness, tempered by impartiality, the rules which unfortunately in the past I myself have honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

From this moment on I cease to be a party man; I become the servant of the House and in a broader sense the servant of the country, of which you are the direct, and I should add, the graceful expression.

I have sat, as has been stated, for twenty-five years in the House of Commons. I hope to live up to its traditions and to its memories. It shall be my endeavour in my administration of the rules of the House and in my interpretation of the constitutional usages to maintain and preserve those traditions, customs and privileges, and above all, that freedom of speech and that dignity and decorum in debate, which have come down to us through precedent and precedent from the Mother of Parliaments, the British House of Commons.

Madame, mes chers collègues, je vous remercie du plus profond de mon cœur du témoignage de confiance que vous venez de me donner si unanimement. Je sais que je n'ai pas la compétence voulue pour faire dignement honneur à la position, mais vous pouvez compter sur mon impartialité et sur ma fermeté afin que les règlements de la Chambre, règlements qui nous sont venus de très loin puisqu'ils datent de la monarchie anglo-normande dont nous sommes les héritiers au Canada, soient respectés. C'est ainsi que nous donnerons à nos délibérations la dignité voulue. J'espère qu'avec votre concours je serai à la hauteur de la situation et qu'ensemble nous maintiendrons les traditions, les us et coutumes, les privilèges, la liberté de parole qui nous viennent du plus grand, j'oserais dire du modèle des parlements modernes, le parlement britannique. Encore une fois, mes chers collègues, merci du plus profond de mon cœur.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Sergeant-at-Arms, with my approval, has appointed Louis Charles Panet, Esquire, to be his deputy during the present session of Parliament.

ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I think that the House will expect me to make to them at as early a date as possible a report of the proceedings, or at all events of the part taken by myself and by my colleagues, as representing Canada, at the recent Conference in Great Britain. I have been favoured with a complete report of the Conference proceedings myself, but it comes to me marked "Secret," and of course necessarily is in some degree of that character. For the purpose of making the representation I would like, it will be essential that I review my own position, and to make that understandable, the position taken by at least some of the other representatives there on various matters of great consequence. I should not feel free to do so, unless I had a definite word and liberty given as to what use I might make of the report that is to hand. I therefore would ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to communicate with the Prime Minister of Great Britain and secure as far as possible liberty to me to quote from the Report of the Conference and to secure as well a statement of such limitations and reservations as he feels in the general interest should be imposed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be very pleased indeed to give consideration to the matter to which my right hon. friend has referred.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask as well that the Government lay on the Table, at the Opening of Parliament, if possible, a copy of an Order in Council, which has been referred to in the press—I do not know whether one was passed—in reference to the transfer of certain fishery rights from the Dominion to the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 3.55 p.m. Wednesday.

Thursday, March 9, 1922.

The House met at Three o'clock.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary announcing that His Excellency would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p.m. on this day for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

A message was delivered by Lieut.-Col. Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please your Excellency,

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If in the performance of those duties I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons whose servant I am.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate addressing the Honourable the Speaker of the Commons then said:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to assure you that your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to state that the House having attended on His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen upon me, and, in your names and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

BILL INTRODUCED

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office—Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I desire on this occasion to assure you that it is with great satisfaction that I meet the Parliament of the Dominion for the first time since my arrival in Canada, and avail myself of your assistance and advice in carrying out the important duties that His Majesty the King has entrusted to me as his Representative. It is, indeed, a great privilege to be called upon to administer the affairs of the Dominion and to associate myself with you in the work you are about to begin.

Our Dominion has not escaped the world-wide economic disturbance and industrial depression but has suffered less from it than other countries. Keen observers of the business barometer feel that the worst is about over and that at an early date we may look for a substantial revival of activity.

In many parts of the Dominion continued depression of business naturally produced, in a much larger degree than usual, the misfortune of unemployment. Whilst of the opinion that unemployment relief is fundamentally a municipal and provincial responsibility, my Government has felt that as conditions have arisen in a measure out of the late war, they would be justified in continuing for the period of the winter months the expedient of supplementing by grants from the Federal Treasury the relief contributions of Provinces and Municipalities for the purpose of alleviating actual distress.

The decline of prices in farm products in 1921, as compared with the prices of previous years, has seriously affected agriculture in many parts of the Dominion. The ill-effects of this inevitable deflation have been emphasized by restricted markets and the absence of any corresponding reduction in the cost of production. While improved methods of culture, grading and storage of farm crops in some parts, and greater diversification in others, would materially better conditions, it is apparent that adequate markets and marketing facilities and reduced transportation and production costs lie at the root of the problem. Recognizing such to be the case, my advisers have lost no time in seeking to gain more favourable conditions of sale and marketing for the products of the farm. Communications have been opened with the authorities of other countries looking to an extension of trade and a widening of Canadian markets, and conferences have been arranged between the railway authorities with respect to the reduction of rates upon basic commodities.

You will be invited to consider the expediency of making some changes in the Customs Tariff. While there are details of revision, the consideration of which will require time and care that are not at present available, there are features of the tariff which it is felt may properly be dealt with during the present session.

In order that Government ownership and operation of our national railways now extending through every province of the Dominion may be given a fair trial under the most favourable conditions, it is intended at an early date to co-ordinate the Government-owned systems in the manner best calculated to increase efficiency, and to effect economies in administration, maintenance and operation. The whole transportation situation is one which will require your best attention. It weighs heavily upon our national finances. To assist in obtaining the information essential to an exact understanding and an adequate appreciation of the problem in its many bearings, it is proposed to supplement the work of co-ordination by a thorough enquiry.

The stream of immigration to the Dominion was much interrupted and restricted during the war. Now that the blessing of peace is with us, a renewal of efforts to bring in new settlers must be made. My Government are fully alive

to the importance of this question and will use every reasonable endeavour to attract to our country people of the most desirable class, with particular regard to settlement on our undeveloped lands.

The work in connection with the re-establishment, medical treatment and vocational training of former members of the Canadian Forces is being sympathetically and energetically prosecuted. The care of the disabled still demands the best thought of those who are charged with the duty of administering the benefits provided. It is intended, during the coming session, again to consult Parliament concerning some of the problems still remaining.

The long standing question of granting the control of the natural resources of three Western Provinces to their respective Provincial Governments has engaged the attention of my Ministers. Sympathizing with the desire of the authorities of these Provinces, which have now advanced to maturity, to have the same control and management of their resources as is possessed by the older Provinces, my Government have made a proposal to the Governments of the several Provinces concerned, which it is hoped may lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question at an early date.

With the object of promoting economy and increasing efficiency, a Bill will be submitted to you, providing for a Department of Defence, in which the various branches of the defence forces of Canada will be co-ordinated under one ministerial head.

During the interval since the last Parliament, there has been held in Washington on the invitation of the President of the United States an International Conference to consider an agreed limitation of armaments and in connection therewith to reach an understanding concerning the political relations of the Powers interested in the regions of the Pacific and the Far East. From this Conference treaties of far reaching consequence have resulted. It is the opinion of my advisers that approval of Parliament ought to precede their ratification on behalf of Canada. The treaties with appropriate explanations will accordingly be placed before you during the session.

As the result of recent discussions among the Powers, it has been decided to hold at Genoa a conference with the object of securing, through frank and amicable consultation among the nations who have been at war, a concerted effort to repair the grave dislocations in the economic and financial field that have everywhere followed the war. The Government of Canada has been invited to participate and delegates have been appointed for the purpose.

An invitation has been extended to the Government of Canada by the Government of the United States to take part in a Postal Conference, at which all phases of mail communication from one country to the other may be fully discussed. Reciprocating the spirit that has prompted the invitation, the Canadian Government will, in due course, appoint representatives to meet the representatives of the United States for the purpose mentioned.

Members of the House of Commons:

The Public Accounts for the last fiscal year will be laid before you. At an early date the Estimates for the coming year will be submitted. In their preparation imperative need for economy has rendered necessary the non-inclusion of many undertakings, appropriations for which must await a more favourable financial situation.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

In inviting your careful consideration of the important matters which will engage your attention, I pray that Divine Providence may guide and bless your deliberations.

On motion of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister):

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except the introduction of bills until disposed of.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before the motion carries, I would say that I had no intimation from the Government,—which I know will surprise hon. gentlemen across the way —as to what the intentions of the Government were in regard to the conduct of proceedings this week. It seems to me too bad if the entire week is to be devoted merely to formalities. Would it not be possible to take the Speech from the Throne into consideration to-morrow?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, I regret that there has been any oversight in informing my right hon. friend of the customary procedure at the opening of parliament, but I had assumed that his experience in this House would have sufficiently acquainted him with what was customary on the opening day. I think, when we consider that hon. members are gathered together for the first time in this new Parliament, it will probably be consulting the convenience of all parties if we follow the custom of the past and adjourn after to-day's proceedings until Monday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is by no means the invariable custom to do so. The late Government managed to get down to business sooner.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend will have ample time to discuss all matters. I might observe to him that in his impatience to make his announcement to the House yesterday he did not so much as permit His Excellency the right to read the Speech from the Throne before informing the House as to what business he would like to have taken up. We on this side will do everything necessary to facilitate the business of Parliament, and I think we can get on without the suggestion of my right hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10; said Committee to be composed of: Messrs. Beland, Robb, Low, Kyte, Papineau, Tolmie, Boys, Johnston (Last Mountain), and Forke; and that that portion of Rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said Committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

WEEK-END ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Fielding:

That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Monday next, the 13th instant, at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) presented the following message from his Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved Minute of Council appointing the Honourable H. S. Beland, Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; the Honourable J. A. Robb, Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable T. A. Low, Minister, and the Honourable John E. Sinclair, Minister without Portfolio, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Joint Report of the Librarians of Parliament.—Mr. Speaker.

Report of the proceedings of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons for 1921-1922 pursuant to Rule 9.—Mr. Speaker.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Supplement to the 53rd annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended March 31, 1920: Steamboat Inspection Report.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Beland.

Annual Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

Annual Report of Weights and Measures, Electricity and Gas Inspection Services of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Grain Commissioners in respect to country elevators.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Orders in Council passed under the provisions of 6-8-9, the Act to Authorize Rearrangements and Transfers of Duties in the Public Service.—Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1921.—Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

FISHERY RIGHTS

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I lay on the table of the House copy of Order in Council requested by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) yesterday, authorizing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to undertake the administration of the fisheries in the tidal and navigable waters of Quebec that are accessible by way of navigation from the sea.

PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

COPY OF PROCEEDINGS TABLED BY PRIME MINISTER

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I lay on the table of the House a copy of "Proceedings of the Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions, and India, held in June, July and August, 1921—Summary of Proceedings and Documents." This is a copy of the report of the Conference of Prime Ministers which was laid on the table of the House in Great Britain. I may say that a little over a month ago I communicated with the authorities in England asking for a number of copies of this printed document in order that each member of the House might have a copy for his own perusal. I am informed that these documents were shipped from England about the twenty-fourth of last month, so they may be here at any time. The Under-Secretary of State will see that each member is supplied with a copy as soon as they are received.

My right hon. friend yesterday, referring to the proceedings of this Conference, stated that certain of them were secret and asked me to communicate with the Prime Minister of Great Britain in order

to find out what part, if any, of the secret proceedings he would be at liberty to disclose. A good deal has been said by my right hon. friend in regard to the equality of status of the different countries comprising the British Empire. I would say that I see no necessity for our asking Great Britain what we may do in reference to any conference of Prime Ministers. As I look at the proceedings I find that representatives of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and India were present, and I should think there would be quite as much reason for communicating with Australia and South Africa as with Great Britain in regard to what part of the proceedings should be made public in this Parliament. There is equal reason also to ask the Government of this country what its view is as to the proceedings and what action should be taken with respect to regarding any part of them as private. I may say to my right hon. friend that this is a public document and that he or any other hon. member of this House is at liberty to quote any part of it. In regard to any proceedings that were secret, I have no doubt that my right hon. friend was a party to any arrangement that was made as to the secrecy of the proceedings and he must use his own judgment as to what he will disclose or withhold in regard to that part of the Conference.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is true that all parties to the Conference had equal status, but my hon. friend must remember that the Conference was called by the British Government and that the Secretariat has issued the report thereon. It is, therefore, the right of the British Government to say to what extent the part taken by those representatives must be regarded as secret. I have asked my hon. friend to find that out; if he declines, he takes the responsibility.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to make my position perfectly clear. I simply take the ground that the Conference of Prime Ministers was a conference of the representatives of different countries, all of which were met on a basis of equality. For that reason I do not propose to return to the colonial status so far as this country is concerned, by asking permission to quote from the report.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I lay on the table of the House copies of the treaty concluded at the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments held at Washington from November 12, 1921, to February 6, 1922, signed on behalf of Canada. A report on this conference will be prepared by Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, who was Canada's representative at the conference, and will be presented to Parliament in due course.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend if those documents will be printed and made available for the information of members of the House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly. As soon as the report of Sir Robert Borden is received it will be printed. The treaties also will be printed and attached as appendices to the report.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries I find it necessary to make a request similar to the one I made yesterday, because of the impending debate on the Address and because of a reference in the Speech from the Throne. It is this: that there be laid on the table of the House on Monday, if at all possible,—at the earliest possible day, at any rate—a copy of the correspondence that passed between the late Government and the Government of Australia, particularly the Prime Minister of Australia, and between the members of the late Government and myself, with respect to reciprocal trade with Australia. This correspondence commenced about May or June, 1921.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4.20 p.m., until Monday, March 13.

Monday, March 13, 1922

The House met at Three o'clock.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA

CORRESPONDENCE TABLED BY PRIME MINISTER

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) asked me to lay on the table of the House correspondence between the

late Government and the Government of Australia with respect to reciprocal trade relations between Australia and Canada. I have gathered together such papers as I am able to find in the Department, but the file does not appear to be complete, and I have asked that further search be made for other papers. Those that I am now bringing down are the only papers that thus far have come to my notice.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I mentioned as well correspondence between members of the late Government and myself. I refer particularly to correspondence that passed between the Acting Prime Minister and myself while I was at the Imperial Conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the correspondence which I have just brought down.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY Mr. E. J. McMURRAY, SECONDED BY Mr. PAUL MERCIER.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg) moved:

That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is customary, and courtesy requires, that as mover of this Address I should express the appreciation of my constituents and myself for the high honour that has been done to them and to me. This constituency of North Winnipeg which I represent is one of the most cosmopolitan in Canada by reason of the varied ethnic elements of its population, many of them people from Central Europe, who, as new Canadians, I am pleased to say, Sir, are rapidly acquiring the manners, characteristics and habits of old Canadians; and because of their racial origin they appreciate very much the honour that has been paid to them by having their representative move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you, and to congratulate ourselves, upon your appointment as first

Commoner. Your wide experience as a parliamentarian, as a cabinet minister, and as a barrister will be of inestimable service to us as we deliberate in this assembly, and I trust, Sir, that you will be long spared to give us your advice and guidance.

The poet has said:

The old order changeth giving place to the new;

and we have in this House for the first time a lady member—the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). I am sure that when I say we all appreciate her presence here my words find an echo in the hearts of all.

During the past year the term of Governor Generalship of the Duke of Devonshire, who and whose family in many ways have been connected with Canadian life, terminated. Baron Byng of Vimy, a man who as commander of our gallant divisions in the war had won a high place in the hearts of the Canadian people, has succeeded to that office. I am sure, Sir, that it will be filled by him with satisfaction to us, and I trust that his tenure of office will be pleasureable to himself and to his family.

This new Parliament, the first expression of the will of the Canadian people after the war, meets under unusual circumstances. Both at home and abroad conditions are abnormal. Four years of war have rendered Europe not the Europe of old. International trade had drawn us close together, the world had grown smaller. Any serious disturbance of trade or of affairs in Europe must affect every nation, and we in that regard have been affected with the rest. Those circumstances and conditions we cannot control. But throughout the whole of her history Europe has survived tremendous catastrophes; there is in European civilization an inherent strength, a capacity to reestablish itself. Already the situation is clarifying; already the stars are beginning to to shine in Europe's dark night. The Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, which has just closed, is, let us hope, the morning star that ushers in the dawn of a day of international harmony and concord. The reference to that Conference in the Speech from the Throne is a matter of satisfaction. I was particularly struck with the intimation that the treaties there arranged are to be submitted to the consideration of this House; it is a vindication of the assertion that has been made by Mr. Lloyd

George, by Mr. Smuts, and by Mr. Hughes, that we are a nation in every sense of the term.

We have domestic problems, the outcome of which we can more or less control; the exterior problem we cannot so much control. We have a stupendous financial burden, the greatest in the history of this country, involving an indebtedness which can only be carried by large annual outlays. We have also a very difficult railway problem. Our state-owned railroad system, one of the largest in the world, is being operated at an annual deficit of many millions. The rates are so high to-day as to thwart and stifle industry and to defeat the very object for which they were established. This railroad system—a portion of it—has been actually wished upon us; like a starved and emaciated foundling it has been left at the door of the Dominion and the Dominion must perforce take it in and, we hope, rear it and develop it to strong and healthy maturity. Private ownership as applied to much of this road, Sir, has proved to be a failure. Private ownership has laid the burden and asked that we take it up and carry it. That being the case, state ownership should be given a chance. Not for a year or two, but for a reasonable length of time, having regard to prevailing conditions, to the vastness of the project and to the failure of private ownership, state ownership should be given a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate its capacity to deal with this tremendous problem.

Those who have travelled over the state-owned road from Quebec to Edmonton must have been struck with the fact that no railway line on the American continent runs through a better, a more productive, a greater freight-yielding country. In Northern Ontario and Northern Quebec there are probably twenty million acres of fertile land, capable of producing our ordinary cereals, land which will some day be very thickly settled. It is estimated that between Edmonton and Winnipeg, within a distance of ten or twelve miles on each side of the road, there are some ten million acres of unoccupied lands; from Edmonton out to the Coast the line runs through a more or less productive region. It is said, Sir, that comparisons are odious, but one cannot help remarking, merely for the sake of illustration, that the Canadian Pacific Railroad does not run through any section of country so productive as that traversed by the old Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. There is a small strip of rocky land along the line of the state-owned road between the Quebec border and Edmonton, covering a distance of some three hundred miles, but even that area is more or less heavily mineralized. It is a matter of great satisfaction that in the Speech from the Throne it is stated that there will be a co-ordination of the various railroad systems making up the National Railways which will ensure better management and bring about economy in operation.

Closely connected with these two great problems, the national indebtedness and the national railroads, is the question of conditions pertaining to agriculture. Agriculture is the basic industry of Canada; in it we Canadians, speaking from the financial point of view, live and move and have our being. During the war agriculture was a paying industry, but following the termination of the war prices have fallen or have become unstabilized, through the costs of operation—of farm machinery and of labour—continue high. That has been the condition of agriculture throughout Canada. Moreover, a high tariff wall has been raised against us in the United States in the form of the Fordney Bill. In adition to that, the crops of the West last year suffered from heavy rains and there was a consequent lowering in the quality of the grain produced and in the price obtained. Agriculture in Canada to-day, therefore, is becoming an unprofitable occupation.

It was with pleasure that I heard in the Speech from the Throne, Sir, that the policy of the Liberal party of the past and as set down in their election platform was to be brought into effect as far as possible during this session, in a consideration of the tariff and a reduction as far as possible of the duties on certain commodities. The tariff operates, Sir, as a rule to the advantage of the few and to the disadvantage of the many, and the deductions to be made will be in the interests of the producer as well as of the great body of the consumers. These reductions can be made without violence, without dislocation of industry; they will be in the interests of the country as a whole.

While on the subject of agriculture, to those of us who came from Western Canada, which, after all, commands a very high place in our agricultural production, it was particularly gratifying to hear that the natural resources of the three western provinces were to be dealt with and some form of settlement effected, if possible. We of

the West, and particularly Manitoba, have long awaited such a step. We want only what is fair and reasonable, we want only what we believe is constitutionally ours; and I repeat, it was a great pleasure to me as a westerner to hear in the Speech from the Throne, the first time, I believe, any such intimation has been given in that way, that a settlement of this long outstanding question was under negotiation.

Undoubtedly, it is an evidence of the goodwill of the Government and of the people of the East towards the people of the West. In this connection I cannot help making reference to the gracious act that has been accorded to the West by the province of Quebec in providing a constituency and a seat for the Honourable the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Stewart). That gracious act was indicative, I believe, of the goodwill of the people of the East towards the people of the West, of the French-speaking people towards their English-speaking compatriots.

The Speech from the Throne in its opening paragraphs contained a reference to unemployment, and intimated that the Government would continue, at least for the present year, measures of relief in that connection. Unemployment is a painful thing. It is with us very largely because of the dislocation of business caused by the war. Many returned men and many skilled artisans are idle, and it was therefore very gratifying to learn in the Speech from the Throne that there has been an appreciation of that condition.

Then there is the question of the returned soldier. Some arrangement must be made in that regard. We cannot do greater honour to the soldier, the living or the dead, than to provide for his dependents, and for those who have been disabled. We cannot do too much, within reason, in that regard.

These problems that we have to face are tremendous; they cannot be minimized. They are problems worthy of the calibre of the Canadian people. Our problems are great, but compared with the lot of other people we, in this country, are comparatively fortunate. Canada can be compared to a young athlete who has been stunned in a struggle, only to rise stronger to continue the battle to ultimate victory, like the fabled wrestler of old who when he touched his mother earth only rose the stronger. Time and tide are with Canada. Time runs in Canada's favour. The recuperative powers of a country are a combination of its resources and its people, and the history of Canada has proven us to be an intelligent, industrious, and resourceful people. Our resources are very great, in fact, almost illimitable when compared with most other countries. We have a vast extent of fertile land, some three hundred million acres, of which but one-sixth, or some fifty million acres, is under cultivation. We can produce food in as great a variety as the German Empire, and yet the German Empire, by reason of its food supply, was capable of defying the world in arms for a period of years. The German Empire is a mere pigmy compared with Canada in the area of its fertile food-producing land. We have vast forests, some five hundred thousand square miles, two hundred thousand square miles of which is saw timber. And yet with these vast forests we actually have Germany to-day, with its forests planted on the sand dunes, competing against us in the American markets in the pulp industry. Great as is our fertile land in Canada, it constitutes but about fifteen per cent of the total area of the country.

We have also over two million square miles of mineral lands. The mineral lands of Canada are unusual and different from those found almost anywhere else. As a rule, in the matter of minerals, Mother Nature has hidden her jewels well, but we have that great pre-Cambrian range extending down from the north and crossing into Minnesota and Michigan. We have merely touched the fringe of its wealth. Yet we have the Cobalt and the nickel mines of Sudbury—the Hollinger gold mine—the Flin Flon, with its twenty million tons of copper—we have that great iron range extending down into Minnesota—we are on the edge of the great copper ledges of Michigan. Great as are our agricultural resources, high as Canada stands in the agricultural world to-day, some day in the future she may stand still higher as a mineral-producing nation.

We have in our oceans and inland waters vast resources in fish. In water powers we stand second in the world. Undoubtedly, in the very near future water power will take the place of coal in our homes and in our industries; it will operate the transcontinental trains.

In addition to all these resources our railways are built, the trunk lines at least; we have built our canals. The stage is all set. What do we lack? Canada lacks but two things. We are short in man power, and short in capital. Is there a solution to the

great problems that we have to face? What must we do to be saved financially? There is only one way in which wealth can be produced and that is by the application of labour to the natural resources direct or indirect. We must deal with our great resources as an individual would deal with his. We must assist in permitting the free development of these resources, and we can assist by providing markets. As Robert Ingersoll so beautifully said, "And prosperity, when it comes must come over the golden grain fields, past the flaming forges and the whirring wheels, greeted and grasped by the countless sons of toil."

For the building up of our country, for the development of its resources, and in order that we may be prosperous and rich individually, we must bring to our country wealth-creating labour and capital. And I believe, Sir, that the time was never more suitable than at present—owing to the dislocated conditions of affairs in Europe consequent on the termination of the great world war—for the bringing to Canada the very cream of Europe's wealth-producing people. The same would hold, Sir, in connection with attracting settlers from the United States. The stage is all set for the resumption of our development from the point where it was temporarily stayed. Where should we have been, Mr. Speaker, had the trade arrangements that had been established, the wider markets that had been secured, been permitted to continue? Had war not intervened, with these resources where would we have been to-day? Who can tell? As I have already said, the stage is set, Sir. We have no creed problems and no racial problems in Canada such as they have in Europe. We have all the conditions necessary to enable us to forge ahead.

It is true, Sir, that we cannot offer people free homesteads such as have existed in the past, but we can offer them cheap lands—lands close to railroads, lands with all the conveniences of good roads, schools, and every other advantage attendant upon them. It was by a system of immigration that the United States grew up to be the great nation that she is to-day, the paragon of the world so far as wealth and increased population is concerned. And in past years wealth was produced with great rapidity in Canada. So able an observer as the late Viscount Bryce marvelled at the rapid creation of wealth in this country.

It is very interesting—and I will not detain the House long in this connection—to consider the growth of wealth in Canada under an active immigration policy. In the year 1896 there were five millions of people in this country, in 1911 there were seven millions, an increase of forty per cent. In 1896 the exports and imports of Canada amounted to $223,000,000, and in 1911 the figures had increased to $798,000,000, or over 300 per cent. In 1900 the mineral products of Canada amounted to $47,000,000; in 1910 they had increased to $122,000,000, or a gain of 250 per cent in ten years. In 1900 the capital invested in manufactures in Canada was $446,000,000; ten years later the amount had increased to $1,247,000,000, or a gain of 275 per cent. The value of the manufactured products in 1900 was $481,000,000, whereas in 1910 that value had increased to $1,165,000,000 or 250 per cent. Those products in the last ten years, or in 1920, have more than doubled, and to-day amount to some three billions. In the growth of agriculture there has been the same marked increased. In 1900 there were some 16,000,000 acres of land under cultivation in Canada. In 1910 that area had increased to 30,000,000, a gain of 14,000,000—the area of cultivation practically doubled. In 1900 there were 338,000,000 bushels of grain produced, and in 1910 the figures had increased to 583,000,000, an increase of 250,000,000 bushels. In 1911, the number of horses, cattle, and swine had increased by one million each. In cultivated lands from 1910 to 1921, despite the war, there was an increase from 32,000,000 acres to 52,000,000 acres, a gain of 20,000,000 acres.

Now, Sir, to meet this situation what must we do? We must bring immigrants to Canada to fill the vacant spaces of the West and help develop the country's great resources. The call is for men, men, and yet more men. We must attract capital to Canada; we must provide conditions under which capital will come to this country and be safe in its investment here.

I was glad, Sir, to note in the Speech from the Throne that already steps had been taken by the Government to make provisions for obtaining wider markets. These markets must be found. We must consider the Orient, we must consider Mexico. Coupled with these measures we must bring science to our aid. We must prevent national waste, such as the terrible destruction of our forests by fire. By national thrift and saving—the replenishment of our seas, the refertilization of our fields, the replanting of our forest, by planting a tree wherever we cut one down—our future will be eventually assured.

But, Sir, we have another and greater work to perform. We cannot be great and rich, we cannot develop our resources, unless peace and concord dwell within our borders. National duty must never permit class selfishness to usurp its functions. We must build up in this country a democracy sound, and sane, and loyal to the core to Canada. We must have the fullest scope of liberty within our borders. Where liberty dwells license will not exist; license only follows upon the heels of tyranny. Sir, during the last few years democratic principles have had a rough time of it in our country. Perhaps we must make allowance for the consequences of war, and if we do probably some justification may be found for the curtailment of free institutions and the loss of a certain amount of liberty. But at the termination of war that restraint should have been lifted and we should have reverted at once to our old institutions. The condemnation of the late Government by the people of Canada at the last election, so decisive, so absolutely overwhelming, was the united protest—the united and indignant protest—of the people against political autocracy. The people, Sir, could not and would not forget government by Order in Council and specially constructed Election Acts. The status of the Canadian, Sir, as a citizen, in the last few years had sunk very low. May that time never come again. Under the new regime these conditions never will again obtain. Liberalism is associated absolutely with personal liberty. On personal liberty the British Empire was built. And, Sir, while it was not contained in the Speech from the Throne, I would like to see the last Act enacted by the late Parliament, the Election Act, which deprived a large portion of the electors of this country, particularly in my own constituency, from participating in the inalienable right of selecting and electing a Government—I would like to see that Act repealed and disappear from our statute books. As long as it continues in force it is an insult to these people, a degredation to ourselves, and a blot upon our statutes.

When we read the history of Europe and reflect upon its past wars and catastrophies, when we contemplate Europe to-day, with the decimation of its population by wars and famines, when we think of the tragic story of Ireland within our own Empire, with all its tale of sadness and of sorrow, and when we reflect that in this Canada of ours, two of the world's most virile races, high in courage and proud of lineage, but with a difference in speech and religion, with the true spirit of democracy, with mutual toleration and forbearance, for upwards of a hundred years have lived together side by side, and developed the free institutions which we enjoy to-day; when we realize that these wars of Europe have largely been the result of race creed and race difference, Sir, the concord prevailing in Canada must be cause of great satisfaction to us. The same spirit that existed between the French and the English in this country we must exercise towards the new Canadian who is with us in many thousands in the West to-day, who will come to us more and more as time progresses. It was no statesman's hand that spread the weed seeds of dissension to the detriment and injury of his country.

We have occupational troubles in Canada, as other nations of the world have had, and as other members of the British Empire are experiencing. There are troubles between labour and capital in this country, and they must be dealt with. There must be a spirit of toleration, a spirit of reasonableness. With this, and under the guidance of the eminent gentleman, the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Mackenzie King), with his deep theoretical knowledge and wide practical experience, and of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), these problems should be easily and readily solved. There has grown up in this country, or is said to have grown up, a spirit of antagonism between the agricultural interest and the manufacturing interest. These interests are undoubtedly dependent one upon another. We must approach them in the same spirit that has worked out so successfully between our French-Canadian people and our English-speaking people. We must not deviate from the path of reasonableness and fairness in dealing with these questions, and must cast aside everything which is not in the common interest of our country. In a spirit of toleration we must deal with the great problems placed in our hands. We want Canadian people, in the words of Kipling, to realize that "there is no East, no West, border nor breed nor birth." And I recall the very appropriate words of one who in the years gone by sat in this House as a minister, who said, in the words of poetry:

> What matter if at different shrines we kneel unto one God,
> What matter if at different times our fathers won the sod,
> One in name, one in fame,

—the Canadian should ever be.

The question of tariff is a very important one. I notice in the Speech from the Throne a reference to the postal conference to be held between Canada and the United States. That indicates a friendly spirit. The Fordney Bill is not framed specially against Canada, and I understand there are possibilities of some trade arrangements being made with them.

I note also the co-ordination of all the branches of defence under one head. That is indicative undoubtedly of a period of economy in the administration of affairs, and I close with the golden words of one, ever respected by political friend and foe, a truly great Canadian, who left his mark forever upon this country, words uttered a short time before his death to the young Liberals of London, Ontario. I refer to the gifted leader of the Liberal party. He said to these young men—

> After a long life I shall remind you that already many problems rise before you, problems of race division, problems of creed differences, problems of economic conflict, problems of national duty and national aspiration. Let me tell you that for the solution of these problems you have the safe guide and unfailing light if you remember that faith is better than doubt and love than hate. So live, so strive, so serve to do your part, to raise ever higher the standard of life you live in.

I have the honour, Sir, to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St. Henri) (Translation): Mr. Speaker: The opening of the fourteenth Parliament of Canada took place with the prescribed state ceremonies and amidst the concourse of the people mingling their voices in praise to God and our Sovereign King George V.

I highly appreciate the honour conferred by the Prime Minister in calling upon me to second the motion to the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. This honour reflects highly upon the electors of the division of Westmount-St. Henri.

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that in rising amongst this distinguished assembly of the nation, I realize fully all the responsibilities which, at this moment, devolve upon me. Once my task is fulfilled my one regret will be that of not having been equal to the mission so kindly entrusted to me. I therefore beg my fellow members to be indulgent and rather attribute to my lack of parliamentary experience the deficiencies of my debut in this House.

To second in my mother tongue the motion for the Address is to seize upon a pleasing occasion to pay homage to my Sovereign, my country, my province and my race; it is at the same time to perform a duty towards our ancestors for the heritage which we have inherited in the form of the British North America Act; it affords the thankful son an occasion to remember his native province; it moreover testifies to the return to our best traditions; it is to trace our constitutional liberties back to their origin; finally, Mr. Speaker, it is to sanction anew the official use of the French language in the debate on the Address and in the administration of the affairs of the country. General elections took place on the 6th of December last. The Meighen Government and its followers had not the satisfaction of seeing their deeds and their political programme endorsed by the people. On the contrary the Canadian people placed their trust in the Liberals, made them their authorized mandatories under the direction of a Liberal ministry, having as its leader the young and brilliant successor to Laurier, the hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King. The country welcomed the new ministry composed of distinguished statesmen, and in the true spirit of our constitution, all responsible to the people. Just as in 1896, when the Laurier ministry assumed power, the Canadian people look forward with confidence to the future, trusting in the guiding light of those who henceforth designated to safeguard our Canadian traditions, direct the destinies of the country.

Within these parliamentary walls raised with such splendour from their ashes, Mr. Speaker, I feel throbbing in the elite that surround me, symbolising the nine provinces of Confederation, as it were, the anxious soul of the country. Canada is suffering from the consequence of the world-wide crisis; an epoch of heavy responsibility is its lot. Its revenues are no longer adequate to meet the national debt and to enable the federal administration to carry on. The country is anxious and suffering through unemployment; the wheels of industry are running slow. Our citizens bear up with sacrifices, proving by their quiet and dignified attitude that the solidarity in misfortunes must one day or another, earn them a better fate. As a representative of the people, I shared the intimate thoughts of my electors and with them I was most desirious to hear from the Governor General's lips, in the Speech from the Throne a message of good wishes and also the Government's pro-

gramme of legislation in the course of the present session.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to greet His Excellency the Governor General, official representative in Canada of our Sovereign. Lord Byng of Vimy is not unknown to us. Our soldiers knew him on the battle fields of Flanders; he was their general and led them through the raking fire of Vimy.

Together they participated in the same victories. On the return home, our warriors joined in praising his urbanity and eminent qualities of his heart and soul. Better than anyone, His Excellency, will understand how our Canada has grown by the warlike prowess of our triumphant armies and by the ashes of our illustrious dead, who peacefully rest over there, on the battle-fields of Flanders and on the plains of Champagne.

I moreover greet, and in this circumstance I firmly believe that I shall again have the entire approval of this House, the new Speaker, the hon. member for Gaspé, that loyal friend, grandson of a true patriot and father of a hero. His twenty-five years of exemplary parliamentary life, his uprightness, his judicial and profound knowledge of the rules and regulations of this House, had for a long time past truly designated him for this princely Chair.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I second the motion for the address because I realize that the Government has understood, under its true aspect, the economical situation and by its programme will live up to the requirements of the hour. Guizot, the French historian, said:

"In well administered States, the greatest concern of the government is for the improvement of economic conditions in their widest sense. Large amounts are voted favoring agriculture, industry and commerce."

These statements cannot be gainsaid. If the government of a country does not endeavour to advance agriculture, industry and commerce, it will proclaim itself to be a weak and unprogressive administration, the country will remain in a state of stagnation and poverty and failure will be the lot of its people.

These hard truths, Mr. Speaker, are worthy of reflection. These great misfortunes must be avoided and forestalled. I notice by the Speech from the Throne that the King Government recognize those duties and that agriculture, industry and commerce will receive their entire solicitude as well as the administration measures with which they are closely linked.

I agree entirely with our Government's views on this subject of general interest, and let me point out to you why we must encourage to-day more than ever, agriculture, industry, commerce and their attributes amongst which I mention immigration and the labour question.

Agriculture is bound with the future of our Dominion. Rightly is it said that our country is the granary of the empire.

The history of the world teaches us that the ancients held in honour agriculture, and put it to an intelligent use, except during the epoch of their downfall. Agriculture was the source of prosperity of the European countries. It has been the dawn of our progress and it is yet one of the factors which shall assure our prosperity. Liberal governments have always understood that the agricultural budget should include generous subsidies. Therefore, within the bounds of its revenue, the Government will favour a sound agricultural policy permitting agricultural science to develop continuously, and the farming industry to rest on a solid foundation. True, Mr. Speaker, America and Australia are new countries where as a matter of course, farming is pursued on a large scale, where returns from the land are prompt; but it is necessary all the same, to assist our a[illegible] more than is being done, by [illegible] and scientific methods. Acting [illegible] touch with the provinces, the Dominion government will not fail to realize its cherished dream, that of upholding agriculture as the corner stone of our material and social progress.

The interest which the Prime Minister, following in the footsteps of Laurier, has shown to the agricultural class, will the better convince the latter of the nobleness of its calling, and that it is absolutely essential to our country. In thus preventing the emigration of our own people to foreign lands, the homestead should become an earthly paradise rather than the neighbouring towns where the sons and sometimes the fathers are unfortunately attracted.

We have reason to be proud of our Canada, Mr. Speaker, for it is one of the few countries of the world where there is yet hope for honest and civilized working souls, far from the war troubles of old Europe.

A great foreign immigration may begin to flow in on a large scale during the course of the next two years. It seems to me that the Government holds decided ideals on this score and it is to be con-

gratulated. The Government should entertain a just but strict policy of immigration, a policy truly national. It will surely see to it that our country is not overflowed by foreigners unused to our customs and traditions.

"We must not forget says the economist Chandèze, that the consequences of immigration for the country receiving it depend on the fitness and the resources possessed by immigrants. Slightly trained to labour, inclined toward city life, turbulent, they are a disturbing factor rather than an element of prosperity. The only kind of immigrants we are at present in need of are those who are laborious and lean towards farming life,—they will have every chance to settle definitely and to assimilate themselves rapidly. But if they come in too great numbers, if they are not merged in the population of their adopted country, they may perhaps remain strangers."

Let us bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that from a social and economical point of view, immigration has always had serious consequences, both to the immigrants themselves and to the countries to which they immigrate.

Chandèze further adds: "According as their education and other influences of their home surroundings have fitted or unfitted them for emigration, and that such surroundings are or are not fostered by ad hoc institutions, emigrants in their new settlement improve their condition or degenerate."

This view of immigration which I just pointed out seems correct. I rejoice that it is the reflex of the Liberal policy and well applied it will lead our country to happy results. To chosen immigrants coming to our soil, colonization and agriculture offer a vast field of action. The Dominion and its multiple wealth suits them. There is still room in the nine confederated provinces for all commendable ambitions. The Dominion Government must be the best adviser of the provinces, and by frequent interprovincial conferences, the provinces, acting, as much as possible, along the same lines, will find that, through the impetus of a proper immigration policy, the limits of the colonization and settlement areas will recede.

These various undertakings, Mr. Speaker, which have for their object the production and circulation of wealth, go under the name of industry. At all times industry has existed in this country, and the different governments have aided in its expansion. We, of the Liberal party, know more than ever the part which industries, large or small, play in the activity and future of this country. This vital question should be considered most carefully so that the producer and the consumer may obtain satisfaction by means of a tariff adapted to present needs and circumstances.

It is necessary that our commerce and our markets should attract the attention of purchasers and consumers, of whatever country, European or American, they may belong to. It is necessary that both find all commercial advantages desired on the Canadian market; and to reach this, progressive legislation should be enacted in favour of Canadian industry and commerce. Our commercial relations should be extended and revised if need be. We must find and send to foreign countries the best commercial agents so as to do justice to our manufactured products and provide markets for them under fair conditions. Why do industrial and commercial conditions seem to us more alarming than ever? Mr. Speaker, the problem is easily solved. It is because until these latter days, the best and sometimes the only clients in certain industries, were the governments. Times have changed. The normal industrial and commercial conditions are returning. The manufacturer and the merchant will in the future depend on the pre-war customer, the usual consumer. This great industrial and commercial prosperity was fictitious as regards its effect on the nation. Therefore industry must pick up and recover just like private individuals. The hour of national reconstruction with all its hopes has struck and as Sir Wilfrid Laurier so well predicted, the twentieth century belongs to Canada. Industry, in all its accepted forms, must be upheld, be it called extractive, manufacturing, commercial or transport, because they all depend on one another, have a common goal and in completing one another form an entire circle of economical activity.

Mr. Speaker, to industry and commerce the question of labour is intimately linked. I see by the Speech from the Throne that the Government wish to closely study this question and already a hymn of thanks arises from the heart of the Canadian workman. In this period of crisis and of upheaval, the capitalist and the toiler have need of uniting if they truly have in view Canadian unity. As soon as the toiler of this country will have met with the sympathy and attention which he well deserves, and it is my humble opinion, without touching on any of the disastrous doctrines of socialism, he will at all times rise to the height of the occasion. Through these in-

termittent periods of unemployment, he has been magnanimous in his conduct. He never had the intention, as was so justly remarked the other day by one of their leaders on a delegation to Ottawa, to belittle any government, but on the contrary to co-operate to the best of his ability in the country's interest. However, in return he expects a legitimate and effective protection from the Government, a legislation which will give him hope of more favourable conditions of employment and compensation. It is with pleasure that I see that this question is under consideration and will be solved by the department to the advantage of all interested.

Justly does the Canadian workman hope, for the present Liberal Administration was born from the popular vote, and knowing its responsibilities, of an incomparable importance in our political history, it will strive for unity, right and justice.

Representing in this House an electoral division for the greater part made up of workmen, and knowing these good people, having witnessed the throbbing of their generous heart under their working blouse, I can vouch that the workman of my county, like others, understands that he has to work with the ultimate end of the greatest possible production in order to establish abundance and competition of products in the world's market. In so doing, he will have been a help to his Government, he will become the recognized artisan of the falling cost of living already but too high, the comforter of human misery.

And we on this side of the House, witnessing such a noble act on the part of the working class, shall continue to believe in the just administrative principles bequeathed by Laurier and which our party has always extolled in its programme and which the people accepted at the last general election, that is: that the individual of whatever art or trade, commerce or profession he may be, is indispensable on this earth; that classes must exist, help one another, love and respect each other in order to re-establish peace in this world and thereby assure the success and the welfare of humanity. This is, Mr. Speaker, the true doctrine; no other exists, to follow or to invent in order to make a people happy.

I admire the reference in the Speech from the Throne, which draws our attention to the fact that in the hard times we are experiencing a wise economy must be sought by all the federal departments if we wish that Canada, burdened with heavy debts by the different administrations that have followed one another since the year 1911, meet her obligations. Official figures speak more plainly than words and sarcasm. On January the 31st, 1922, our debt amounted to more than two billions of dollars. Our current revenue on January the 31st, 1922, amounted to $318,489,889.74. The expenses incurred by the late government for the fiscal year ending on March 31st, 1921, required the enormous sum of $361,118,145.21. We must conclude, taking into account these figures, that the financial position of Canada must be judiciously looked into if we wish to maintain our national credit. It is absolutely necessary to make the best possible use of our revenue; to see that such an important problem as the railways be solved not in the interest of individuals, but in the interest of the whole country; to reduce the expenditure of the various departments to the minimum of their needs; to reclassify the Civil Service, if need be, in order to secure in every case the greatest efficiency and also that every civil servant may prove his actual usefulness by his daily labour. This economy which we are now preaching with a view to restoring our national credit, will show to the citizens of Canada that the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues are conscious of their responsibility. No doubt, during this much confused period, they may rely on every member of this House who sincerely wishes for the prosperity of this Dominion.

Before I resume my seat, as I cast my eyes upon this House, I realize better now than I did at the beginning of my remarks, that it is composed of three parties. The division of the old Canadian political system into two great parties, Liberals and Conservatives, seems to have disappeared, at least for the present. The Conservative party died away, even in time of victory, and like an autumn leaf, was carried away by the passing breeze of Unionism. Since 1911, the Liberal party alone remained in existence. It remained the party of the people, of the humble and of the mighty, of the poor as well as that of the rich; untouched by the conflict of opinions which has destroyed everything else, it will live to promote the actual interests of the country.

There is a third party, named the Progressive party. At its head and in its ranks there are experienced men who are filled with the best public spirit.

The people of Canada, however, have looked at those political changes with some apprehension, but always confident in the destinies of the Liberal party and in the King Administration they look forth to the days of resurrection.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am able, with, I believe, more than even the usual sincerity, without reservation, insofar as their personalities are concerned, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of this motion. To come into this House for the first time and address his fellow-members is no easy matter for a young member of Parliament. I, of course, was able to follow more closely the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) than the hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) who seconded the motion. With the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for North Winnipeg, I find myself in concurrence to a greater degree than I had expected prior to his rising and, I think I may add, to a greater degree than he expects even now. I am not able to share all his hopes as to what is to be the fruitage to come from this Speech from the Throne. Indeed, I may venture to predict that before the session is over he will find himself a great deal nearer the depths of distrust and despair in which I am now than the high level on which he has commenced. He has, however, acquitted himself creditably to his constituency and creditably to the province which he alone represents on that side of the House.

The hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri has come to this Parliament preceded by a reputation which does him honour. Though I was not able to follow his utterance with that degree of certainty that would enable me to refer to it particularly prior to translation, I am sure he has vindicated his reputation as a public speaker at least in point of clearness of enunciation, in point of natural decisiveness and graciousness of speech. Those of us who have spent many years, many of us the best of our years, in public and parliamentary life, gladly welcome new talent amongst us. There is room in the politics of Canada, there is room in the work of this House, for the best and most promising of our young men, and the welcome that I hope I may be permitted to extend to the mover and the seconder of this Address goes with equal sincerity to all who come among us on all sides of this assembly; and possibly I may add that it goes as well to many good friends, although my opponents politically, who, after severance from public life, are back with us again.

I add especially a word of welcome to the first lady member of the House of Commons. The last Parliament, by a very large majority, almost by a unanimous decision, conferred the franchise on women, and conferred upon them as well the privilege of candidature for the Commons of Canada. To be the recipient of the first expression of confidence by a constituency is an historic honour, and I know I express the feelings of all, when I put into words the hope that she will vindicate the confidence that the last Parliament has reposed in her sex, do credit to herself and to the constituency that she represents.

This House meets under a new Government and under a new Prime Minister. The Prime Minister who leads this assembly now has come to his high office at an early age. He has had considerable association with public life in a conspicuous way. Notwithstanding the feelings many of us have of opposition, of, indeed, antipathy, to the methods indulged in by himself and his followers, by which their so-called success was achieved, we all, as Canadians, wish him long service in the life of this country. We shall give him fair play in the work of this House; we shall do our part to contribute to the success of this Parliament; and I, for one, wish him personal success. Before I sit down, I shall have something to say in explanation of the words I have uttered as to the character of the campaign that preceded the last contest. I do not do so in any spirit of resentment to the people of this country; I do not do so at all out of any personal regret I may feel at not holding high office still; indeed, I speak in all sincerity when I say that it is well that young and, indeed, sometimes untried figures come to responsibility in our public life. Alternation of party control is good—those of us who know what the burden has been during the past ten years will understand what I mean. I do not think the years ahead will be so strenuous; I hope they will not; but aside from all questions of public policy, it is well that those who are fresher to the task and who perhaps bring new points of view should assume from time to time, the responsibilities of administration.

There has been comment in the speech of the mover of the motion, and there is

reference in the Speech from the Throne itself, to the conference that has just been concluded at Washington. I am sure the words of the Speech in that regard and the words of the mover of the motion as well find unanimous and hearty echo from us all. The purpose of that conference is not misunderstood by those who have read the press. I was anxious—and I think I succeeded in my desire—not to impart into the late party contest any questions of external policy of this country, any question as to the conduct of our affairs in relation either to the Empire or to the outside world. It is, however, only fair to say that in the bringing about of that conference this country took its part as other countries did, and in the earnest hope that something real, something practical, has been effected in the alleviation of the woes and miseries from which the world has suffered and suffers to-day in the lifting of the clouds that are before the world to-day, Canada's anxiety, Canada's earnestness takes second place to that of no other country in the world. That the Conference has had practical results should be a matter of congratulation; that there have been practical results I have no doubt at all. I am sorry that the purpose of the conference, that Canada's participation therein, should have been a subject of misconception even in the last election contest in Canada; but it is well in that respect to let bygones be bygones, and I make no further reference thereto.

The first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne makes comment on the present condition, commercially and industrially, of this Dominion. All of us were glad to see that paragraph inserted, and I think we understand the significance intended thereby. It is as follows:

> Our Dominion has not escaped the world-wide economic disturbance and industrial depression, but has suffered less from it than other countries. Keen observers of the business barometer feel that the worst is about over and that at an early date we may look for a substantial revival of activity.

Those words are true. I find no mention in the Speech from the Throne of a very outstanding fact that might, I think, have appropriately been referred to—namely, what has been disclosed as regards our population in the recent census returns. It is true that those returns are not to the last fraction of percentage complete, but they are substantially complete, and what is known of them is a matter for congratulation on the part of all our people. Our population has increased from less than seven and a quarter millions to well over eight and three-quarter millions. In a speech which I read in the press recently, delivered by the chief statistician of the Dominion in the city of London, he called attention to the fact that the rate of increase has in these ten years been the fastest of that of any English-speaking country in the world, inclusive of all the British Dominions and the United States. We have passed the 21·5 per cent rate—that is the highest rate. In that speech emphasis is laid on the fact that this increase has been achieved against the handicap of the war. And Mr. Coates says that Canada would have passed the nine million mark but for the losses in men and women and in the birth rate due directly to the war. The fact, however, that we have surpassed the record of the world in this regard, at a time when the greatest difficulty was encountered in doing so, and when some of the other great countries of the world outside the English-speaking countries sustained a loss in population, is a matter for pronounced congratulation.

This increase in our prosperity, as evidenced by our increase in population, has been accompanied by an expansion of our trade unprecedented in our history. Our trade has expanded to proportions undreamt of ten years ago. In making that statement I have reference not to the inflated figures that obtained during the war, but to the 1921 figures obtained during the very depths of the post-war deflation. Comparing those figures with the figures for the ten years preceding 1911, our exports have multiplied almost three times over in that decade, as opposed to the increase of less than twice in the fifteen years that went before. Therefore there was a very considerable basis of fact for the assertion in the Speech from the Throne that this Dominion, which took a place of honour and of great value in the most terrible conflict the world has ever known; this Dominion that performed the stupendous task of placing on another continent five hundred thousand of her sons; this Dominion that took upon her back a debt of over $2,000,000,000 for the sole purpose of prosecuting to victory a war for human freedom—this Dominion finds itself to-day, as acknowledged in this Speech, in the best position of any country in the world. And I am disposed to believe that when the Speech from the Throne enters into the realm of prediction it does not go

too far. It states that to keen observers of the business barometer the worst is over, that the year 1921—which I have just compared with the year 1911—was the year of greatest deflation, the year of heaviest reaction. That prediction placed alongside the assertion of fact as to our present condition, should bring comfort and cheer to us all.

I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite would recognize any comparison between this very frank acknowledgment in the Speech from the Throne and some of their literature and speeches in the late campaign. Was it a picture of confidence that they drew? Was it a comparison favourable to Canada that they made with other countries of the world? It was not. I have before me some of the speeches made and pamphlets issued by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). I understood that until he reached this House he was in a state of exceeding doubt, not to say irremovable despair, at the awful position into which this country had fallen. He was associated in those feelings with the present hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell), who felt that the condition of the country was so desperate that he should resign his post in the government of his Province and devote his capacities to the rehabilitation of the Dominion financially and commercially. I have before me some utterances of both these hon. gentlemen. In a manifesto, issued at, I fear considerable expense, and appearing among other publications, in The Montreal Standard of the 5th November last, the following is given as a description of our plight—I would like it placed alongside of the paragraph that I have just quoted from the Speech from the Throne.

"Our country," said Mr. Mitchell, now hon. member for St. Antoine, "is passing through a crisis."

After passing through four years of war and sacrifice which did it credit, Canada to-day is reeling under a burden which would crush many nations less courageous than ours. With a war debt unparalleled in the history of this land or any other with a population the size of ours;—

This land that is now acknowledged to be the best of any in its relative position in the world.

—with a gaping wound in the body politic which only the best physicians gathered together in counsel can heal;—

And which I assume, this Speech from the Throne is designed to heal even in this present session.

—with a railway deficit which would rock to its very foundation; with a merchant marine, the national credit of any land with a population of nine millions; with a national revenue which is declining day by day while our burdens and liabilities increase, Canada to-day is looking in this direction and in that direction to find a way to meet the terrible storms that are ahead.

An hon. MEMBER: And they have found it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have found the way, and the way is designated in this Speech from the Throne, which, as hon. members will see in a few minutes, promises to do in every regard just what they found the late government doing, and insofar as it does not promise to do what they found the late government doing, promises to think about the subject. The manifesto continues:

With these huge undertakings, either one of which alone is sufficient to cripple Canada, this Dominion is sick commercially and weakened financially.

I will refer to other portions of this address when I come to other subjects treated of in the Speech from the Throne.

The hon. member who is now the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) speaking in his province also in the course of the campaign, gave utterance to sentiments that painted an equally doleful picture. He seems to have declared even that our population was diminishing. I see he gives mute indication of dissent, but I have the declaration attributed to him before me now. He stated as well that trade was falling; that unemployment was rampant; that bankruptcy was at hand; and that, indeed, we were going to fall into the hands of the United States unless the people arose to a sense of the appalling condition they were in,—in other words, unless they elected him and his party to power. On the 3rd of December he is thus reported in Le Soleil:

Sir Lomer Gouin received an ovation when he entered the hall. He warned the electors against the stratagem of the Conservatives—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I paused there purposely in order that the opportunity for applause might come. I will wait now for the applause that will finish the sentence:

—the stratagem of the Conservatives, who, once elected, will take away from us our railway shops and managements, thus depriving at least 50,000 of our workingmen who would be compelled to exile themselves.

In which the hon. member, now the Minister of Justice, deliberately associated himself with the most disreputable political roorback that ever disgraced the politics of any country.

Again, in a speech at Three Rivers on 21st November, the Minister of Justice said:

> In case the Meighen or Crerar Government be adopted—

My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is in the same boat as myself.

> In case the Meighen or Crerar Government be adopted, farm land will be taxed, as well as urban and rural dwellings and the house of the rich as that of the poor. If we maintain the Meighen Administration, not only will your lands be taxed but you will never be so close to that annexation, which will soon be a reality in this country, if Meighen is elected.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear."

> Already, so to speak, he said, our country is palsied, and halted immobilized in its expansion.

This country which, let me repeat, is acknowledged in the Speech from the Throne to be in the soundest position of any affected by the war.

> It makes no more progress; its population decreases while its indebtedness increases to a huge extent; its trade diminishes every month; uncertainty and uneasiness obtain everywhere, according to the own admission of the Prime Minister, and minds heretofore optimistic foresee only bankruptcy and annexation. The people are giving way under the burden of taxation, and in spite of that, deficits accumulate. Dulness is experienced in Government administration; industry is standing pat; trade is stagnant, and on the approach of winter unemployment prevails throughout the country. How can we be charged with exaggeration when the highest financial authorities of the country are frightened?

I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to my left to the quotation of the hon. Minister of Justice of "the highest financial authorities" being frightened because of the course pursued by the late Administration.

Now, I need not make reference to utterances in the late campaign by which the entire anti-conscription feeling of any part of this country, but particularly of the province of Quebec, was turned against the late Administration. This from "Le Soleil," however, is typical:

> The people's forces consist of all those who have wept when they saw their sons being hunted for the slaughter; of all those who were deceived by the false promises of ministers; of all the heroes who were deluded by those who drove them to carnage.

That is worthy of memory, and I am sure it will be remembered and will be done justice to by the hon. member (Mr. Crerar) who leads the Progressive Party and who had part with us in the, not pleasant but necessady, tasks—and onerous tasks they were—imposed upon us during the conduct of the war. I doubt if I could point to any hon. gentlemen opposite coming from that province—although I think I should exculpate the hon. Minister of Justice in this regard—who did not make use of that appeal; who did not point out as the chief sin of the late Government that, in a time when the country was rocking in the very worst convulsions, struggling through the very darkest nights of a terrible war, that Government sought to carry out the undoubted mandate of the people to impose compulsory and equal military service throughout the length and breadth of our land in order that the honour of the nation might be maintained, in order that the men who fought for us might be supported —in order, in a word, that we might do in the best way we could what we deemed to be our duty in the most awful crisis of the world's history.

Now I pass to other and to me—because I do not desire unnecessarily to harp on the past—more pleasant subjects, so far as discussion goes, enumerated in the Speech from the Throne. The Speech makes reference to the return to the western provinces of their natural resources, and in a somewhat boastful way refers to the fact that already a definite proposal has been made to the prime ministers of the western provinces for the return of those resources. The Government appears to feel that as a consequence a settlement of the question is at hand. On the same subject the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) too, is optimistic. He is hopeful that something will be done at once. It is stated in the Speech from the Throne that a proposal has been made to the several governments of Western Canada looking to the return of those resources. What the proposal is is not vouchsafed in this Speech. However, there has been given to the press, and to the public through the press, a full statement—I believe it is a full statement—of what the Government has proposed. That, I might remark, has been done notwithstanding the many protestations of the Prime Minister that Parliament always had to know Government policy ahead of the press and of the public. In the letter which has been given publication, the Prime Minister proposes to the three western provinces that the resources withheld from them when those provinces were established, or what remains of those resources, should now be transferred to them by federal statute, and that each of them should in return release any claims it may have to the

extra indemnity which at the time of the original withholding of the resources was given to the provinces concerned. One would think by the emphasis and the advertisement given to this action on the part of the Administration that it was a new and wholly original thought.

The House, of course, is aware that for ten years that precise proposal has been before the western provinces. It was made ten years ago by the then Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden. It was repeated afterwards, repeated by myself specifically in 1920, when I attained the premiership, in letters to the prime ministers of the western provinces. But from the first the proposal has been rejected; it was rejected in 1911, and every year since, and it stands rejected to-day. I do not know what value there is in making the proposal once more, nor do I quite understand the complacency evidenced by language which indicates that in making the proposal which in the past had been rejected, all eyes are turned to the future and to this "new method" of solution. It is true that that letter goes on to propose arbitration as a means of solution if this offer is again refused, but we have no intimation either in the letter of the Prime Minister to the three western provinces, and much less in the Speech from the Throne, of the nature of the arbitration that is to be conducted or the character of the tribunal that is to be erected.

As hon. gentlemen know—and no one knows it better that the Hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) for no one was more emphatic than he in the claim that he made when Prime Minister of the province of Quebec—the assertion has been persistently made on the part of British Columbia, on the part of the province of Quebec, on the part of the province of Ontario, and possibly more emphatically still on the part of the three Maritime Provinces, that they as provinces have a claim in respect of those resources, and have a claim particularly in regard to any adjustment of provincial subsidies that may be made as a result of the return of the natural resources. Is each of these provinces to be represented on this board of arbitration? Let the Prime Minister now make good his boast and tell this Parliament. Let us know, first, whether the province of Nova Scotia is to be represented, whether the province of British Columbia is to be represented, whether the province of Quebec is to be represented, and whether the province of Ontario. I do not know how there can be an arbitration with their approval unless they are represented, and if there is to be an arbitration board on which all provinces are represented, on what principle and by what right is any such arbitration board going to assume functions that are essentially functions of the Parliament of Canada? All these provinces are represented here. They have sent their representatives to this Parliament. Why, the leader of the Government elected one of his supporters in this House, even the hon. member who succeeds him in the representation of the county of Prince, by advancing a claim on behalf of Prince Edward Island that that province had millions of dollars of interest in the resources of Western Canada. I read from an advertisement published under the heading "Why vote for MacLean?" Among other reasons, none of which appeal very strongly to those who have had experience in this House, the following is given:

> Because by doing so you will be upholding your birthright in the public domain of the western provinces, in which millions of dollars are involved and justly coming to us, in spite of Mr. Crerar's contention and assertion to the contrary, and we can surely do with that money now.

Again I ask, are we to acquiesce in a proposal which proposes to erect a tribunal, composed of representatives of all the provinces, to be substituted for this tribunal in which the constitution vests responsibility for apportioning the rights and claims as among all the provinces of Confederation? Is Parliament to make that surrender? It is for this Government—this Gevernment whose members for years criticised the late Administration because we were not able to get the representatives of the various provinces to agree upon any terms that would have been acceptable to Western Canada, and which belaboured us for the delay that intervened—to come to this Parliament with a proposal which they believe will commend itself to a majority, a proposal not for the abdication of the rights of this Parliament but for the assertion of those rights in solving a problem that Parliament alone can solve. Let the Prime Minister come down with a proposal that commends itself to a majority of Parliament, and then it will become the law of this land. But, is something to become the law of this land because it happens to commend itself to certain others selected by the Government to represent the constituencies of this country when it does not commend itself to those selected by the people to represent those constituen-

cies? I venture to recall the assertion I made early in my address and to ask the hon. member for North Winnipeg not to forget that before this session is over, and still more, before the end of sessions to come, the optimism excited in his breast by this sentence in the Speech from the Throne will be very much lower and darker than it is just now.

I see in a statement, evidently issued officially or semi-officially, that the government of Manitoba has resented the proposal to accept a return of the resources and release all the extra subsidy that came to take their place, and further that if an arbitration board is to be appointed, the Manitoba Government is going to be represented by the Attorney General of the Province, by the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson), and by one other —three representatives from the province of Manitoba; and the prediction is made—a prediction that very probably will come true—that if this course is adopted it will take several years to get the accounting done and come to a decision.

Now I come to a paragraph in the Speech of His Excellency which, in its comparative innocence, is really fitted to be historic—I refer to the paragraph dealing with the Customs Tariff. Hon. members should keep in mind, as I refer to this subject, the declarations in this House on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite—when declarations were made to get votes, declarations of definite and specific policy were made and voted for year after year. They should remember how anything in the way of delay was deprecated and berated. They should remember how we were told, session after session, that there was no need for any tariff inquiry, that the way was clear for action, that there was no need for delay at all—the proper course was to act and to act at once. Hon. members should keep in mind, as well, the specific commitments of hon. gentlemen opposite, made with all the sanctity of democracy in a great convention held in this city in August 1919, commitments that have a very peculiar ring when contrasted with this pallid, barren paragraph in the Speech of His Excellency to-day. The paragraph in question reads as follows:

> You will be invited to consider the expediency of making some changes in the Customs Tariff. While there are details of revision, the consideration of which will require time and care that are not at present available, there are features of the tariff which it is felt may properly be dealt with during the present session.

[Mr. Meighen.]

What are the features, what are the "changes" alluded to? The hon. member for North Winnipeg assumes that this means a revision of the tariff downwards. I am afraid he will look long and patiently for any mention of the word "downward" in the paragraph. There may be revision upward, there may be revision
5 p.m. downward, there may be no revision at all, there may be inconsequential changes; but Parliament is not advised what shall be the character or the nature of the subjects dealt with. In such a position has the Government placed itself in its first session in office—this Government that obtained the seats it occupies this afternoon by specific, definite, and understandable pledges to the people of this country; this Government which obtained seats in this House because candidates now sitting behind it pledged themselves to their constituents that those promises—promises that everybody understood—would be made good as soon as the Liberal party was returned to power. I have before me those pledges and those commitments but is it necessary to read them? Have not hon. gentlemen read the commitment of 1919; has it not been placed on the pages of Hansard, over and over again? Did not the present Prime Minister—speaking in this House in the month of June, 1920, almost a year after the convention—pledge himself that when returned to power the resolution in question would be made the law of this country. Do hon. gentlemen not remember? Did not the present Prime Minister—speaking at various places in the country in the fall of 1920—bind himself to the terms of that resolution, and declare that by it he was going to stand or fall? Did he not, as respecting many of those terms, commit himself definitely even in the summer of 1921? I am quite aware that his language moderated after he was joined by the present Minister of Justice, after the resignation and candidature of the Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Quebec, and after those interests that to-day are responsible for his elevation to the Prime Ministership came and exercised their sway in the councils of his party. I know that it was in the fall of 1921 that he preached throughout Canada the doctrine of the chart, that all the commitments of the 1919 convention were merely indications of the direction in which he should proceed, and that as to how far he proceeded, or whether he proceeded at all, he was going to be governed by the wisest

councils of the men around him, knowing quite well that to his left—if he obtained power—would sit the present Minister of Justice; knowing quite well that to his right would sit the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who had frankly declared to the people of the country that this platform was only made to get in on well knowing also that he would have near him the present Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham); knowing too that he would have behind him, and directing his conduct, the powers centred in and spreading from the city of Montreal who are responsible for his elevation and for his position to-day.

Then it was that the doctrine of the chart was promulgated, then it was that the guarded empty language came into use on platform after platform—about a tariff for revenue, about a tariff for producer and consumer, about a tariff for the home—then it was that all these phrases came to mind, and the hon. gentleman sought by means of them to escape from the commitment which he and his party had made in the month of August, 1919, upon which he accepted the position of leadership that has brought him the Prime Ministership of this country but which binds him in the same degree to-day as when he was simply leader of the Liberal party. I do not need to remind the House of all these commitments, but possibly it would be just as well to read them in order that they may stand alongside of the aggregation of letters of the alphabet that is supposed to denote the Liberal policy as respects the tariff now that they have attained power. Here is what was resolved upon at the Liberal convention in 1919:

> That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reduction of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance: First, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses too severely on the masses of the people; Second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country;
>
> That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat, the principal articles of food, farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber, gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments, cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same;
>
> That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reduction should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same;
>
> That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.
>
> And the Liberal Party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

The day of the return to power has come. The hour has struck and the moment is here. I would not expect that they would embody this resolution in the Speech from the Throne, because that is not the custom, but I would expect that the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne would be comparable in principle and would intimate a fulfilment of the resolution. I ask this House and my hon. friends to the left, whom I endeavoured to persuade many a time of the very truth that is revealed before their eyes to-day: do you find in the Speech from the Throne the slightest intimation or promise or hint that anything will be done, even of the very nature of that delineated in the resolution of 1919? Are we to expect it? Proud hearts beat with hope as does the heart of the hon. member for North Winnipeg. I ask particularly the hon. member for Marquette (Hon. T. A. Crerar) to answer this question. I wonder now whether my analysis of the sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, made last session and the previous session, which I am sorry the hon. member for Marquette did not receive very well, will not prove more accurate than the hopes that even he sometimes gave expression to.

It is not hard to find the reason for the change of heart. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government in, I think, the last speech he made, at least one of the most recent speeches, declared that there was virtually no difference between his stand and the stand of the progressive party. He described their principles as the principles of Liberalism, to which he says he is prepared to give a very wide interpretation. In that I thoroughly agree with him, because the interpretation he has given to Liberalism has been so wide as to include every side of every question under the sun. Indeed, under his aegis, Liberalism has become merely a synonym for political dishonesty.

I refer to a speech, which, I think, was made in the province of Quebec, at a banquet given to celebrate the victory of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries

(Mr. Lapointe). In that speech the Prime Minister declared that the principles of his party, of this broad Liberalism, were identical, or, I think, he used the words, "were the same in aim though not the same in name" as those believed in and supported by my hon. friends to my left, that there was a difference only in affiliation—no difference in principle at all, and that he confidently relied upon them to co-operate with him in order to put into effect what he proposed to put into effect during this Parliament.

Now I am going to quote some of the principles or rather the promises upon which some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been elected to this House, upon which hon. gentlemen in the Government have been elected to this Parliament. Perhaps I should start with the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice. I do not think he will repudiate the pamphlet which I hold in my hand, because on its face there is a very excellent photograph of himself. It is printed in French. I think I had better attempt the translation for the reason that my translation will be more nearly correct than my pronunciation of the original. The pamphlet reads:

> Sir Lomer Gouin is a partisan of moderate protection. He is in favour of the Laurier tariff, and he does not believe that Canada ought to be converted into a sort of dumping ground for the goods of other countries, but on the contrary, by means of moderate protection of our national industries, not only the interests of manufacturers who have their capital invested, but those of the working classes who depend on those interests, ought to be protected.

Now it would be difficult to state more clearly, more definitely, or more firmly the principles that we frankly stood for in the last campaign, than they are here expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin-.

I pass from the enunciation of the tariff position of hon. gentlemen opposite, as expressed by the Minister of Justice, to the position taken by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell). In a document to which I previously referred he first of all dealt with what he called the dilapidated condition of the nation and then with the tariff. I have just read from the pamphlet of the Minister of Justice a statement to the effect that he stood for moderate protection which he said was the Laurier tariff, that he stood indeed for adequate protection, which he said was the Laurier tariff. I now come to a definition of the Laurier tariff by the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine, as follows:—

> The Laurier tariff means a tariff that will keep Canadian manufacturers in business and guarantee them a fair profit, foster new industries, while at the same time giving a square deal to the consumers.

Whoever heard a clearer definition of protection? Then he goes on:

> In 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier was face to face with a problem of industry similar to the one we are faced with to-day, when there are hundreds of thousands of our workmen out of employment. What did he do? He created a tariff board, and sent it through Canada, inquiring into the effect of the tariff upon local industries and conditions. We would do the same to-day, and be guided by the best trade experts available. We would devise means of encouraging and stimulating our industries, means which would extend old industries and bring new ones to Canada, just as the Government of Sir Lomer Gouin at Quebec made Quebec the centre of the world's pulp industry and asbestos industry, we would help to build up our cities, give more employment to our workmen who, would in turn provide a better market for the produce of the farm. Thus the farmer would see created for him right in his own country, the greatest and surest market of all for his own produce, not subject to Fordney tariffs and the whim of statesmen of other nations.

This is a definition of the tariff principle which the Prime Minister declares is the same in aim, the same in principle as that of hon. gentlemen to my left, by which declaration he hopes to lure and entice them, if not to his side, at least to his support.

As regards the railway problem—I will not deal with it now, but it would be too bad not to read the first sentence of the speech in that regard:

> My stand on the railway question—

Says the hon .member for St. Antoine.

> —is just as clear and pronounced as it is on the tariff.

It will be noted that in this declaration that I have read, a commitment is made that the Liberal party, if returned to power, will appoint a tariff board and will be guided by its results. The Prime Minister, however, is committed on platform after platform, not only not to provide a tariff board, but to do at once what he is pledged to do in the declarations of the Liberal party. I have before me his commitments in that regard. I would like this declaration, for example, to be read in association with the tariff pronouncements of the Speech from the Throne. He states that the Prime Minister preceding myself, Sir Robert Borden, in the month of August, 1920, had stated that before revision there

should be an enquiry. He repudiates the thought of an enquiry.

That is—

He said,

—what every Government that has no policy of its own sets out to do. What we want in Canada is not more enquiries and government by commission, but government by a Government which has a policy that is known and approved, and which helps to meet the necessities of the hour.

What is the "time and care," declared to be essential in the Speech from the Throne, for, if not for enquiry; and if it means enquiry, how is enquiry to be conducted by a Government headed by a Prime Minister who says enquiry only means that they do not know what to do themselves and have no policy? But that is not the only declaration. Speaking at Calgary on the 11th October, 1920, the Prime Minister made this statement:

We feel that there is no necessity for a tariff commission or any other like expedients to point the way to what is obviously demanded in the interests of consumers and producers as respects the necessities of life and the instruments of production; but that a downward revision of the tariff and, in some instances, its complete elimination should be immediately effected.

Now, I would like hon. members, some of the expectant ones, like the hon. member for North Winnipeg, and all of those to my left, to wait and see how the tariff proposals of this session will comport with the language that there must be at once substantial reductions on the necessaries of life; that there must be downward revision of the tariff, and in some instances, its complete elimination, and that done and effected immediately. Further on, he states that there must be put on the free list and at once all farm implements and machinery as well as other articles enumerated in a speech which he made in the city of Saskatoon. Let hon. members wait and see how far that is accomplished this session. Let them wait and see the fruitage of this reference to the tariff in the Speech from the Throne that we are considering now. It will be recalled that in the official commitments of the party, of which hon. gentlemen opposite are the representatives in this House and which this Government represents in authority in Canada, there was a precise promise that farm implements and machinery would all be placed on the free list, and as shown in my quotations later, there was a definite pledge by the Prime Minister that no enquiry was necessary for that purpose, but that the reduction would be effected and effected immediately. Those who are too optimistic, however, might read the manifesto of one hon. gentleman who sits opposite to us in this House, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). In that city farm implements and machinery are manufactured. It will be recalled that the late Government, in the revision of the tariff in 1912, reduced the duty on those articles of consumption on the farm—farm implements and machinery—to a very substantial degree. They were reduced until they became the lowest in the whole customs schedule of this country. Those that were dutiable at that time were reduced from an average of about 21 per cent to 14.6 per cent, and indeed the principal ones were placed at a duty of 12½ per cent. Because that was done, there arose in the city of Brantford a candidate representing hon. gentlemen opposite, who declared to his electors that there could not be anything in the nature of free trade in Canada.

With the balance of trade with the United States so much against us no further lowering of duties is possible. The thousands of unemployed workmen in Brantford at the present time must realise that their unhappy condition is owing to the action of the Government, which reduced the duties on agricultural implements, and maintained free trade in binder-twine, cream separators and tractors.

The candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite contested the city of Brantford, and issued this proclamation containing that, the sole reference to the tariff, appealing to his people to denounce and defeat the late administration because of the reductions they had made in the duties on farm implements and machinery and because they had maintained free trade in binder-twine and cream separators. But that is not the most significant fact. With a platform in his pocket, with a platform committed to him by that convention to which repeated reference was made for so many months by hon. gentlemen opposite, a platform declaring that all those implements would be made free if hon. gentlemen were returned to power, and made free immediately, the Prime Minister himself went down to the city of Brantford and urged upon the people the election of the candidate who ran upon the programme that I have just read.

This is the commitment as regards tariff matters of another hon. gentleman who represents a Montreal constituency in this House. I note the levity with which hon. gentlemen opposite receive all references to their past commitments. It indicates how seriously they view poli-

tical promises. It indicates that once they have got their reward, once they have reaped the fruit of their professions, those professions and promises go into the discard and are forgotten. It indicates that when the hour for bringing down those "some changes" in the tariff comes, there will be about as much resemblance between the actual legislation and the pledges of the past as there is between darkness and light. The hon. member for St. Lawrence and St. George (Mr. Marler) declared his tariff faith as follows, and upon this he was elected:

> That the tariff should be framed with the assistance of such scientific or other board acting in collaboration with a committee of Parliament, with the object in view of providing the revenues required for the administration of the country— the maintenance of established legitimate industries, the encouragement of new industries— the promotion of trade with other countries, consistent with the above objects— and with due regard to the economic rights of the consumer.

As clear and unequivocal a declaration of the principle and practice of protection as any candidate for Parliament ever made. By those means the government now in power obtained office. While their candidate in North Winnipeg was publishing the promises of 1919, while their candidate in Centre Winnipeg—and I have his declaration before me—was casting far and wide a circular in which he pledged himself, and declared his party was pledged, to put into effect the pledges of 1919, while every candidate that supported them in all the provinces of the West right to the Rocky Mountains was binding himself and his party to those pledges and getting votes upon the strength of those pledges, these hon. gentlemen, now elected to this House, were pledging themselves and their party to exactly the opposite course, and by that means they were elected. So the Government is bound to betray those who supported the present hon. member of St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell), it is bound to belie the declarations of the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), it is bound to take his electors into camp and deceive them; or it is bound to carry out the pledges they made to the whole people—pledges that were ratified, confirmed, repeated and voted upon by immense sections of this Dominion. That is the position hon. members supporting the Government are in, that is the position the Government itself is in. Far be it from me to make the claims of a prophet, but I know something of the preponderance of influence in the present administration, I know something of the source of the momentum that put them into office, I know something of those who bought and paid for a programme and who expect delivery of the value thereof, and in my own mind I have not very much doubt as to what will be the measure and character of the "some changes" referred to in the customs tariff paragraph of the Speech from the Throne.

I pass from that subject to refer to the declaration as regards railways. Of that I have less criticism to make. On the subject of railways it is declared, as though it were a matter requiring the attention of Parliament—and as I understand, speeches from the Throne are intended to lay down a programme for the consideration of Parliament during the ensuing session—that there will be co-ordination of the railways owned by the people of this country. This is the paragraph:

> In order that government ownership and operation of our national railways now extending through every province of the Dominion may be given a fair trial under the most favourable conditions, it is intended at an early date to co-ordinate the Government-owned systems in the manner best calculated to increase efficiency, and to effect economies in administration, maintenance and operation. The whole transportation situation is one which will require your best attention. It weighs heavily upon our national finances. To assist in obtaining the information essential to an exact understanding and an adequate appreciation of the problem in its many bearings, it is proposed to supplement the work of co-ordination by a thorough inquiry.

A Speech from the Throne, written by a Prime Minister, who, within a few months of writing that speech, had declared to the people that an inquiry is only suggested by a government that has no policy at all! It will be noted how sedulous the draughtsman of the Speech from the Throne has been to use the most evasive and nebulous terms at his command. He does not say there is to be unification of the roads owned by the Government; he does not say there is to be amalgamation; he does not say all are to be brought together as one system, as was the intention of the last Parliament, and, is the intention of the law today. He says: There is going to be "co-ordination,"—a word chosen because of its elasticity, because its exact meaning is at least capable of more interpretations than any other word that could have been used. I hope, however, that the meaning that will appeal to most of us is intended, namely, that there will be actual unification, in order that the advantages and economies incident to unity will be provided; in a word, that all intended by the statute of

this Parliament will be carried out. I hope that is the intention of the Administration. If it is, I can assure the Prime Minister on the part of those whom I represent in this House that he will have our assistance to the full in the carrying out of that policy.

I have no objection to reference to this being made in the Speech from the Throne; indeed I welcome it; but it does not provide material for the consideration of Parliament. This policy is already imbedded in the law of the country to-day. The Government need no legislation to carry it out. The Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 provides that roads from time to time owned or controlled by the Administration may be brought under the National system and operated as a unit in the same way as the roads at that time were being operated. From time to time the late government brought one road after the other under that system. The Grand Trunk Railway system alone now remains outside. As respects that system, the arbitration following its acquisition by the government was proceeding up to the time I arrived home from England in the summer of 1921, when the matter of the general election had immediately to be taken into account, and during the campaign no one would suggest that any action should have been taken to bring about that amalgamation, the last step of the whole process; it had to wait and did await the judgment of the people. But the intention of the late government as embalmed in the legislation of this House is apparent, and to do what is set out in the Speech from the Throne is only to carry out what is already expressed in the statute books of this country. I say again that I hope the language means the bringing into one unit of all our railway systems in order to get the advantages of co-ordination and unification. By that I do not imply that there cannot be that measure of local supervision that is so essential to the best management. That measure of local supervision, I, on the advice of the best experts at our command on the National Railway Board, stated was the policy of the late government, recommended by the board. With the Grand Trunk coming in and the entire mileage owned by the people of this country brought into one system, there should be what are called grand divisions, whereby, without in any way impairing the advantages of unification, a measure of local supervision in the operation of the lines would be feasible.

All these things are quite consistent, but there must be unification. There must be one system; there cannot continue to be two. The late Government proceeded on that principle and carried it out to a great extent; all that is left to be done is to bring in the Grand Trunk. Let that step be taken. May this paragraph in the Speech from the Throne mean that this will be done without delay; and if it is done it will have the support of those who stand behind me in this Parliament. But I am afraid that if the Government take that step they will have difficulty with those around them; either that, or hon. gentlemen around them will have difficulty with their constituents.

I see in front of me now hon. members who are committed to their constituents to an exactly opposite course. I see in front of me those who have pledged themselves, not that the National Railways will be unified but that they will be disrupted; not that the National Railways will be co-ordinated, but that they will be disintegrated; not that the National Railways will be maintained out of politics, managed by a business board and all brought under that business board, but that portions of the system will be taken back into politics as they were in politics for many decades I see in front of me also those who are pledged against a continuance of national ownership and operation—yea, I see its bitterest enemies, its stoutest foes, in the ranks of the Government itself. I know the Prime Minister has declared, and I see a reference to it in the Speech from the Throne, that national ownership and operation shall be given a fair trial, but I for one, am apprehensive of the fairness of the trial to be given national ownership and operation at the hands of its inveterate enemies. I am apprehensive that it is not the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite that the utmost possible success shall follow that trial. because I know there are hon. gentlemen on that side who would be infinitely more pleased by the utmost possible failure than by the utmost possible success. I know there are hon. gentlemen elected to support this Government who have declared themselves on principle opposed to government operation not only of railways, but of everything, and who have pledged themselves to their constituents to do everything in their power to stop the wheels of government operation at the earliest moment. I know there are those who declare not only that the acquirements of the roads never should have taken

place, but that now they are acquired the proper policy to pursue is to get rid of them at the earliest possible day. Some would turn them over to the Canadian Pacific—even among those whom I see in front of me, hon. members supporting the Government. Some would sell them for a dollar—they have so little use for them.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Hear, hear" from the hon. member opposite; but he is going to be asked to support what is described as, and promised to be, a fair trial of government operation. I venture to suggest that government operation would have received a much fairer, a much more useful and much more successful trial at the hands of those who were its friends and wanted it to succeed; at the hands of those who in the difficult position in which they found themselves after years of railway blundering, took the best and the only course this country could take in its own interests and for its own protection in the acquirement of these roads.

Mr. CANNON: And you made a lovely mess of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Pardon me? I did not hear: The hon. gentleman will not repeat. I looked opposite during the speech of the hon. member for North Winnipeg, I heard his references to the railway history of our country. I heard him say that the late government found on its doorstep bankrupt roads—found there railways that he described as starved and emaciated foundlings; as he spoke, on the faces of some I saw a smile, at least a gleam of approval, but on the faces of others I saw a scowl of resentment. I thought I would like to hear some of the private conversations between the hon. member for North Winnipeg and others when he went outside and beyond the pale of this House. But he spoke the truth. The late government found itself the recipient of all the penalties, the heir to all the railway blunders of this country. The late government found itself with four or five thousand miles—yes, nearly six, of prematurely constructed railway mileage. The late government found itself the mortgagee of railways that were ill-conceived, that were constructed to a grade far beyond the requirements of the country and at a time far in advance of the country's needs. The late government found itself administering the affairs of a nation over railroaded by four to six thousand miles, and as such mortgagees—private ownership of that mileage having irretrievably failed because of the blunders of the projectors, in which the government that preceded the Laurier government were coadjutators and co-operators—in order to protect our position as mortgagees, to protect ourselves as the inevitable owners of a large and almost barren mileage—a mileage that we could not help becoming possessed of—and in order to make that mileage possible of ultimate success through the acquisition of the systems that it was built to be a complement of, the late government took the course that it did. Now, this country has got upon its back an impossible mileage of railways, railways that never could be made to succeed run by the government or by a company as single separate systems. We have something which, now that all are collected, possesses in Eastern Canada an excellent gathering system, and that possesses in Western Canada the finest gathering system there. We have an immense mileage, but it is a system that is complete,—burdened, I know, with large transcontinentals built long before their time; burdened, I know, with transcontinentals that should never have been projected, to which the country was irrevocably committed by the government that preceded us and necessarily doomed to deficits for years to come on that account. But we have a system that is a system. We have a system to-day in which the people of this country can take pride, in respect of which they may have hope, and which they know can reach the day of solvency and of surpluses sooner than it possibly could have reached that day had any other policy been adopted.

Hon. gentlemen talk about handing it back to private ownership. Let them come forward with their proposals. Hon. gentlemen opposite are elected by the forces opposed to public ownership in this country, by the forces opposed to public operation in this country, and they know what those forces are. They know who were around them in the late campaign. They know that the interests that they pictured day after day and night after night as having their hands on my neck and as dictating the policy of the late government—they knew at the very moment in which they spoke those very interests were backing them in the contest, determined to secure their election. They know they sit opposite me now elected by the powers they have denounced. They know that some of the heads of those in-

terests have been favoured by them even since they came into office. They know that very little has been done—indeed, nothing at all except, forsooth, that which was the policy of the late administration as to the unemployed about whom they shed tears abundant in the course of the campaign—while nothing new has been done as to them, a lot has been done for others. There has been a lot by way of recognition of the men—very wealthy men—whom they berated with all the ridicule at their command and whom they pictured as our supporters and our friends.

Now then, if they mean to carry out the pledges they have undoubtedly made to those who put them where they are, they are in a position to carry them out better than they were when they made the promises long ago. If they are against public ownership and operation, do not let them argue that it is impossible now to bring private ownership back but that it was possible before. The system that we own to-day is a system that would appeal to private capital certainly better than anything we could have owned if we had not acquired what we have now. Now, if they have courage to make good the understanding with those who supported them abundantly and generously, if they have the courage to deliver the goods, let them come forward with their programme to this House; I assure them we stand where we did when we adopted the policies. We stand where we did then. We believe these roads can be made a success under fair trial. We believe that if their friends, those who want them to succeed, were in charge of their destiny they would be made to succeed, and the results of the last few months are encouragement to us in that belief. But I must say I have distrust of the future. I have distrust of the conduct of these roads when influential men in charge of our country's affairs to-day, and because in charge, responsible for those appointed to take care of these roads, are the sworn enemies of the very principle entrusted to their care, the sworn enemies of public ownership and operation in every way, men whose reputation as public men and business men is based upon their declared antagonism to the system now entrusted to their charge. So let us watch the progress of government operation in the next few months. Already we see the interesting process under way. This government operation and co-ordination are to be accompanied by an inquiry. I do not know who are to make the inquiry. I do not know just what they are inquiring for. I know the hon. member for St. Antoine has his ideas about an inquiry. He said in a public speech published under his photograph that we ought to get the best railway men we could, not from this continent, but from Europe and other continents, and that they should sit down and think the whole subject out, and he promised that if they would do that—these experts from Europe and, I suppose, from Africa—when they got through he would sit down and help them come to a decision, and he promised that the solution would be a solution "without deficits." I do not know whether the inquiry foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne is to be an inquiry at the hands of Europe and Asia, or Europe and Africa, but while this inquiry is proceeding I venture to predict that one thing will be taking place. I venture to predict that the propagandist will be at work, and that there will be over-flooding this Dominion an anti-government operation propaganda designed to turn the minds of the people of this country in disgust from the public ownership of railways; and that propaganda, the signs of which we see already all around, and under the onrush of which we sit at this very hour, will be powerfully financed by interests most friendly to this Administration. That is what the people of this country will see. All the while that this nominally fair trial is being held, these forces will be at work, and these forces are very confident they can succeed.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, I had reviewed some of the methods adopted by the leader of the Government, the members of the Government, and members supporting the Government in connection with their advocacy of railway and other policies. Let it not be understood that I have exhausted all ammunition in that connection—I have only commenced. The list is a numerous one whether on the subject of railways, whether on the subject of the tariff, whether on the subject of any other of the questions that they brought to the front

throughout the land in the places and from the angles that they thought would pay. On all of them every possible phase of opinion was by some one of them held. I am in a position, and would undertake now, to name a supporter of the Government who was elected because he took any certain view and had that view accepted: and I would, at the same time, be prepared to name another supporter of the Government—very probably a member of the Government—who was elected because he preached exactly the opposite.

Something is said in the Speech on the subject of wider markets for our products. I think there is more said about it in the Speech than we will hear of during the course of the session. It is said there, also, for the benefit of the farmers of our country, that there ought to be more diversification, there ought to be better methods of culture, and there ought to be better methods of grading; but I am sure those of us on this side of the House, of whatever party, could not help but note that one subject that is of moment—a subject indeed that has earned a position of great importance, particularly in our western country—is entirely ignored. There is indeed a member of the Government elected on the solemn pledge to re-establish the Wheat Board in this country. I refer to the Minister of Agriculture. There are other members who contested on their behalf and members sitting to my left who advocated that policy. The Government is in power and is responsible. For myself I took a stand on that question that I do not think anyone had any difficulty in comprehending. I did not believe in the re-establishment of the Wheat Board as a monopolistic body, I did not believe that the conditions prevailing in the world markets to-day were such as to justify or demand that step; but I did believe that the time had come, when better marketing facilities should be given, and I stated to the people of Western Canada that if returned to power those facilities would be provided by the establishment of a board by the Government which would be prepared to handle all the grains of our country that the producers of those grains chose to commit to its charge, and would handle those grains by the methods, and with adequate powers,—save monopolistic power,—such as had the Wheat Board that handled their wheat in 1919-20. There was no misapprehension as to the meaning of my statement. Of course it would not have done for the opponents of myself and the then Government to have concurred—that might possibly have helped us. There were those who complained, and complained bitterly that the Government had done much while in office without resorting to a general election, and that is quite true. But those who had complained that we took great and important steps, without the mandate of the people, expressed by a general election, found it necessary in this instance to get on exactly opposite ground, and to say that because I asked the mandate of the people I was playing politics and was not sincere. However, they succeeded in doing their part in preventing the establishment of that board by that course of conduct.

There is, however, a member of the present Government who expressed himself most definitely, who issued his manifesto in print and resorted to the public press regardless of expense—and I am sorry to say in some cases regardless of veracity. He is now in power and able to give effect to his views. Is he going to do so? I have heard—I may be wrongly informed; I did not see it in the press myself—that he takes the ground that those promises were made with the understanding that he would be a private member of Parliament and are not applicable now that he is a member of the Government. But the hon. member is in a rather difficult position in that regard because concomitantly with the pledge that he would put into effect this platform, he also described himself as the future Minister of Agriculture. What is his position to-day? Is he prepared now to fulfil the pledges he made to the people of Regina? What is the policy of the Government? It is worth while, apparently, to tell Parliament what is to be done on subjects that require no legislation, and no change of policy at all, but it is not worth while to tell Parliament what the Government proposes to do on the subject of the marketing of the grain of this country? Is the Government going to let this session go by without any action? If it does it will be too late for 1922; if it does there will be no relief for the grain growers this coming year; if it does there will be many in our western land who will have a very different opinion of the present Minister of Agriculture from that previously held owing to declarations by himself and by the propagandists behind him.

There is a question that I would like to put to the Administration:

Where have the advances been made with a view to securing what they describe as wider markets? We see in the press—though we do not see it in the Speech from the Throne—the announcement that advances have been made to the United States of America; that the Minister of Finance made another trip down to Washington in the supposed belief that he would achieve some practical result in this respect. We are also told that, as well, efforts have been made to establish reciprocal relations with Australia. Apparently the Goverment have in mind—but I must say that in my own judgment it is only apparently as far as one of those countries goes—the making of a reciprocity pact, one with the United States and another with Australia. As far as the United States are concerned, I expressed the fear that the desire was only apparent. I believe on the part of most members of the Government, and I am inclined to believe on the part of the preponderating element of the Government, the only purpose was a mere gesture, knowing full well its futility, in order to see if they could lure behind them, without the reward of office, the honourable gentlemen who sit to my left.

In so far as that subject is concerned, my position has been well known for years. I do not believe advantage can be gained for Canada, I do not believe advantage can be gained for any country, only a fraction the size of its neighbour, the competitor of that neighbour in every field of its enterprise, by tying itself to a trade treaty with that neighbour. Reciprocity with a country which is not a producer in surplus of our products is something that should be sought for and should be gained, if at all possible; that is something which would be of advantage to both countries. Reciprocity with Australia is something which should be obtained, if we are able to obtain it for Canada. Reciprocity with the West Indies, who produce goods that we do not produce in surplus, who consume what we produce in surplus, is desirable. Reciprocity with a country in that position should be the object of our policy. The late government achieved it with some of these countries. The late government tried to achieve it, and did everything in its power to achieve it, with Australia, and before retirement from office I was instrumental, by interviews with the Prime Minister of Australia, in securing his influence to have inserted in the legislation of that dominion power to its government to negotiate reciprocity treaties with the other dominions of the Empire. I pressed that upon him. It was inserted and after I returned communications passed with a view to securing practical results. The legislation of the Commonwealth of Australia came into effect only, I think, in the fall, and some time late in the fall, of 1921; consequently the government of that dominion was not able to take action upon it during the life of the late government. I earnestly hope this Government will press for fair terms of reciprocity with that dominion, and I earnestly hope they will meet with success. But Sir, in regard to the United States of America, reciprocity with that country of the nature of that which they achieved, and which the people of this country rejected in 1911, could, I think, lead to no good object for this Dominion, it could, I think, only succeed in tying our hands fiscally, in subordinating us more and more, as years would go on, to the commercial domination of the republic. I think hon. gentlemen will agree that now in opposition I take no different stand from that which I took in office, and that I took no different stand in office from that which I had taken throughout the country, before acquiring the reins of power. In all modesty I venture to suggest that those opposite consider now for the first time an example of that kind.

It is stated now that they are making a powerful effort for the reduction of freight rates. Reduction of freight rates is a vital question in this Dominion. That freight rates must come down is axiomatic, but I had thought that the control of freight rates had been, even by hon. gentlemen opposite, placed in the hands of a railway board, which had been given a judicial status, which had been given ample power, and whose duty it was to do the right thing in this regard. I know that in the late campaign hon. gentlemen, hoping to secure votes thereby, ignored their legislation, ignored the status of the board, played before the electors as if it were the duty of the Government to derogate from its own legislation, the duty of Parliament to derogate therefrom, to invade the domain of a judicial body, and to do what alone a judicial body was empowered to do. I know they sought to raise a wave of prejudice against the Administration by ignoring the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I know, besides that, one member of that Government, not content with

that offense, went on and sought to curry the favour of his electors by pledging himself to remove the Chairman of that Board. I have not observed in the Speech from the Throne, nor have I observed in any of his post-election utterances a reference to that subject. However things are done sometimes that are not in the Speech from the Throne, and now that the member for Regina (Mr. Motherwell) has fulfilled one, only one, of the pledges he made, namely, the pledge to be Minister of Agriculture, the House will look to see what progress he makes in the fulfilment of the others. Yes, we must have a reduction of freight rates. The Railway Board has the subject before it now, and has heard the evidence. If hon. gentlemen feel that the Board is not doing its duty, that it is not discharging the sacred and most vital trust reposed in it by this Parliament, ratified and confirmed by the verdict of this country, then it is the duty of the Administration to act with reference to the Railway Board. The Government say that they have brought the heads of the two railway systems together. Mighty achievement! Have they not been together every week, every month for years gone by, conferring over this subject and that? Railway rates were reduced last fall. In the latter part of the summer the rates on some basic commodities were substantially reduced. Later on a general 10 per cent. reduction took effect. But since the present Government has come in, since the late Government went out, there has been nothing but advertisement on the subject. So far nothing has been done.

What is the composition of this Administration? We are told it is a Liberal Administration, that there is nothing in the way of compromise in it. All sections, all corners, all elements are of a pure and undefiled Liberalistic type. Well, according not only to the press, but according to hon. members of this House, that is the case through no fault of the Prime Minister (Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King). I know it is in his mind at the present time that he preceded the elections by loud denunciations of coalition. I know that he depicted the extravagances, the evils and the compromises that coalition engendered, and declared time and again that the country was sick of coalition and that he would have nothing to do therewith. Speaking at North Bay on the 1st of December last he stated:

> The country is sick unto death of coalition with their log rolling and expensive attempts to satisfy this party and the other.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Hear, hear," say hon. gentlemen behind him. We will wait for the "hear, hear," when we see the other side of the picture as presented by the present leader of the Government. When we come to actions, very often the colour is wholly different than when we are in the realm of promises. That, however, was not the only place. Speaking at Newmarket on the 20th of January—this was after the election—he declared himself as against coalitions; but before, at Saskatoon and in many other points in Western Canada, he warned the Progressives that unless they supported him before the election, they need look for no favours at his hands, nor for any share in the government afterwards.

As for what took place, the country is not yet advised by the leader of the Government. I am not one of those who would argue that it is the duty of the leader of a government, elected as the head of a party, to disclose the invitations, to disclose the negotiations, if you will, he may have had with one of his followers, one elected with him, one supporting him in his campaign, as to admission to his Government. I am aware that I was held responsible for disclosure of even such negotiations as that. I will make no such claim with respect to any leader of a government; it is not proper, it is not right. But when a leader of a government sets about to negotiate with a leader of another party not elected on his platform, not supporting him in his campaign, not one of his own party at all, the leader of a wholly separate group, a wholly separate party, then it has always been the practice and it is the duty of the leader of the Government to make known to Parliament and to the country what those negotiations were, what the offer was, and all the details thereof.

That duty the leader of the Government has not yet performed.

It was possible that he approached the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), the leader of the Progressive party, and invited him to desert the Progressive forces, to abandon his party as a separate organization and entity, and to come over and join the party of which the Prime Minister is the head. That was one course which he might have adopted. Another course that he might have adopted was to have gone to the leader of the Progressive Party and ask to negotiate on a coalition basis for the joining of their forces and arriving at a

common line of policy. Coalition is one thing; abandonment of party and alignment with another is a wholly different thing. Those are the only two courses, and what we desire to know, what Parliament has a right to know, what Parliament cannot be denied, is which of those two courses was adopted. Does anybody opposite know which course was followed? Do hon. members for Montreal know which course was followed? Do they know which course was prevented? Do they know what were the terms given to the missionary of the hon. gentleman who proceeded to the city of Winnipeg to lay them before the leader of the Progressive party? Do his following in this House know what those terms were?

Mr. DUFF: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They certainly do. Who is the hon. member who knows? Speak out. Since the Gordian knot was cut, not by the leader of the Government, but by the master of the Government who sits to his left, since the banns were forbidden by him—

Mr. MARTELL: You are the King maker.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. member mean by that?

Mr. MARTELL: You say the banns were forbidden by the hon. member. You have made him Prime Minister and you have made the hon. member a member of the administration by your autocratic actions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have been charged with autocracy; I have been charged with much that is wrong; but I have never yet been charged by a chagrined and disappointed country, nor even by the Prime Minister himself, with having made him.

Mr. MARTELL: Your record has made him Prime Minister, apart from his ability.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true that since the contest, since the banns were forbidden, the Prime Minister has made reference to the negotiations, but the attenuated character of his utterances is very marked indeed. He stated, speaking in Quebec, that he had invited the Hon. Mr. Crerar, leader of the Progressive party, to come into his Government on one condition and one only.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I interrupt my right hon. friend? Would my right hon. friend read any remarks of mine in which I mentioned Mr. Crerar's name?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When my hon. friend was speaking at Newmarket on the 19th January, the following assertion was made. If it did not refer to the leader of the Progressive party, it would be interesting indeed to know to whom it referred.

> Over and over again, I have said that the Progressive party was a sort of advanced Liberal group. I decided I would be true to what I said in that regard and I made known to Progressive leaders that I was prepared to take into my Cabinet representatives of the Progressive party on one condition, that they come into a Liberal Cabinet.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did that refer to the leader of the Progressive party, or did it not? I do not know what the purport of the Prime Minister's interruption was.

The explanation given was that he invited Progressive leaders to join his Government, but to join it "as a Liberal Government"—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the Progressives will note the enthusiasm with which that quotation is received by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I hope as well that hon. gentlemen opposite will note the coolness with which it is received in the Progressive party. That is to say that they desert the party, that the leader deserts the party that he led into the contest, abandon it and join this Government as a Liberal Government. That is one course that might have been followed. Do hon gentlemen think that was the course that was followed? Apparently, a few minutes ago there were some hon. gentlemen who would like to proclaim that they did think so. I know they would desire that that was the course followed, but I am afraid we cannot accept it unless we impugn the honour and the word of an hon. member of this house. We have had no version of those transactions from the leader of the Progressive party himself. I think we should have had a version from both leaders. When in 1917, the then leader of the Government, Sir Robert Borden, approached the leader of the Opposition of that day with a view to coalition, the negotiations between the two were embodied, under the joint supervision of both, in written documents which immediately afterwards were given to the country, and indeed were later placed upon the pages of Hansard.

This country was advised fully of the negotiations. But how different to-day at the hands of him who never tires of pro-

testing about the rights of Parliament—who never ceases so to protest save to violate those rights himself. Yes, he said, I adopted the first way, I only asked him to leave his party and join us.

But we did get an insight into the negotiations later, and, I am bound to say, if my judgment is of any value at all to hon. members, a pretty faithful insight. The present hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner), speaking on the 15th day of January last at the city of Calgary before the United Farmers of Alberta in convention assembled, is reported in a Canadian Press despatch as follows—and if this report is in any sense incorrect, I would be glad indeed to have it corrected by any hon. gentleman here, particularly by the hon. member for Medicine Hat:

Mr. Crerar stated, he said, that there were two sections of the Liberal party,—

I have heard that belief expressed before.

—one progressive and the other autocratic—

Think of it!

—but that the larger portion was progressive. The position, he said, was that if they allowed the Progressive party to take the place of the Opposition, the autocratic members would seek to take control of the progessive section of the Liberal party, and that it was up to the progressive farmer members to see that that did not occur.

These are the words reported by the present hon. member for Medicine Hat as spoken by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) at Saskatoon, for be it remembered that after the terms of the present leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) were laid before the leader of the Progressive party through this missionary to Winnipeg, that leader thought it worth while to call together his followers at the city of Saskatoon and to take their opinion of the suggestions made and of the terms offered by the leader of the Government. Does any man who knows the hon. member for Marquette imagine that he would call his followers together at Saskatoon in order to put before them the suggestion that he should abandon them and go over to the Liberal party? Then the report of the hon. member for Medicine Hat as to this Saskatoon conference goes on as follows:

Mr. Crerar therefore proposed that a coalition arrangement—

Remember, a coalition arrangement.

—should be effected between the progressive Liberals and the Farmers, and a resolution was offered embodying the arrangement, but attention was called to the fact that the Alberta delegate, Mr. Gardiner, had not expressed his opinion.

Then Mr. Gardiner's opinion in antagonism to the suggestion of the resolution is recited. The hon. member for Medicine Hat goes on to say:

There was no question in my mind but that Mr. Crerar was there for the purpose of forming a coalition of the Progressives with the Liberal party.

A much more detailed, a much more understandable, and infinitely more creditable account of the proceedings than that contained in the mere assertion that all the leaders of the Progressive party were asked to do was to leave the party they were leading and come over to the Liberal fold as members of the Liberal government.

Now, let us have the facts as between these two versions. On the one hand is the assertion of the Prime Minister; on the other are not only the assertion but the detailed revelations of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, and as well the inference, naturally arising in the minds of reasonable men, that any such naked proposal as that declared to have been made by the present leader of the Government would never be such as would warrant the leader of the Progressive party calling his followers together, even to suggest to them that it be accepted. The country should know what was offered. What were the articles of policy that were offered to the Progressive party as the terms of coalition? What was to be the membership of the Government? What were the inducements laid before hon. gentlemen of the Progressive party that as a party would warrant them in taking such action as this?

I can not leave the subject without commenting that the resolution passed by those assembled at Saskatoon, according to this report, was to the effect:

That the leaders of the Progressives, especially Mr. Crerar,—

Those words "especially Mr. Crerar," apparently were struck out before the motion was put.

That the leaders of the Progressives were tc be at liberty to do so that is go in on a Coalitior basis but "on their own responsibility."

I am somewhat mystified as to what the effect of such a resolution would be. Would "tacit consent" be given to the formation of a coalition provided the leaders proceeding to do so "on their own responsibility?".

Mr. CRERAR: I am not at all clear what my right hon. friend is quoting from. Will be kindly inform me?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I stated, I am quoting from a Canadian Press despatch from Calgary the statement made there by the present hon. member for Medicine Hat as to the occurrences that took place in the city of Saskatoon on the occasion when the hon. member for Marquette met his followers there.

So we will expect to-night when the leader of the Government speaks that he will for the first time take us into his confidence and frankly and fairly tell us what the terms of those negotiations were, whether he only offered the hon. member for Marquette and the other Progressive leaders inducements to come over to his party and enter his Government as members of his party, or whether on the other hand he did what the hon. member for Medicine Hat in detail declares he did, and what all the circumstances of the case would lead us to believe was actually the fact—whether he offered terms for a coalition of another party with his own in order that he might have the numerical strength he desires for the conduct of affairs in this House.

Now, I have passed from one article to the other as the subject is remotely referred to in this Speech from the Throne. There is not enough of legislation proposed in this document to occupy much of the time of Parliament. There is not indeed enough foreshadowed in this Speech from the Throne to cover as much work as the late Government, when they were in office and when immense work had to be done, disposed of in a day or at most in a week. All that is here foreshadowed can be dealt with in a very short time indeed.

Oh! I note one omission. I wonder if it has not occurred to hon. members. Are you aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is no announcement whatever in the Speech from the Throne that responsible Government has been restored in Canada; no declaration to an anxious public that our emaciated and mutilated constitution has been resurrected and rehabilitated to its pristine integrity? Why, even the hon. member for North Winnipeg was impressed by the protestations of the present Prime Minister in the election contest on that subject. Look, he says, at the Speech from the Throne. Are we not actually told that the treaties into which Canada has entered at Washington are going to be submitted to Parliament? What a concession to democracy! What a vindication of Parliamentary practice! What a restoration of the rights of the people! Well, were treaties never brought to Parliament before for ratification? Were treaties ever accepted, save only when there was no possible way of avoiding it and in cases of virtually no consequence, except after those treaties were brought before this Parliament and ratified? The late government always did it. But the member for North Winnipeg says: Order in Council government is gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Order in Council government is gone; "Hear, hear" say hon. gentlemen opposite. Will the hon. gentleman tell us when he speaks how many Orders in Council he has passed since he attained office two months ago? Will he tell us anything his Government has done save by Order in Council? Does the hon. gentleman have in his mind Orders in Council passed by the late administration in unnecessary anticipation of the will of Parliament, subject to ratification—orders that he believes should not have been passed? Let him name one and I will undertake now—yes, if he will permit me, I will do it before this debate is over, though I have not the right to speak twice—to name him one passed in his two months of office that offends more in that respect than any offence he can even attribute to any Order in Council passed by the late administration. I will undertake to name him Orders in Council that not only unnecessarily transcend the powers given this Government by the Parliament of Canada but that in my judgment, transcend even the powers of Parliament itself. The hon. gentleman has laid on the Table some of the Orders in Council that he has passed. He has laid on the Table Orders in Council that do not even pretend to be within the powers of the Government. I am free to say that there come times when a government must, in the discharge of its bounden and inescapable duty, take courses in anticipation of the will of Parliament. This Government has taken those courses, but the most extreme exercise of Order in Council government that this or any Parliament has ever witnessed has been that indulged in by the very gentlemen who sit opposite us now, led by him who made it his boast on every platform—and an easy boast it was; it

really meant nothing in the world; it was only the text of a sermon at his hands—made it his boast that he was going to abandon Orders in Council and restore responsible government to a waiting people. Yes, my hon. friend is in office.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite aware that hon. gentlemen opposite conceive that to have been really the only thing they ever had in mind. I must say their conduct through the campaign made it only too evident that the mere triumph of party was their ultimate ambition. They conceived that to be the whole purpose of politics. No principle can be said to have been decided in the late contest; if so, what was it? I pause for a reply; does anyone penetrate the silence? Was the principle of our railway policy decided? If so, will the hon. Minister of Justice tell us what the verdict was? Was the principle of our tariff policy decided? If so, will the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Justice just confer with the hon. Minister of Militia and tell us what the verdict was? No; carrying a campaign on in that way does go to the very roots of responsible government. The course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite was that of adopting a platform in every constituency—any platform in any constituency moulded to suit what they believed would best appeal to that special district. Following a course of that kind in a campaign puts it above the power of any people to declare their will on any definite subject that comes before them. No; hon. gentlemen are there because, assisted by the influences that I described before the House rose, they suceeded in raising a veritable deluge of misinformation and misrepresentation a deluge that submerged the deliberate judgment of the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen rejoice in glee because of that success. Ah, let them rejoice; but those practices cannot be indulged in without thought of the penalty to come, without rememberance that the day of reckoning is sure to follow. I venture to suggest that as the hours of this session advance, still more as the weeks and months of this Parliament pass by, hon. gentlemen will come very definitely to the conclusion that more and more surely the day of reckoning is at hand. The people of this country, witnessing from every quarter of the Dominion how they have been deceived and how infamously pledges made to them have been broken—because no matter what this Government does its pledges are bound to be broken—witnessing, I say, how they have been deceived and betrayed, will visit upon the heads of hon. gentlemen opposite the penalty that they have earned and from which I assure them they shall not escape.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my first word must be one of congratulation to you, Sir, upon having received the unanimous election of this House as its presiding officer. I only re-echo the sentiments we heard expressed on Thursday last when I say that hon. members, irrespective of party, feel confident that you will discharge the great responsibilities and obligations of this important position in a manner worthy of its highest traditions.

May I at once thank my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) for the kind personal words at the beginning of his address. It is a pleasure to me to recall that some twenty-five or thirty years ago we were associated as fellow undergraduates of the same alma mater, and that since then, notwithstanding the severe strain that the differences of public life and opinion sometimes place upon personal relationships, we have continued our friendship unbroken. I reciprocate the good wishes he has expressed in reference to myself; indeed, I will go further than my right hon. friend and say that I hope he may be spared many years to fill the position which he now occupies.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to join with my right hon. friend in the words of congratulation which he extended to the mover (Mr. McMurray) and to the seconder (Mr. Mercier) of the Address. As the right hon. gentleman has said, it is never an easy matter to address Parliament; it is always a difficult matter for one to speak in Parliament for the first time. But when that effort comes at the beginning of a new Parliament, it is indeed under circumstances the most trying and the most difficult with which a new member can possibly be faced. I think that all of us who have had the privilege of hearing the hon. member for North Winnipeg and the hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri this afternoon will feel that they were singularly fortunate in their broad grasp of public questions and in the vision they manifested in presenting their views. They bring to this House not only wide

information but a high degree of debating ability. In their able addresses they have done great credit to themselves and honour to their respective constituencies.

It is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, at this time, having regard to the motion for an Address to His Excellency, that we should make some reference to the circumstance that not only have we a new Parliament and a new Government, but that we also have in our midst a new Governor-General. I am sure that all the hon. members of this House are glad to have this opportunity of welcoming to our Dominion Their Excellencies Lord and Lady Byng. We have been singularly fortunate ever since the days of Confederation in having had as the representative of the Crown in Canada illustrious and distinguished statesmen, men distinguished in arms or in politics, who have brought to our new country many of the benefits which come from the larger life and thought of the Old World; but never before have we had a Governor-General whose life and fortunes have been so intimately linked with the lives and fortunes of our own citizens as is the case with the present Governor-General. We welcome him to our country. Perhaps I could not better express what I believe to be the national sentiment than to say that the people and the ministry have the same confidence in His Excellency as a constitutional ruler that our brave soldiers had in him as their general when he led them to victory in the Great War.

I think, Sir, it is also appropriate that we should make mention on this occasion of the recent marriage of Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary. I am sure that the members of this House will be pleased to have conveyed to His Majesty through you, Sir, the Speaker of the House, the congratulations of the Commons of Canada upon the marriage of Her Royal Highness to Lord Lascelles, who for some time was on the staff of a previous Governor-General, and is well known in our country. We hope that their marriage will be fraught with great happiness and blessing upon their lives and other lives associated with them.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, join with my right hon. friend in welcoming to this Parliament the lady member who has come to us from Southeast Grey (Miss Agnes C. Macphail). I could not but think that my right hon. friend's remarks would have been still more felicitous had he not been a member of a government which at a previous election denied to a very large proportion of the women of this country the right of the franchise. It is still more unfortunate that among the women of this country who were denied that privilege and right was the hon. member for Southeast Grey who is sitting in this House of Commons to-night. My right hon. friend has at last received his answer from the women of this country to the action which disfranchised such a large percentage of their number in the election of 1917.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to make mention of a regrettable incident that serves to remind us of the passing of time and the brevity of human life. I wish to recall the sad circumstance that even before Parliament was summoned, one of the hon. members-elect was taken from us within twelve days after the last general election. I refer to the hon. member-elect at that time for Argenteuil, the late Mr. Peter McGibbon. Mr. McGibbon sat in this Parliament with members of the previous House. He was of a retiring disposition and did not take any very active part in the debates, but he was always faithful in his attendance in the House of Commons and very faithful in the discharge of his duties to his constituents. I know I express the wish of the members assembled here when I say that we desire to convey to the widow of the late Mr. McGibbon our sincere sympathy with her in her bereavement, and with the members of her family as well.

May I come now to some of the remarks of my right hon. friend? Perhaps I should congratulate him on the length of his remarks. He has kept the House for a long time for one who has undergone the strain that he has of late. He does not seem to have lost his power of utterance in regard to many questions. I was hoping that he would be perhaps a little more chastened than he appeared to be. My hon. friend has a way of speaking which at times savours considerably of bitterness, and I fear that his remarks to-night had just a shade of disappointment in them as well. There were many things he said which under other circumstances I am sure he would have expressed a little more happily. However, I do not wish to dwell upon what to him are painful recollections of the late campaign. I would not refer to them at all except for the circumstance that my right hon. friend took up a good deal of the time of this House in recalling many of the incidents and matters connected with the campaign.

He also found fault with us because certain matters were not

mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. He said that we should have included mention of the census, that we should also have included some mention of the return to responsible government. Why, my right hon. friend has only to look across to this side of the House to see that responsible government has come back again in this country. Why should we make mention in the Speech from the Throne of anything so obvious? The election was fought on that issue. My right hon. friend has not yet wakened up to the significance of his own defeat. We on this side of the House who during the last Parliament were on the other side contended that when my right hon. friend held the position of Prime Minister he held it, not as the elected representative of the people, but as one who had usurped the rights of the people. We carried our appeal from this Parliament to the country, and the country supported us in that appeal.

I was somewhat surprised that my right hon. friend should have made the reference he did to the province of Quebec. As far as I could judge his remarks, their purpose was, if possible, to stir up anew racial strife and differences in this country. That is a very bad beginning for my right hon. friend in the position which he now holds. May I bring this significant fact to the attention of my right hon. friend? If the verdict of the province of Quebec was solidly against him and those who surrounded him in the last election, so was the verdict of six out of the nine provinces of this Dominion. My right hon. friend tries to attribute his defeat in one province to special reasons. Let me tell him that there was but one main issue in the recent campaign, and it was equally the issue in all the provinces of this Dominion. The people wanted in power a government that would represent the people, and they wanted out of office a government that had usurped the rights of the people. It is perfectly true that in the province of Quebec the following of my right hon. friend was completely obliterated. Every seat in that province was lost to him and carried to this side of the House. But what was true of the province of Quebec was equally true of the province of Nova Scotia. There my hon. friend lost every supporter that he had, and to-day every member from the province of Nova Scotia is sitting on this side of the House.

Mr. DUFF: He deserved to lose them.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was true of the province of Quebec and of the province of Nova Scotia was equally true of the island province, Prince Edward Island. Every single member from the province of Prince Edward Island occupies a seat on this side of the House.

Now I come to the western part of this country. Take the province of Alberta, the province of Saskatchewan, and the province of Manitoba; my right hon. friend has not sitting behind him to-day a single member from any one of those provinces. How can he endeavour to stir up strife in this country along racial lines?

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many supporters has the hon. member behind him from those provinces?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me say one word further: I have spoken of six provinces out of nine in which my right hon. friend has not a single follower in the present Parliament. Take the remaining three provinces. My right hon. friend, I believe, has behind him at the present time some fifty representatives from the three remaining provinces. Mr. Speaker, if you deduct the number of constituencies that returned him followers by a minority of votes, it will be found that his following is reduced in numbers to a number equal to the number of Cabinet Ministers with whom he went to the country.

Was there ever such a humiliating defeat! Twenty-two followers is all that my right hon. friend has back of him of hon. members who have been returned to the present Parliament by a majority of the votes of their constituencies. Under these circumstances is it not surprising that my right hon. friend finds it difficult to discover what the true significance and meaning of the verdict of the people of this country is?

My right hon. friend made reference to some of the literature issued in the late campaign. He seemed to have a particular fondness for producing documents which carried portraits of one kind or another. I would say to my right hon. friend that he should not take too seriously much of the campaign literature that was issued on any side. I think I need only remind him of one poster that had something to say about a very distinguished public man. This poster asserted that the statesman in question was much needed by Canada; but the country did not think so. My right hon. friend ought to be the last to take too seriously to heart the literature or

the pictures that appeared in the newspaper press and on the bill boards, during the campaign.

We contended in the last Parliament that the House of Commons was not a representative House, that the Government was an irresponsible and not a responsible one, that my right hon. friend was an unelected and not an elected Prime Minister, and it was with that appeal we addressed the people of this country. To-day we have a Parliament that is representative of the people, to-day we have a Government that in the truest and broadest sense, is responsible to Parliament as well as to the people and I think my right hon. friend may cease to be alarmed as to how the affairs of this country will be carried on during the next few years under these new auspices.

To come now, Mr. Speaker, to some of the concrete matters touched on by my right hon. friend, may I speak first of the question of the return to the western provinces of their natural resources? My right hon. friend said that for ten years past an offer had been made to the western provinces along the lines of the proposal that has recently been made by the present Government. He pointed out a little later, however, that the offer which had been made by the present Administration was not confined to one method of solution only but that an alternative method was also suggested. My right hon. friend spoke about an offer of an arbitration, and seemed to think we on this side should endeavour to settle that question by appointing arbitrators from the different provinces of the Dominion. No one knows better than my right hon. friend himself, that that is the very course that the western provinces have objected to so strongly in the past. There was nothing in my communication to the Premiers of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan which spoke of arbitration. I made a reference to an accounting in matters of financial obligation between these provinces and the Federal Government, but that is a very different thing to an arbitration of a character likely to cause embarrassment and that will bring no fruitful results. May I read from the letter which I sent to the Premiers of the different provinces. The apposite paragraph is as follows:

> If however, the Government of the Prairie Provinces would not be satisfied with such an arrangement,—

That is the one similar to the offer which had previously been made—

> —but would prefer an accounting between the Dominion and the Provinces from the beginning, by an independent tribunal, we would not object to such a plan. In any agreement that might be come to along these lines it would be, of course, necessary that adequate provision be made for crediting the provinces with all moneys received by the Dominion and charging to the Provinces all outlay by the Dominion, directly or indirectly, in relation to the management of the resources. Any award duly made by the tribunal should be binding on both sides. Any sums found to be due by the Dominion to a Province or by a Province to the Dominion might be capitalized and interest adjusted in connection with the annual Provincial subsidy.

Another point to which I would like to draw attention is this: The concluding paragraph of the letter from which I have just read is in the following words:

> I need hardly add that of course any arrangement that might be made would be subject to the approval of the Dominion Parliament.

My right hon. friend tried to convey the impression that in some way the Government was prepared to hand over their natural resources to the western provinces and under the arrangement deny to the other provinces of the Dominion any rights that they might have. Nothing can be clearer than what I have just read to show that the proposal the Government has made is one which carries with it the right of every province of this Dominion to have any claims it may have against the western provinces taken into due consideration in any accounting that will be made in the settlement of these natural resources claims.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I misunderstood the letter. Does my hon. friend mean that when this commission makes its award, on the basis of accounting as he states, that award shall be submitted to Parliament afterwards for its approval?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It need not necessarily be a commission. We have offered the western provinces to meet with their representatives. As a Government we are prepared to discuss with them the return of their natural resources. It may be necessary to go into a strict accounting of all the moneys due by the provinces to the Dominion, or by the Dominion to the provinces. Whether or not it will be necessary to do more than employ expert accountants for that purpose will depend largely on the attitude which the western provinces take. Whatever course may be necessary—and that is a matter for negotiation—to arrive at a final conclusion as to what is just and fair, it must carry

with it the condition that the arrangement reached must be subject to the approval of this Parliament. This means that every province represented here will have, through its representatives, the right to say whether or not the settlement made is fair and just in the interest of all the provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the meaning of the words "That the award shall be binding on all parties"?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend and I were trying to settle a difference between us, and we made that difference subject to the finding of some third party, conditional upon that finding being accepted by the representatives assembled here, we would have exactly what I propose now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not final at all. If it is, the word final has no meaning.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It reaches a degree of finality that my right hon. friend and his Government were never able to reach. If there is any possibility of getting this question settled—and it is a question that ought to be settled, and settled as quickly as conveniently can be effected—this method which has been proposed would appear to be the most effective and the best.

My right hon. friend made some reference to the question of treaties. He spoke, and I thought rather slightingly, of the remarks of the mover of the Address when my hon. friend from North Winnipeg made reference to the clause of the Speech from the Throne which implies that all treaties should be submitted to the approval of Parliament. My right hon. friend asked: when did his Government not submit its treaties to Parliament? The treaties in question happen to be the recent treaties arising out of the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments at Washington. Whether it was to matters concerning that Conference to which my right hon. friend alluded or not when he said that certain misrepresentations of his attitude had been made during the campaign, I cannot say, but I venture to assert at the present moment, that if it had been left to my right hon. friend to settle the question as to how these treaties were to be finally signed, in all probability our Dominion would have had no representative at that Conference at all. I have here a statement which was made by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister of Great Britain shortly after my right hon. friend returned from the Conference of Premiers. It reads:

> As regards the Dominions and India, it was arranged at the recent Imperial Conference that His Majesty's Government should represent the whole Empire at Washington.

That was the position in which the treaty matter was left at the Imperial Conference attended by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are you reading the whole statement? I cannot think that that statement was made in that naked form. If so, I would dispute it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will read my right hon. friend's own statement which is just as naked as the other, and I think he will discover that its meaning is quite apparent. It was during June, July and August that my right hon. friend attended the Conference. On the 18th of October my right hon. friend handed out the following statement to the press of this city:

> As the result of recent telegraphic communications between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, it has been arranged that a representative of Canada should be appointed as a member of the delegation which will represent the British Empire at the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments and on Pacific and Far Eastern Questions summoned by the Government of the United States to meet at Washington on November 11th. The Canadian Government have accordingly appointed Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden G.C.M.G. as the representative of Canada for this purpose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but does he note the date of this particular communication, the 18th October, 1921? It was in June, July and August that my right hon. friend was at the Prime Ministers' Conference. It was between the time my right hon. friend was at the Prime Ministers' Conference in England and the date of his issuing the statement I have just read that the Prime Minister of Great Britain said:

> As regards the Dominions and India it was arranged at the recent Imperial Conference that His Majesty's Government should represent the whole Empire at Washington.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to state again, that the hon. gentleman has failed to quote such language from any statement of mine, and I was no party to such an arrangement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me then say what will be familiar to many hon. members of this House, that after the Imperial Conference the Prime Minis-

ter of South Africa, General the Right Hon. J. C. Smuts, having read the statement I have just quoted from the Prime Minister of Great Britain in which the latter says that it had been agreed at the Conference that His Majesty's Government would represent the whole Empire at Washington, made the declaration that, so far as South Africa was concerned she did not propose to return to the colonial status, but was going to maintain the status which she had won at the Peace Conference at Paris at the conclusion of the great war, and that South Africa would not be represented by a delegation to be named by the British Government to take its instructions from the British Government but that she would be represented by one of her own delegates acting under instructions from the government of South Africa, representing South Africa as one of the countries belonging to the British Empire, or not be represented at all. If Canada was fortunate enough to be represented at the Conference at Washington by her own representative we have to thank the Prime Minister of South Africa and not the late Prime Minister of our own country for the fact that we had that representation. I might add by way of confirmation of what I have just said, that in a cablegram of October 8th Lord Curzon, British Minister of Foreign Affairs, said to the British Ambassador at Washington:

> We leave to the sole discretion of the United States' Government what powers are to be invited.

He went on to say later:

> His Majesty's Government would now prefer to include the Dominion point of view.

So that as regards representation at Washington there seems to have been three stages. First the understanding arrived at during the conference of Prime Ministers in which it was apparently agreed that representation at Washington would be by the British delegation appointed by the British Government, receiving its instructions from the British Government and reporting to the British Government, Canada to come in or not to come in according to the decision of the British Government. Then there was the second stage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I rise to a point of order. I have made a statement on the subject to which the hon. member continuously refers, a subject within my own knowledge which he persists in contradicting. He has no right to do so. I stated I was no party to any such arrangement at the Imperial Conference that Canada should be represented merely by a delegation appointed by the British Government, taking its directions from the British Government, nor was such an arrangement arrived at while I was a member of the Conference. Our negotiations took place in this regard by correspondence, and from the first I insisted that we should name our delegate and that that delegate should take his instructions from us.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no desire in any way to contradict my right hon. friend, but I confess that when the Prime Minister of Great Britain makes a statement which he gives to the entire world, which was accepted in South Africa and which was accepted in Australia as being a correct statement, I find it somewhat difficult not to accept that statement as correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would remind—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would remind the hon. gentleman that I was not there to the end of the Conference.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is a way out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think if my hon. friend is pleading that he was not present, he should not be so emphatic as to what took place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am emphatic as to what I was stating.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am responsible to what I was a party to and only that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know what my right hon. friend is responsible for, but I do know that we prorogued this House in time to allow him to be present at the proceedings of the Conference, and I am sorry that he has to make the statement that he was not present at one of the most important meetings of the Conference.

May I pass to another matter which my right hon. friend felt somewhat sensitive upon, and that is the statement in the Speech from the Throne in reference to the revision of the Customs Tariff? My right hon. friend, in the course of his remarks,

repeatedly said to the hon. members of the House that they should not take too seriously what appears in the Speech from the Throne, that probably before the end of the session they would be considerably disappointed. I have here his exact words. In one place he said that the optimism excited in the Speech from the Throne would probably be "greatly depressed" before the session was over, that the Speech from the Throne was apt to be made up in part of forgotten promises and pledges. He referred in his graphic way to the Speech being "an aggregation of the letters of the alphabet". I am not surprised that my right hon. friend has the opinion he has of declarations in the Speech from the Throne, when one considers how he carried out the pledges which were made in the Speech from the Throne as presented to this Parliament last year. May I, for the purposes of making clear the point of view of the present Administration, quote to my right hon. friend the respective paragraphs in the Speeches from the Throne of this year and last year in regard to this important subject of the tariff? The Speech from the Throne of this year as presented by the present Government reads:

> You will be invited to consider the expediency of making some changes in the Customs Tariff. While there are details of revision, the consideration of which will require time and care that are not at present available, there are features of the tariff which it is felt may properly be dealt with during the present session.

My right hon. friend characterizes this paragraph as "pallid and barren." Those are the words he applies to the reference in the Speech to the subject of tariff revision. I am quite prepared to admit that the language of that paragraph is not overdrawn. But let me contrast with it the language of the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne of last year which my right hon. friend was responsible for having presented to this House. Here is his reference on the subject of the tariff:

> My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs tariff. In order to secure the most complete information a committee has conducted an extensive and thorough inquiry and has secured the views of all parties and interests in every province. The hearings necessary for this purpose have now been completed, and the conclusions founded thereon will be submitted to you in due course.

That paragraph may not be pale, pallid, barren; but I much prefer the one to which my right hon. friend has taken exception, which means what it says, to a paragraph that proved to be without any meaning and wholly untrue, and that has never been fulfilled in any particular.

My right hon. friend asks: what are the changes that are to be made in the tariff. He knows very well that the occasion of the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is not a time to discuss tariff changes. I think he may feel well assured that the pledge made will be carried out during the course of the present session, and I think that not only he, but hon. members of this House and the country generally, will rejoice that they have, in the person of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the one man above all others, in this Dominion, in whom the people of Canada, irrespective of party, have the utmost confidence in dealing with financial and tariff matters.

My right hon. friend seemed to be grieved that during the course of the campaign, in touching on tariff matters, I had made use of a little simile which served to describe my attitude in relation to the management of public affairs and to the tariff in particular. He seemed to think that in dealing with these important public matters, I should not have spoken of a chart and compass, and he sought to convey the impression—at least I thought he did—that in some way or another I had resorted, during the course of the campaign, to an attitude which was wholly new, and which was giving me some means of escape from dealing with tariff matters other than that which I had previously taken. He referred to the convention of the summer of 1919 and intimated that at that convention a platform had been drafted to which I was necessarily obligated, and that in some way I was betraying that whole convention, in the recent campaign, in not going forward with that platform in hand and saying that regardless altogether of existing conditions or the language therein contained, I was supporting it exactly as expressed. In order that there may be no doubt as to the position I took at the time of the convention of 1919 in reference to the platform as laid down, let me read the words which I addressed at that time to the assembled delegates. I have in my hand a copy of the proceedings of the Liberal Convention, and at page 199, my right hon. friend will find the following:

> I should be unworthy of any measure of the confidence you have so abundantly bestowed were I not fully conscious of my own

lack of Parliamentary experience, my own lack of training in public life, my own limitations in a thousand and one directions adequately to meet the obligations of this great duty, this great honour, which you have conferred. I should despair altogether of being able even to attempt to discharge its obligations were it not that I know that one who is called upon to accept the office of leadership must first and foremost be the willing servant of all, and that in seeking in the spirit of service to meet the wishes of those who have chosen him as their leader, he may look for guidance and counsel to the great forces assembled about him. . . . . I hope you will feel that in seeking to do the work of the Liberal party in the way I believe the Liberal party would wish it to be done, I shall rely upon the counsel of those who are outstanding in the ranks of the party, the Liberal members of the Senate, the Liberals in the House of Commons, the leaders of the party in the several provinces, the representative men who are gathered together here; and that in this way I shall find a compass which will point the direction that ought to be taken, and will point it aright.

If more is needed, that more is to be found in the platform which has been laid down by this Convention. That platform, ladies and gentlemen, is the chart on which is plotted the course desired by the people of the country, as expressed through the voice of the Liberals assembled here. So, with this chart and this compass, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, let us press on from this moment, a great, a united, a mighty force, making ever for new liberty, for wider freedom, for greater righteousness, in the public affairs of this nation; press on, ever more zealous and united, till we have reached the goal where the principles and policies laid down on this historic occasion will have become, through legislation, part of the law of our land.

That was the position which I took on the occasion of being honoured with the leadership of the Liberal party at the convention of 1919. That is the position which I took during the recent campaign, and that is the position which I take at the present time. I look upon these questions of Government, not as questions to be decided by any one man, but as matters requiring the most mature and careful consideration which it is possible for men of many points of view, assembled together, to give to them, and as long as I have the privilege of being entrusted with the responsible position which I at present enjoy, I shall ever look to the able men who are associated with me for the guidance and direction which I need in regard to these all-important public questions.

May I pass on from this subject, because the question of the tariff will come up at an appropriate time and need not be dealt with further at this moment, and speak just for a minute in reference to the subject of railways which was also alluded to by my right hon. friend? The leader of the Opposition stated that there was no need for having any reference in the Speech from the Throne to the subject of railways because it did not involve legislation. I am sure that if my right hon. friend looks over previous speeches from the Throne with the preparation of which he has had to do, he will find references to many subjects which do not require legislation one way or the other. The reference may not have been necessary on the ground that it did not involve legislation; but it was necessary that the country and Parliament should be informed at the opening of Parliament exactly as to the purpose of the ministry with respect to the National railroads which are in our possession at the present time, and the most appropriate place to make such a declaration was in the Speech from the Throne. The statement of the Government's position has been made, I think, with sufficient clearness to be intelligible to all hon. members of the House; but I would remind my right hon. friend that the proper person to discuss railway policy is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), and I would prefer, until he has had an opportunity of addressing members of the House, to defer saying anything further with respect to the meaning of co-ordination as set forth in the Speech from the Throne. I think the language must be perfectly clear to hon. members. If there is any doubt as to what is in the Government's mind, that doubt will be dispelled by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Kennedy) himself.

I cannot however, let pass what my right hon. friend said in reference to the present position of the country and its railways. As I listened to his remarks it seemed to me that they implied that when the Administration of which he was a member took office the country was overburdened with railways, and that that was the reason why we have the serious railway problem we have to-day. If what my right hon. friend says is true, that when the Administration of which he was a member came into office the country was, to use his expression, over-railroaded, I am at a loss to understand how he can defend the extent to which railway construction was carried on after 1911. Let me read from a report which I think he will quickly recognize and not be apt to dispute. I have in my hand the report of the Royal Commission to inquire into Railways and

Transportation in Canada, made by Sir H. L. Drayton and Mr. W. M. Acworth. I think the former gentleman is the hon. member who sits to the left of the leader of the Opposition. What does the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) say in that report? To quote from page 10:

> In 1901, with a population of 5,371,315, Canada had 18,140 miles of railway in operation; roughly a mile of railway for every 300 inhabitants. In 1911, the population had increased 34 per cent to 7,206,643, while the mileage had increased by 40 per cent. to 25,400 miles; a mile of railway to every 284 inhabitants. Since 1911—

Which was the time that the Administration, of which my right hon. friend later became a member, took office,—

> Since 1911 the population has, it is understood, not much increased, but the railway mileage open and under construction has grown to 40,584 miles. In other words, Canada has to-day—

That is, 1919.

> —taking the present population as 7,500,000, only 185 inhabitants to support each mile of railway.

In addition to that statement I have also here the evidence of a gentleman who was called before the Select Standing Committee on Canadian National Railways and Shipping at the last session of Parliament, the evidence of Mr. A. J. Mitchell, one of the directors, and vice-president, of the Board of Management of the Canadian Northern Railway system. At page 107 of the report of that committee the following appears from his evidence:

> For the year ending June 30th, 1914, the Canadian Northern Railway system had an operating mileage of 4,563 miles, with gross earnings of $23,781,328. Last year, for 1920, the mileage was 9.788 miles in operation, and the gross earnings were $68,541,393. In other words, there was over double the mileage in 1920 that there was in 1914. To be exact, 5,225 miles were added to the Canadian Northern Railway for operation since June 30th, 1914.

Let my right hon. friend reflect that 1914 was the year the war commenced. Then, if at any time, we should have ceased railway building. He will surely begin to see the extent of the responsibility of his Government in permitting the continued building of railways. We were already over-railroaded, as my right hon. friend says, yet we continued to build to the extent of 5,225 miles. My right hon. friend fails to place responsibility for the railway situation where it properly belongs.

The position we are in to-day is due in large part to this excessive construction during a period when construction should have been discontinued altogether. It is due further to the fact that the government which succeeded the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, instead of seeking to carry out in a sympathetic way the large vision which prompted the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, a vision which foresaw a great national highway connecting the waters of the Atlantic with those of the Pacific in a manner which would serve to unite this country, industrially, politically and commercially,—instead of seeking to realize that vision sympathetically, the government of which my right hon. friend was a member did all in its power to make that project a failure.

My right hon. friend had a good deal to say this afternoon as to the success of government operation depending upon who was administering national affairs. I could not help thinking that at the time he was speaking of the fulness of his heart and knowledge. He has had to do with the administration of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the other railways and he knows, perhaps better than anyone else in Canada, how a road can be made a failure if you do not wish to make it a success. So far as this Administration is concerned, I will not for one moment accept any of the insinuations or suspicions of my right hon. friend in regard to its intentions in administering the national railroads. We intend to give government ownership of the National system, which as the Speech from the Throne states now extends through all the provinces, the fairest trial under auspices the most favourable it is possible for a government to secure. We go into it with all sincerity and in the hope that we may make it a success. I will say with perfect candour that there are hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, as I know there are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who doubt very much whether public ownership can be made the success which private ownership might. But there are others who believe that it can be made a success, and so far as it is possible for this Government to demonstrate what can be done under government ownership, it is our intention to see that it is done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend had something to say in regard to the marketing of wheat. He took exception to the fact that there was no mention in the the Speech from the Throne of the method which the Government proposed to adopt as respects marketing facilities for this

great commodity of Western Canada. If there is an omission in the Speech in that particular, it has been made designedly. I think I am right when I say that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has one view, which he has expressed, as to the way in which wheat should be marketed, but that view does not accord with the view which my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) holds. I think there are others who hold yet another view. If I am correct, there are three main bodies of opinion as to the manner in which the marketing of wheat may best be carried on. The first may be described as the compulsory wheat board method, such as we had in Canada in 1919. The second is the voluntary wheat board method, such as my right hon. friend advocated during the campaign. The third is the farmers' own co-operative method carried on by the co-operative companies, such as the United Grain Growers, of which the hon. member for Marquette is president, and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Company, they holding the view that these co-operative companies should handle the crop themselves. Here are three bodies of opinion, each of which is entitled to consideration. The Government is anxious in this matter to do the best it can to serve the interests of Western Canada. Under the circumstances, is it possible to devise a better method of ascertaining what is likely to be of most service to those interests than that this question should, during the present session, be referred to the Select Standing Committee of Agriculture, with power to go carefully into the whole matter and report to the House as to which if any of the three methods it would recommend, or what course it thinks can be taken with most advantage? I may say that the Government has decided that that course will be adopted with respect to this important question. I hope that on that committee we shall have representatives from all groups in this House so that the policy ultimately adopted will be based upon the best information that can be obtained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have touched on most of the points which my right hon. friend dealt with in the course of his remarks. He made some reference to the reduction of freight rates, but I think I will leave that matter also until my colleague the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) has occasion to speak on the subject. I might point out, however, that while it is perfectly true, as the leader of the Opposition has said, that the Board of Railway Commissioners has power to regulate the railway rates, there is nothing which precludes the Administration from using its influence to bring together the different railway companies with a view to their taking, of their own accord, a course which should result in a reduction of freight rates on basic commodities in the best interests of all parties concerned. That step has already been taken and we hope that the railway companies will see the wisdom of speedily bringing about a reduction on basic articles. If it is not successful, then it will be for Parliament to consider other methods which will, perhaps, be more effective.

My right hon. friend concluded his address by making reference at considerable length to negotiations that took place prior to the formation of the present Administration. A little earlier in the course of his remarks he taunted me with having given a somewhat broad interpretation to the word "Liberalism"; indeed, he went so far as to say that I had made the word almost synonymous with "political dishonesty." Well, may I say to my right hon. friend that at least I have never been ashamed of the name of the party with which I have been connected. When my right hon. friend was in power in a previous Administration, it was first of all, I think, the "Liberal-Conservative" Administration. That name became questionable, and my right hon. friend was one of those who helped to give the new Administration the name of "Unionist." That name lasted for a short while, but it became even worse, and when my right hon. friend's predecessor went out of office, my hon. friend took it upon himself to insist that the party should have a new name and gave it the name "National Liberal and Conservative"—whatever that meant. That was his first act in becoming Leader of the Government. I now understand that my right hon. friend's party has just held another caucus, and that this time he has insisted on another change. He calls his party once more "Liberal-Conservative." Well, I do not know what interpretation may be placed upon the word, "Liberal" in that case, but if I am to judge the meaning of the word by hon. gentlemen who surround my right hon. friend at the present moment, for my part, I should never stretch the word "Liberal" sufficiently to include any of them. Speaking of "political dishonesty," if he wishes to avoid the charge, I think my right hon. friend should come right out

and call his following what it is—"Tory"; a Tory administration of the old type. May I suggest to my right hon. friend that when he is criticising others in the language they use he should be a little more careful. If there is one gentleman more than another in this country who is apt to use extreme and at times offensive phrases, it is my right hon. friend.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the negotiations which preceded the formation of the Government, that I have nothing to conceal; indeed, I am only too happy to have opportunity to repeat on the floor of the House what I have already said publicly. I do not know that there is any obligation upon the leader of a Government to explain any of the negotiations relating to the formation of a ministry; on the other hand, I am quite willing, if only to satisfy the curiosity of my right hon. friend, to give him the fullest and most candid account.

When I was called upon to take the responsible step of forming a government, I naturally, Mr. Speaker, looked over the situation as it presented itself as a result of the elections. I saw that in three of the western provinces the representation in this Parliament was for the most part Progressive, with two or three exceptions it was exclusively such. During the campaign I heard, and I read also in a number of papers, declarations made by candidates to the effect that as Progressives they were really Liberals; that their point of view was a Liberal point of view. I was perfectly sincere when I said, and I repeat it here, that I believe many of the hon. members who belong to the Progressive Party regard themselves, if you like, as Progressive Liberals. May I say that in so far as the word "Progressive" indicates an attitude, my hon. friends of the Progressive party will find the present Government wholly in sympathy with them. The word "Liberal," to my mind, has always stood and will ever stand for progress. To the extent to which my Progressive friends use the word "Progressive" as indicating an attitude to be taken toward questions which come before Parliament for discussion; to the extent to which that word is synonymous with "Liberal," they will find this Government wholly in sympathy with them. So far as the word may have any meaning which relates it to class, there may be a difference between us; because Liberalism implies a point of view which embraces not merely one class but is broad enough to include representatives of all classes who take a like attitude upon public questions. The fact which confronted me when I was forming the Government was the circumstance I have just mentioned, that in three of the provinces, the representation was almost exclusively Progressive representation. To my mind there can be nothing more unfortunate for this Dominion than that any part of it should have cause to feel that it is not to have its voice in the councils of the country. I feel that the whole purpose of Confederation itself would be menaced if any great body of opinion, any considerable section of this Dominion of Canada, should have reason to think that it was without due representation in the shaping of national policies and in the carrying on of our public affairs. I was anxious,therefore, that so far as the Government I was endeavoring to form was concerned, Western Canada would never be able to say that the Liberal Party adopted other than a generous attitude toward those who opposed some of its followers. So, Mr. Speaker, I made it known to gentlemen who, I believed, were representative of Progressive thought and opinion that I was prepared to consider taking into the Government members of the Progressive Party who enjoyed its confidence; but I made it quite plain that I would only consider that representation on the basis of its coming into a Liberal Administration. I was quite sincere when I said during the course of the campaign that I thought coalitions were a mistake. We have only to recall the Government of which my hon. friend was a member to realize how costly coalitions are, to realize how full of compromise and how inefficient they are. What the country needs most, and I believe British parliamentary practice has gone far to prove it, is an administration sufficiently of one mind and sufficiently strong to be able to adopt policies of great national importance and carry them through in a way that will help to make for good and strong government in the country. That was the position which I took in regard to our western friends in the formation of the Government. I take that position to-day and I will always take it as long as I have to do with the affairs of the government in this country. Any body of opinion in Canada which represents itself as Liberal will be entitled to a place in the councils of this country, but it must be for gentlemen themselves to say whether or not they wish to have their views regarded as Liberal, or as of some other point of view. All I wish to

make plain at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is this: If we are to have a happy, a united and prosperous Canada, we must seek at all times to give, so far as it may be possible, representation to kindred bodies of opinion in the work of the administration of our country. I am sorry that we have not in the Government at the present moment representation from that large Western group. I say it in perfect frankness, and I say it simply because I feel that the more united those of us are who are opposed to Toryism, the more likely we are to secure the enactment of Liberal policies. But what we have been unable to do as a Government, I hope we shall be able successfully to do in this Parliament. In other words, I hope that it will be possible for this administration to make it plain to hon. members that the Cabinet regards itself not as some group of supermen imposing their will upon the House of Commons, but as a committee of the House of Commons, responsible to the House of Commons, anxious to get the freest and fullest discussion of all public questions, and willing to carry out the will and the wish of the House of Commons to the best of their ability.

May I say, and with this I wish to conclude, that I agree with the hon. mover of the Address (Mr. McMurray) that the people of this country are greatly indebted to the sister province of Quebec for having through one of its constituencies afforded a place in this Parliament and in the Government, to a gentleman who for many years held the position of Prime Minister of the province of Alberta. I think my friends from Alberta sitting opposite to me will agree that he enjoyed the confidence of the people of that province as few men have ever enjoyed it, also that, notwithstanding circumstances which limited followers of the Government so far as Western Canada is concerned to the numbers they are, that in the choice as Minister of Agriculture of this Dominion, of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Motherwell), who for thirteen years was Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the choice of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), who, as I have just mentioned, was for many years the Premier of the sister province of Alberta, western opinion is represented at the council board and there is reason to feel that full consideration will be given at all times to the needs and to the rightful aspirations of the Western provinces.

We have a great country, but we can only keep it great as we have all parts united and contented. That, Mr. Speaker, above all else will be the aim of the present Administration, to see that every shade of opinion, other than that to which we are diametrically opposed, every shade of Liberal and Progressive thought is duly considered in the shaping of the policies of the Government and in the carrying out of those policies. In that way I believe, now that we have a new Parliament and a new Government, we may look forward to a new era of prosperity, contentment and happiness and, above all, of unity in our Dominion.

On the motion of Mr. Crerar the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 9.58 p.m.

Tuesday, March 14, 1922.

The House met at Three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—WEDNESDAY SITTINGS

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Fielding:

> That on Wednesday the fifteenth day of March instant and subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House will meet at three o'clock in the afternoon.

I may say in regard to this motion, Mr. Speaker, that during the sessions of the previous Parliament the House assembled at two o'clock on Wednesdays instead of three. Experience, however, went to show that meeting an hour earlier on one day of the week resulted in a good deal of confusion, inconvenience and embarrassment, and I think it will probably better serve the convenience of all members if we assemble at the same hour on Wednesday as on other days of the week.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a variation of a long standing rule of the House, but by way of trial I offer no objection to it at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

GRAIN INQUIRY COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to ask my hon. friend the

Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) if any report has been made to the Government by the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission appointed by the late Government, known in Western Canada as the Hyndman Commission, and if so, whether such report will be made available to the House. I should like also to ask whether the Government has a copy of the evidence taken, and if it is the intention to submit such evidence to the House.

Hon. J. A. ROBB: (Minister of Trade and Commerce) There is a voluminous amount of correspondence in the department, but no definite report. The expense of printing this evidence would be considerable. I see no objection to supplying it to my hon. friend if he so desires, and if the House decides to bear the expense of printing it there will be no objection to that being done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the minister if it is the intention of the Government to continue the work of the commission?

Mr. ROBB: Well, the Wheat Board have apparently discontinued their own work. They have run out of supplies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Wheat Board?

Mr. ROBB: The Grain Commission.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, March 13.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my first words this afternoon shall be words of congratulation to you, Sir, upon your elevation to the position of First Commoner of the land. The office of Speaker in the greatest deliberative assembly of the nation is one of much responsibility. I think the House has been happy in its choice, Sir, and I have no doubt that hon. members will give you every assistance in the maintenance of that order and decorum which are necessary for the proper conduct of the public business.

It is appropriate also that I join with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the words which they have uttered with regard to the appointment of His Excellency Lord Byng to be Governor General of Canada. A good many of us have pleasant recollections of the late Governor General, the Duke of Devonshire. I have no doubt that the present Governor General will soon gain from the whole of the Canadian people that esteem and respect that he gained so rapidly among the Canadian soldiers when he was their chief at the front.

I wish also—and I feel a particular pride in doing so—to say a word of welcome on the part of my fellow Progressive members here to the new lady member of this House. I think it is particularly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the first lady member elected to the House of Commons, marking a distinct step in progress, should be elected as a member of the Progressive Party. We have recently given the women of Canada the franchise. I am a thorough believer in that reform; I believe that the women of Canada can make a great contribution to the public life of the country, and I have no doubt that our new member will make a valuable contribution to the work of the House.

I wish also to say a word of felicitation, not only because it is customary but because I think it can be sincerely offered upon the present occasion, to the mover (Mr. McMurray) and to the seconder (Mr. Mercier) of the motion we are considering. It is not a light ordeal for a new member to speak from his place in this House for the first time; I recall my own experience in that connection. But I know I am well within the judgment of the whole House when I say that the hon. member for North Winnipeg discharged his duty yesterday very well indeed. Unfortunately for me I do not speak the graceful language of my hon. friends from Quebec and I was therefore unable to follow in actual text the address given by my hon. friend who seconded the motion. But I am bound to say that of the many admirable speeches that I have listened to in the French language none has impressed me more than the speech I heard from my hon. friend yesterday.

It is proper that I should make some reference to the speeches of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). If the speeches we had yesterday from our hon. friends, Mr. Speaker, are an indication of what we shall have throughout the whole session and this Parliament, I can well believe that we are in for some interesting times. I should like to have seen a little more discussion of the really serious prob-

lems that are facing this country. The business of this Parliament is very serious, and I hope I am not giving any offence to my hon. friends when I offer them this advice, that it would be well in the future to give more consideration to the great problems that are facing us in this country.

My hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) had a good deal to say as to the character of the campaign carried on in some parts of Canada by my hon. friends on the Government side. Well, I had some experience myself of the character of the campaign carried on in some parts of the country by my hon. friends on the other side of the House, and I dare say that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had a similar experience, but I must say that he was living perilously near a glass house when he was making those charges. I am among those who believe that the election campaigns of this country, whether federal or provincial, should be conducted as far as possible upon the basis of a clear and honest discussion of the issues before the people. I conceive that only in such a way can the best government be secured. I have no patience with the character of the campaign that was carried on by some of my hon. friends on the Government side in the province of Quebec, both in respect to the question of conscription and the question of the tariff. As far as Western Canada was concerned, and Eastern Canada too, very largely, on what basis was the campaign against the Progressive party and the Progressive candidates carried on? On a basis of utter and gross misrepresentation. As far as Western Canada was concerned, the record of the Government and the question of the tariff were discussed very little. I discovered in the election contest recently closed that I had become a most dangerous character in this Dominion, and if some of the things that I heard were said about me and about some of my associates sitting behind me, in the last election campaign in Western Canada were true, I certainly should not be occupying a seat in this House of Commons to-day. I say again, let us endeavour to free our minds of these things, for there are great and vital issues before this country at the present time. Let us concentrate our attention upon these issues and endeavour to seek a solution for our problems along the line of what will be in the best interests of our country. On no other line can I conceive that we can discharge our duties to our constituents as we should.

We have had a change of government, and we shall wait with interest to see what benefits that change of government will bring to this country. That brings me to a matter that was referred to by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and by my hon. friend the Prime Minister. I refer to the question of the negotiations that were entered into, or were supposed to be entered into, between the Government and myself and one or two members representing the Progressive party elected in the last campaign. My hon. friend the Prime Minister, I think, was animated by a sincere desire to do what was in the best interests of this country, but when he states that he made it quite clear in any proposals or suggestions he made, that this ministry was only to be a Liberal ministry I must say that I did not so understand it. When these proposals were first made they were discussed or suggested on the basis of policy and on the basis of the personnel of the Government; and that, to my mind, is the essential thing. I am not much concerned with what government is in power in this country so long as the country gets the legislation and the administration it should have. I have had a great many differences of opinion with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who was very kind in his references yesterday —or at all events in the inference that might be drawn from his references to his hon. friends who sit on his left; but notwithstanding the strong differences of opinion I have had with my right hon. friend I would be prepared to co-operate with him or with anyone else at the present time to secure for this country the administration and the legislation that it needs. But such co-operation would be upon definite lines of principle, upon definite lines of policy, and upon no other lines. I submitted the suggestions that had been conveyed to me to my supporters, as it was my duty to do. Those suggestions were considered and there were further discussions, but nothing came of those discussions, and we are here to-day sitting in this House as an independent party standing for the principles that we believe in and prepared to further those principles by every honest and legitimate means within our power.

There has been some speculation in the press, and, I dare say, also in the House, as to what attitude the Progressive party would take in this House. Well, Sir, the attitude of the Progressive party is easily

and simply stated. We are here, not to oppose for the sake of opposing; we are here prepared to give the Government every assistance in carrying on the government of this country, when it gives the country the policies that we believe it should have. I say that we are prepared to do that, but we are equally prepared to oppose the Government and to criticise it when we think the Government is doing wrong or not adopting the policies that we think this country should have. That, to my mind, frankly and clearly states our position. My own hope, and I am bound to say that the words of my hon. friend the Prime Minister give some ground for that hope, is that the policy pursued by the Government in respect of the great vital questions before the country, to which later I shall make some allusion, will be such as to command our support. If their course is shaped in that direction so that we can support them, we shall do so, but if it is not, our duty then will lie in another direction.

I am among those also who believe that the Government should have a reasonable time to carry out its policies and to frame its programme. I quite realize the difficulties of the present situation, that a government coming into office only a few months before a session is called has not had the opportunity to familiarize itself with all the questions of public administration, and perhaps not the opportunity to make a full inquiry as to the lines of public policy that should be followed, and we are therefore prepared to give the Government every reasonable time to shape its course and decide upon its line of action.

I desire to speak, and I shall not detain the House at any great length, upon the subjects dealt with in the Speech from the Throne. It was a good speech as such speeches go. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was on rather poor ground yesterday when he criticised the tariff plank in the Speech, because I recall that a year ago we expected from the Speech delivered at that time, that definite tariff proposals would be laid before Parliament. There is one thing that strikes me, Sir, in respect of the recent Speech and it is that there are in it no decided statements of Government policy excepting perhaps on one or two particulars. There is the suggestion that several branches of defence in Canada should be co-ordinated or joined together under one minister. I think that is a step in the right direction, and I would commend to the Prime Minister and to the other members of the Government that that course might very well be followed in respect to other departments of the public service. I sometimes think that this country is over-governed. I know that in the United States, with a population of 108 or 110 millions of people, the cost of the Federal Government is relatively much lighter than it is in the Dominion of Canada; and I trust that when the Minister of Militia brings down his estimates he will carry the good work further and pare those estimates as closely as he can. One of the criticisms I had to offer of the late Government was the fact that it did not practise economy as it should be practised having in view the conditions and the circumstances of the country, and I trust that we shall not be obliged to level the same criticism at the members of the present Government when its estimates are placed before the House.

The Speech refers to the existing world-wide depression. Well, we are all pretty well familiar with that. I think we have all, as a matter of fact, pretty much experienced it in our own pockets.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: I am glad to hear that note of aproval from my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister because I think perhaps he had a very active experience during his tenure of office of this condition of affairs.

There is also a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and to my mind a very important one, dealing with the condition of agriculture in the Dominion. There is no doubt, Sir, that the condition of agriculture throughout Canada to-day is very serious indeed. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is, I am sure well aware of that fact. After all when we survey this whole Dominion from one end to the other, when we take account of the great manufacturing establishments that we have built up, may we not properly ask upon what does the real prosperity of this Dominion rest? It rests upon our agriculture; and if the farmers of this country are not prosperous, if agriculture is not thriving, then there is only one inevitable consequence—the business of the country languishes and dies. What is the situation to-day? I venture to say that a great majority of the farmers of Western Canada, that portion of the Dominion with which I am more intimately acquainted, conducted their business last year at a loss. I believe it is true of other portions of the

Dominion. And what is the result? The result is that our factories are closed, there is unemployment in our cities, and there is lack of business for our railways. At a previous session I gave figures to the House showing the value of our agricultural exports in comparison with the total of our exports from Canada; and without any question of doubt whatever an examination of the facts in all their particulars shows conclusively that agriculture is the greatest industry of this Dominion, and that upon its success more than upon anything else depends the success of all the other industries and business activities of Canada.

I am very glad to note in the Speech from the Throne this statement:

> It is apparent that adequate markets and marketing facilities and reduced transportation and production costs lie at the root of the problem.

There is no doubt that better methods of tillage, better methods of farming, and better live stock will increase prosperity and the profits of the farmer; but it is equally true, in the largest sense, that the very things stated here are the things that vitally affect the prosperity of agriculture in this Dominion. The paragraph I have quoted makes the declaration that adequate markets are a part of the problem. That is unquestionably true. How a country such as Canada, with half of its people engaged in the business of agriculture, can have too many markets, or too broad markets, for its agricultural products passes my comprehension. I am not at all sure that the visit of the Minister of Finance to Washington recently was well timed. He of course is the best judge of that; but I do want to commend the purpose of my hon. friend in his desire to promote better trade relations with the United States in respect to markets for our agricultural products. I am not so sure as to how far the Minister of Finance has the support of all those who sit behind and around him in this proposal; but if any words of mine will have any influence with my hon. friend I hope he will persevere in that good work and, if possible, secure that market for Canada's products. I do not agree with the view of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who yesterday briefly argued that reciprocity would be of no value to the Canadian farmer. How that argument can be made in the face of patent facts I cannot understand. The year before last we exported, if my memory serves me right, 350,000 head of live stock over one year old to the United States. When our American friends passed their Fordney Emergency Tariff that market was shut off, and what was the result? The result was that the farmers of Canada did not have that market for their live stock, and the value of live stock in the live stock markets of the Dominion went down, and went down steadily. Now is that a good thing for Canada or is it not? Is it a good thing for this Dominion that the farmers of Canada shall get the highest possible prices for their live stock and for their grain? I conceive that it is, because if the farmer has money in his pocket, he buys goods from the merchant and contributes traffic to the railways. As a result of that operation the whole area of business is extended and enlarged so that the whole country benefits from it. That is the inevitable result, and consequently there is no greater need for this country to-day than that of wider markets.

A reference is also made in the Speech to the need of improved market facilities. I presume that the Government have in mind in that respect the marketing of the wheat of this country. I hope their reference has a wider application even than that. One of the great difficulties in Canada to-day, and one of the causes of the high cost of living, is the expensive system of distribution, not only of farm products, but of the supplies that consumers require. I am a great believer in voluntary co-operation among the people to overcome these difficulties. I recognize that the middleman in some cases, perhaps, has his place, but when a great body of consumers and producers have to support a vast army of middlemen, it is not a healthy condition, and I trust the Government have in mind in this respect the encouragement and the opening up of these avenues of co-operation.

I would like to make a reference particularly to the marketing of our wheat. The conditions in the past year have been very bad. As my hon. friends know, there is a widespread feeling in Western Canada, shared not only by producers, but by many business men as well, that the Canada Wheat Board should be re-established in a temporary way to meet this condition, and I noted with interest the statement of my hon. friend the Prime Minister yesterday that the whole question of marketing wheat is to be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I

would suggest that it be done as quickly as possible, so that the whole matter can be thoroughly inquired into. My right hon. friend who leads the Opposition has advanced a proposal that may have some merit in it, the proposal of a voluntary wheat pool under the control of the Government, but I am not convinced that that proposal as a permanent method of marketing grain, or indeed the method of a Government Wheat Board as a permanent method of marketing grain, is the best and soundest method.

I recently had the opportunity of learning that in the United States great progress has been made in the past few years in the development of co-operative pooling organizations, handling fruits, grain and other commodities used and produced by farmers. In the United States, within the past year, the Federal Government has given substantial assistance in the way of financing these pools in their selling operations. That was done through the revival of the War Finance Corporation, which it will be recalled functioned in the United States during the war. This question of how the Government can aid by assistance of this kind is one that might very well engage the attention of the Government. I can tell them now that they will have the opposition of our banking institutions, but our banking institutions are not freighted with all the financial wisdom that this country contains. This questions is one that should receive the consideration of the Government, and it is a field that can be explored, I feel sure, with great profit to the country.

There is another suggestion in this declaration, namely that production costs should come down. I sincerely hope that that is a forerunner of the wiping out of the duty on agricultural implements. It is absolutely necessary that production costs come down in this country, and where the wisdom comes in, in increasing the cost of the equipment the farmer uses on his farm passes my comprehension. The world is going through a period of great change. It is a well known fact that before the war, Russia, with its population of 160,000,000 or 170,000,000 people, was one of the greatest competitors of North America in supplying Europe with the wheat for the breadstuffs her people consumed. Russia since the war has been out of that market, but there are signs to-day that the restoration of Russia has commenced, indeed, if it is not well on the way, and within a few years that great country, which is now so stricken with famine and pestilence, will be supplying the markets of the world with wheat in competition with us. I say to the Prime Minister and to the members of his Government that there is no more important matter that can engage their attention to-day than the question of how these production costs can be brought down, and when they face that consideration they will recognize that one method in which that can be done is by taking the duties off agricultural implements.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) have a very full and complete knowledge of the needs of the people in Western Canada. There are those who have said that if the United States raises a tariff against our wheat and against our live stock, we should raise our tariff against them by way of retaliation. What an absurd policy. In other words, when you find the farmers of Canada shut off from this market, thus placed in the position where they have to carry on their work under greater disabilities, you propose to help them—how? By raising the duties, or increasing the cost of the equipment they have to use. The sensible thing to do under such circumstances is to endeavour to meet that condition by reducing the cost of the things the farmer needs to carry on his operations.

There is one other thought suggested in this paragraph. It is a reference to transportation costs and I judge from what the Speech states that that matter is engaging the attention of the Government. I trust that it will engage their attention, Mr. Speaker, to good purpose. Without question one of the things that is throttling business and industry in this country more than anything else is the excessive freight rates that the country is labouring under. Those increases have been very considerable. I am not going to debate the question now whether those increases were justified or not. In a large measure they were justified, owing to conditions under which the country was labouring at that time, but when you find a condition of affairs where a farmer, for instance, ships his oats from the province of Alberta to Fort William, and finds that almost half the money he realizes on the oats at Fort William has been taken in freight to pay

the transportation costs, then I say this country cannot prosper under those conditions. Consequently, this question of freight rates is one that should engage the attention of the Government. and if the Government are not competent or able to deal with it, the question should engage the attention of this House.

There are some changes forecasted in the customs tariff. I read that paragraph, Mr. Speaker, with a good deal of care, indeed I will confess that I read it a good many times. It is a very carefully worded paragraph. I hope it forecasts a revision of duties downwards. I cannot conceive for a moment that the Government would think of revising the tariff upwards. I hope that will not be done, although when I read the speeches delivered even since the Government was formed by some of its members I have a mental reservation even on that question. I say that because I have in my hand an extract from the Montreal Gazette of February 3, giving a report of a meeting of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association of Canada at which the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) was present. The Minister of Justice delivered a speech upon that occasion, and I shall read from the report in the Gazette. The Gazette is an old established newspaper. It is veering very close to my hon. friends on the Government side at the present time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: I believe that the ex-Minister of Finance has a note of regret in his "Hear, hear." Not only the Montreal Gazette, but the Montreal Star as well, are adopting a very friendly attitude to my hon. friends on the Government side.

Mr. JACOBS: Loaves and fishes.

Mr. CRERAR: I am not at all sure that that will bring much comfort to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), but at any rate I want to deal with this report of the speech made by the Minister of Justice. It reads:

> Sir Lomer Gouin pointed out that from 1900 to 1914 the importation of foreign-made shoes had increased 700 per cent and that women—who now had their share of public rights and obligations—were responsible for the importation from the United States last year of over 500,000 pairs of shoes for a value of $1,700,000.

Very serious offence. He added, and I want hon. members to note this:

> For that reason, he added, we can easily understand that our Canadian manufacturers should insist on being granted a reasonable measure of protection to assure the survival of an industry which is as old as the country itself. For it is on home trade alone, or nearly so, that your industry must live and thrive.

And so on. That is as fine protectionist doctrine as I have ever heard preached in this country, and I trust that doctrine will not be the one that will guide the Government when it comes to the consideration of revising the tariff. The tariff should be revised downward and downward very considerably. During the election there were those who said that I stood for absolute free trade, and that if the Progressive party came into power the tariff would be swept away over night. That proposal has never been made anywhere at any time by any member of the Progressive party. I am convinced that the principle of protection is not suited as a fiscal policy for this country, and this country will never develop as it should develop as long as protection is embedded as the guiding principle of our fiscal policy. I recognise that it is and will be necessary for a considerable time to raise revenue by customs duties; but a tariff based upon the principle of revenue and the needs of revenue is an altogether different thing from a tariff based upon the principle of protection, and I earnestly hope the Government, when they come to present to Parliament their concrete proposals in respect to the fiscal policy of this country, will be guided by the former principle. Indeed, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) pointed out to the House yesterday, the Government have a very explicit and definite programme as regards the tariff. I had intended pointing that out. It is a definite programme, and I think the country expects—and I hope it will not be disappointed—that the Government will, in a very considerable degree, at this session implement the tariff programme that was part of its platform when it appealed to the Canadian people.

Another question to which I wish to refer is the railways. I am glad to note the declaration in the Speech from the Throne in connection with our National railways. I take it to mean that the intention of the Government is to give public ownership of these roads a full and fair trial in this country. If that end is to be achieved, one or two things are absolutely vital. One is that those roads comprising the Government system—I care not whether you call it co-ordination or amalgamation or anything else—be placed absolutely and without any question of doubt under one

central management, and be controlled by that management; otherwise you cannot avoid having duplication. I am a believer in the principle of public ownership of public utilities. I know there are in this House many who do not hold that view; there are many of my hon. friends on the Government side who do not hold that view. I respect their opinion; but I believe, that in these questions of great public utilities, in the end, even with all the defects that public ownership may have, from public ownership the greatest good will come to the greatest number of people, and that is the only basis upon which these things should be considered. But even if it should turn out in the future that we are not pursuing a wise course in respect to public ownership of these roads, I point out to my hon. friends in the Government that, for pure business reasons alone, the only thing to do is to handle this proposition as a business proposition, to do what private capital or management would do under similar circumstances, namely, to co-ordinate those roads absolutely and entirely as regards management. Build your system into one complete whole, and then, no matter what disposition you may desire to make of it in the future, you have an asset that is worth while. Our Government railways, with all that has been said about and against them, are potentially a good asset for this country, and why? What is the cardinal defect of our railway system to-day? It is that this country is overbuilt with railways. I am not going to apportion the blame for that. I would say that the blame rests, perhaps, on governments of the past, and it rests, perhaps equally on the people of this country, because any programme of lavish expenditure of public money always commanded public support, and was a strong temptation to any party in power to embark upon and engage in it. But while that is true, these roads must and should be handled as a business proposition. How has it come about that the public have these roads to-day? We have them for one reason and one reason only: private ownership and operation absolutely broke down. Public ownership of railways in this country was not the deliberate choice of the people; it was forced upon us because of the collapse of private ownership and operation; and I am well within the judgment of the House when I make that statement. There are those who would like to see our National Railway system broken up. I see articles in the newspapers which force upon me the conclusion that there is in progress in this country to-day an active propaganda against the National railways. The solution of the question will never be found in that direction. I submit that these roads must have a fair and full trial, and I am glad to know that it is the intention of the Government to give them that trial; and so far as their efforts go in that direction I can assure them that we in the Progressive section of the House will give the Government our support in their endeavours in this respect. If I may for a moment play the part of a candid friend, I may say to the Prime Minister, whom I wish well in the high office he occupies, that there is perhaps no question to-day upon which there is greater doubt in the public mind than that which respects the probable course of the Government in regard to the railways, and I say to the hon. gentlemen that if his course is fixed, clear, and unequivocal along the lines I have indicated, he will do a great deal to relieve the anxiety that exists in Canada at the present time. An inquiry is referred to. We have no information, either in the Speech from the Throne or from the Prime Minister, as to what is involved in that inquiry, and we shall await the Government's proposals in that respect before offering further criticism thereon.

I desire for a moment to refer to another important matter mentioned in the Speech, and that is the question of immigration. I am very glad to know that the Government are alive to this important subject. I cannot agree with the optimistic view expressed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as to the results of the last census. I think that the last census figures are disappointing, and I propose to give to the House very briefly some information on this matter. Our present population, according to the census figures, is slightly over 8,750,000 people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The population is 8,774,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, 20,000 more; I I thought it was exactly 8,764,000; however, I stand corrected. Our population at present, then, is 8,774,000. The population in 1911, according to the official census was 7,206,000. Now we have taken into Canada, through the gates of immigration during the last decade, 1,812,000. We have also had a natural increase, in excess of births over deaths, during the same period, of 1,140,000. Our population on this basis

of the figures of 1911, supplemented by immigration secured, and natural increase during the period, should be 10,158,000. We shall allow for a very considerable wastage during the war. We know that we had heavy losses during that time, but I think that 158,000 would cover the wastage that occurred in connection with the war. So that on a fair basis, if we had held our people in Canada, we should have to-day a population of at least 10,000,000 souls in this Dominion. But the figures show that we have slightly in excess of 8,750,000; in other words, there are well over one million people who have gone somewhere and whom we should have in Canada. Is that a serious condition of affairs, or is it not? I think it is. What is the use of our spending millions a year in promoting immigration to Canada when we are losing the people almost as fast as we can bring them to our doors? Some of my critics may say that immigration declined during the war, and that that fact accounts for the poor showing that the country has made in its last census. An examination of the official figures, however, discloses the fact that from 1901 to 1911 the total immigrants received into Canada numbered 1,764,000. During that period there was an increase of 34 per cent in the population. In the last decade we had an increase of only 21 per cent in the population. But during the last ten years we have received in immigration 1,812,000, or roughly speaking, 50,000 more in immigration than in the previous ten years. It is obvious, therefore, that this disappointment in our population is not due to a decline in immigration, because the immigration figures for the past ten years are in excess of those of the previous decade. This question is one which, I suggest, might well engage the attention of the Government. Why are people leaving Canada? People usually do not leave a country in which they are prosperous and happy, and I say that this question might very well engage the consideration of my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces. There is one of those provinces that shows an actual decline in population in the last ten years. It is a rather curious fact that the little province of Prince Edward Island showed a steady increase in population until the national policy was introduced into Canada in 1878, but, in every decade, from 1880 up to the present day, that province has shown a loss in population. I trust that this whole question will receive the serious attention of the Government, and I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), who I understand has now charge of the immigration work, will be able, when he submits his estimates to the House, to lay before us concrete suggestions on the part of the Government as to how this difficulty can be overcome and how immigration of desirable settlers, who will go on the land and stay there after they come into Canada, can be best promoted. The relation of population to other problems is quite apparent. I spoke a moment ago about our railways. If we had double the population we have in Canada we should have no railway problem to-day. What our railways lack is business, and business can come only through an increase in population. It is therefore a matter for concern when population does not increase as rapidly as it should. Take, again, the great burden of the debt, in taxation, that rests upon the country. I need not give to the House the amount of the total debt of Canada; but it is obvious, even to a third form school boy, that if your population increases the per capita amount of the debt declines and, consequently, the per capita taxation upon the citizens is lessened. In view of these facts, therefore, the question of how our immigration can be increased and how the country can be settled is one of first rate importance from every point of view. I desire to make my position clear in that respect. We have sufficient people in our towns and cities to-day. What Canada needs is not artisans, or workmen, but a sturdy rural population. We need immigrants to go on the land, people who, as I said a moment ago, will stay there permanently when they do come into the country.

4 p.m.

I notice also in the Speech from the Throne a reference to soldiers' re-establishment. We shall await with interest the proposals of the Government in that respect. I trust that the Government will be generous in the treatment of the disabled men; it is an obligation of honour resting upon the Canadian people and upon this Parliament, and it is an obligation which, I am sure, will be fully discharged.

Reference is also made to the the fact that the treaties passed at the Washington Conference will be submitted to the House for approval. We shall await the submission of those treaties. I am glad to note that Canada was represented at the

Washington Conference. I would make the suggestion to the Government, though some members of it may not agree with my view in this respect, that they might very well carry out the understanding that was reached a few years ago with the British Government by appointing a Canadian Ambassador to Washington. I have no criticism to offer of the British Embassy, but I do believe that these two great countries lying alongside each other for nearly four thousand miles have more interests in common with each other than they have, perhaps, with any other countries in the world in matters of business and trade. If we had a representative at Washington who could represent the Canadian viewpoint I am quite sure that great good would come to this Dominion.

I note also that Canada is to send a representative to the Genoa Conference, and I have seen reports in the press with regard to the appointments made in that respect. I would express my regret that the Government have appointed as one of the Commissioners to the Genoa Conference, Sir Charles Gordon. I have nothing against Sir Charles Gordon personally, but what is this Conference at Genoa? It is primarily an economic and financial conference; an occasion for the coming together of different countries with a view to seeing how a sick world can be made well; to see how business can be re-established between the nations. Sir Charles Gordon is well known as a high protectionist, and I feel that whatever influence he will have in that conference will be exercised along the line of maintaining those artificial barriers between nations, which, after all, in the long run are one of the greatest causes of international misunderstanding.

I wish to strongly commend the Government for the appointment they have made to the High Commissioner's office in London. I believe that Hon. Mr. Larkin will discharge admirably and well the duties of that position. He is going to a task of considerable magnitude; I hope and trust that he will justify the confidence that his friends have in him.

I do not need to impress upon the Government the necessity for economy; my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) at any rate is fully seized of that need. I want to offer a word of congratulation to the Finance Minister with respect to the sale of Canadian National Railway bonds that he made in New York the other day. He proceeded in the right way so far as that transaction is concerned; I think he himself can do this business just as well as turn it over to our friends the bond brokers and give them a large commission for handling it.

The financial condition of this country is serious. The people are suffering under heavy taxation. The question of how economies may be introduced into the administration of this country's business, are very pressing questions indeed. I may say in passing that I hope the Government will not accede to the request made by the manufacturers, who recently waited upon them, that additional revenue should be raised by an increase in the sales tax. My hon. friends opposite—some of them at any rate—know what an antediluvian theory the sales tax really is, and I trust the Government will not increase it. Indeed, I hope they may be able to reduce the existing one—and why? Because the sales tax bears most heavily upon the persons least able to pay. The workingman in the city with a family of six or eight children and a small income is taxed on practically everything he buys for his family—there are a few exceptions; but in the matter of clothing and a great many of the actual necessaries of life he is taxed through the operation of the sales tax. I do trust that among the proposals which will be submitted by the Finance Minister to the House for the raising of additional revenue, the sales tax will not be included.

There is one other suggestion I would make to the Government; it was one that I made to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition when he was at the head of the late administration. It is this: that a conference of the leading municipal and provincial authorities and proper officials of the Federal Government be held to inquire into the whole question of taxation. What do we find to-day? We find overlapping of taxes in various provinces and, indeed, in the municipalities as well. For instance, I understand that the citizens of a certain city pay an income tax to the city, an income tax to the province, and an income tax to the federal treasury. Some way might be found of adjusting those differences. If such a conference is called it should be preceded by a thorough study of the question so that when the members of the conference come together the Government will be able to place before them full and accurate information in respect to the whole question of taxation in this Dominion. I have been told—I do not

know how true it is, but I think it is well within the mark—that the Canadian people are paying annually in taxes of all kinds, municipal, provincial and federal, close to one thousand million dollars a year. If that is true, I can conceive that a conference such as I suggest might be productive of very good results in delimiting the fields of taxation, in reaching an understanding as to where expenditures should be embarked upon; indeed, in promoting a sane financial policy for the whole country founded on its needs. That practice was followed during the dark days of the war when Sir Thomas White, then Finance Minister, developed to a certain degree a co-ordinated financial policy for the provinces and the Federal Government. I trust that this suggestion, which I offer in the desire to be of some real help, will be given consideration by my hon. friend the Prime Minister and by the members of the Government.

There are a few omissions from the Speech from the Throne. I find in it no reference to the question of redistribution. Redistribution should be dealt with at this session. I know that from the very nature of things, members of the Government have yet to become fully acquainted with their respective departments and they may desire to pass this matter over to another session. It is unlikely that an election will be held before another session, but in any case I think it would be well before this session closes to pass a measure of redistribution, and I am sure that the Government, when they come to a consideration of the question, will desire to have that redistribution fixed upon lines that are fair and just to all. After all, Western Canada has suffered more in this respect than other portions of the Dominion. I would point out to the House that an election followed the census of 1911, before the census figures were available for redistribution purposes, and the same thing has happened in respect of the last census. On a redistribution Western Canada would increase its representation by ten or twelve. Some of my hon. friends opposite and some of my hon. friends to my right may think that my suggestion is not altogether without self-interest: had we had a redistribution before the last election, why, we would have had ten or twelve more sturdy Progressives from Western Canada on this side of the House.

There is also the question of proportional representation. The last election disclosed more clearly, I think, than anything else could have done the need for this reform in our electoral machinery. What does it mean? It is simply a method for securing a more correct and exact registration of the people's will in their representation in Parliament; that is all proportional representation is. What do we find as a result of the last election? We find the party to my right without any representation from six provinces in this Dominion and yet the election figures show that there were a great many people—all misguided, I think—who supported the candidates of the leader of the Opposition. These people should have some means of expressing their will in this House. The same is true in respect to the Progressives and in respect to the party supporting the Government. The Government would not have a great deal of difficulty in counting their supporters from the Prairie Provinces in this House, and yet the support the Government did receive in the Prairie Provinces does not adequately reflect the vote the Government policies received in those provinces. I am quite aware that had the last election been conducted on the system of proportional representation, there probably would not be as many Progressive supporters in this House as there are to-day. But I am not so much concerned about that as I am with this fact, that this House should be as nearly as possible a correct and exact expression of the will and wishes of the people of Canada. There is another argument in favour of proportional representation. My hon. friend the Prime Minister pointed out yesterday that a good many of the supporters who sit behind my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were elected by minority votes. I think that if my hon. friend the Prime Minister examines the election figures, he will find that quite a considerable number of those who sit on his own side of the House were elected in the same way. I am putting this forward simply as an illustration of the need for this reform, and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to give favourable consideration to enacting a measure of proportional representation. Such a measure should apply in my judgment to the large cities of Canada, all those cities that elect two or more members. I should also like to see the principle of the transferable vote applied to single-member constituencies. With these reforms we shall get as exact a reflection of the will of the people of this country in this Parliament as it is possible to secure, and such a reform

is particularly needed in Canada. This country has serious dangers to face. Any one who knows anything of the history of Canada or has had any experience of government in this country knows that Canada is a difficult country to govern; it is difficult to govern because of the different elements in its population, and because of the vastness of its territory. There is always the danger of sectional differences, of racial differences, and even of religious difficulties arising. These dangers would be minimized if we had an electoral system in this country whereby this Parliament would become an exact reflection of the people's will, and I trust that on that ground the Government will see fit to give favourable consideration to the enactment of this reform.

There were one or two other matters that I was going to touch upon, but they will wait; we shall have a further opportunity in this House of discussing many other matters of importance.

I re-echo fully the hope expressed by my hon. friend the Prime Minister yesterday that this country might become united, contented, and happy. I know of no greater ideal to strive for, but if this country is to become united, contented, and happy, its laws must be founded on justice; there must be fairness in administration to all, with special privilege to none; there must be equality for all. If we shape our course along these lines I am confident of Canada's future. We have a great country, great in its possibilities, great in the virility, energy and capacity of its people, and those of us who are labouring in this Parliament to-day have an opportunity to lay the foundations of our laws and their administration in a manner, that will be worthy of our country and promote its welfare and advancement.

Mr. WILLIS KEITH BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House I first wish to congratulate the constituency of North Winnipeg on electing the capable young man they have sent to this House (Mr. McMurray). I am sure that we all enjoyed his lucid and eloquent speech. Those of us who had any forebodings respecting the seconder of the Address, the hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri (Mr. Mercier), must have been entirely reassured by his speech yesterday. We need have no fears for the future of his political life. His speech, too, was most eloquent.

I also wish to join with those who have congratulated the new lady member of this House, the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). I have been looking up her life and I find that she comes from the land like myself. I was born in the backwoods, and I still live there, and I am happy. It is the people who live in the backwoods who have a chance to develop a sound and discriminating judgment. We can feed our minds on the best of literature. I would warn my hon. friend from Southeast Grey not to be over-anxious to get into the world of fashion and fickleness.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. member who has just preceded me (Mr. Crerar). I take very little exception to anything that he said. He mentioned that the Finance Minister had gone to New York in connection with some financial matters. Now, I have always been opposed to procrastination. I can only say that it might not have been necessary for the Finance Minister to go to New York to raise a loan if the income tax had been collected by the late government from the Riordon Company, the Cockshutt Plow Company, the Canada Steel Company, and a multitude of other concerns who gave notes running close up to a hundred million dollars. I cannot speak exactly as to the figures, but these are plain and everyday facts.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in his political decrepitude bewailed his position. I half expected him to shed tears over the position in which he has been placed, but he soon regained his old ardour, and yesterday he attacked the big men of this House, and their cohorts, although that word does not appear in Hansard. He attacked the Prime Minister; he attacked the ex-Premier of the province of Quebec, probably the most outstanding ex-Provincial Premier in Canada. He also attacked the ex-Provincial Treasurer of the province of Quebec, now the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) in this House. Why, the present Provincial Treasurer of the province of Quebec is about to call in the whole bonded indebtedness of that province. By the wisdom of these hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend (Sir Lomer Gouin) who led the Liberal party in Quebec for so many years and my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) who was such a skilful and successful Provincial Treasurer, that province has attained to its present extremely prosperous and sound financial position. These are the gentlemen, who have won such laurels in the administration of public affairs, at whom the leader of the Oppo-

sition sneered. He has told us that the Liberal party had no policy in the late campaign. What kind of a policy did he have? A most beautiful one. He went up and down the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific shouting for protection. Why did he confine his policy of protection to the tariff when the people of the country were calling for relief from the maladministration that was going on under my right hon. friend? What the country needed was not tariff protection but protection from poverty and despair. The record of the last ten years of administration, when my right hon. friend and his predecessor, Sir Robert Borden, were in power presents a terrible indictment. During the war the country was promised that selective conscription would be carried out but notwithstanding that pledge the Government later on came and took every man of from 19 to 22 years of age off the farm. In Stanstead county during the 1917 campaign the Borden candidate was questioned by the electors as to whether selective conscription would be carried out. He declared that he had the word of Sir Robert Borden to that effect. But what happened? On every farm of forty acres one son was taken, on every eighty acre farm two sons were conscripted, and where there was an acreage of three times forty three sons had to don the uniform. No wonder the indignant farmers of the country stormed the capital by the hundred—it was even said by the thousand—in order to try and bring Sir Robert Borden to time. Was there any need to remind the House of the unsavoury story of the overseas Canadian officer from Ontario who was promised high promotion if he could secure so many thousand soldier votes overseas for the Dominion Government? That officer carried out his task, stole 128,000 votes and was made a Brigadier General and thereupon the nauseating facts were made public.

It is perhaps not quite correct to state that the late Government had no other policy than protection. They had another plank in their platform and that was "Where was Mackenzie King during the war?" I can tell my right hon. friend where that distinguished young Canadian was. The Rockefeller foundation searched the world to obtain the best men to carry out their laudable philanthropic objects, behind which there was a fund of $200,000,000. They made a choice of Hon. Mackenzie King and sent hime to Colorado and elsewhere to settle strikes. The investigations made by Mr. King had brought millions of dollars to Canada for scientific research. The choice of Mr. King by the Rockefeller foundation was probably the greatest compliment that has ever been bestowed upon a young Canadian. But where was Arthur Meighen during the war?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask my hon. friend to refer to the hon. member in the third person.

Mr. BALDWIN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, for the oversight. The right hon. leader of the Opposition received his answer when he appealed to the people. Instead of a following of something like 125 members his supporters now number barely 50. During the election the right hon. gentleman's cohorts went to the province of Quebec telling the people that they would have empty dinner pails if they voted against the Meighen Government. In my own county are two or three of the largest industries in the Dominion. Representatives of these industries went about telling the working men that if they did not vote for the Meighen Government those industries would be closed down. The Dominion Textile Company is one of the industries in question, and although I do not think the management of that company meddles in politics, certain emissaries went up and down making all sorts of predictions as to what would happen unless the working classes voted right. The Union Twist Drill Company is another concern with a capitalization of three million dollars. The day before the election notice was posted up on its premises that the factory would close close down if the employees did not vote for the Meighen Government. In Compton County, the night before the election, seventeen of the local returning officers were dismissed and replaced by men from Montreal and other points and as a result of their nefarious work 1,500 ballots were destroyed. These are some of the means by which support was sought for the Meighen Government. The right hon. leader of the Opposition and the late Minister of Marine, Mr. Ballantyne, toured the Eastern Townships but their efforts were not very successful. The Meighen candidate in Stanstead lost his deposit by more than 700 votes and I want to tell my right hon. friend that had he been the candidate he would have suffered

a similar defeat. Neither the high protection talk nor the scandal that was sought to be disseminated had any influence against the Liberals in the province of Quebec. Although the leader of the Opposition has sneered at the Premier's following from that province I beg to assure him that in admitting the ex-Premier and the ex-Treasurer of Quebec to the Cabinet he has chosen men of eminence who will be of great assistance to the Government and the country. I want to tell the hon. gentleman, the minister sitting at the right of the Prime Minister, that there is one thing firmly established in this country, and that is the great Liberal party. Liberalism means just what it says. It means charity, a willingness to rely on the people and the people's judgment, to obey the will of the country. It does things with an eye to the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. It does business with an eye to the poor and the oppressed. It has a kindly feeling for the poor people. It has an eye to the great agriculturalists of whom the leader of the Agrarians (Mr. Crerar) has spoken. The right hon. leader of the Opposition and his party likened the Agrarians to Bolshevists, and I take umbrage at the accusation. I may say that I have worked fifteen hours a day and thrived on it, and I think any man who endeavours to injure the toiler of the land is making a great mistake. I want to tell the leader of the Opposition that he will never lead the government of Canada again unless he disassociates himself from the autocrats, the plutocrats, the stiff-necked chest-padded militarists of the country, who wish to domineer and dominate everything and to separate themselves from the tillers of the soil. The people trusted the former government too long, and I may tell you that you cannot force people into doing things. The former government, while not characterized as kaiserism, was indeed kaiserism, without any mistake. The leader of the Opposition has come into this House. Having been defeated in his own constituency, he was enabled to come here by a charitable act, a gentleman being persuaded to retire in his favour, and I suppose he gave him a good figure for it. We know that he is getting in his position a good sum of money, and when he comes here he has to assail somebody, but when he assails such men as he did yesterday, he is not winning any votes. He is not intimidating the people who are in the Government now because we are proud of them and the country is proud of them.

I assure him that we have many things to do in this country without fighting each other. We have great potential wealth, and we have a vast country. Let us talk in this House as we would like it to appear in Hansard in future generations. The leader of the Agrarian party was provoked to say in the last days of the last parliament, that the leader of the then government was a vendor of cheap political vaudeville. Likewise the hon. member for Russell and now Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) characterized him as the sluggoo of the Borden government. This young man no doubt has aspirations and I can see that he has reason. Eight or ten years ago, when people came to Ottawa they returned to their homes and said that the whole brains of the government was in Robert Rogers. I think that was humiliating to a young man who was cultured and able and would make a good critic in this House. He was jealous of the superior brain power that had been attributed to Rogers as compared with that of his fellow members of the Conservative party. We know that Mr. Rogers was the champion of Sir Robert Borden when he went overseas, and came back to put through the Conscription Bill. Mr. Rogers said "We must get something to win the election, and conscription may do it". They were out not to win the war, but to win the election, and it cost the country a vast amount of money to put that machinery into force.

I would not want to talk on the lines of the leader of the Opposition. We have a great country; we want the members of this House to deal with affairs in a businesslike way and we do not want the time of this House wasted on other matters. I would not have spoken except for the accusation of being one of the cohorts and I am sure there are other members in the House in the same position. I am proud to be a follower of the leader of the Government. They are kindly hearted gentlemen who can smile and smile for humanity's sake. They feel for the people and their hearts beat for the poor and the oppressed. They feel for the masses of this country. They do not believe in doing things by might but wish to do things by right.

I will not take up more time in this House but I recommend the leader of the Opposition to take the Decalogue and the

Sermon on the Mount as a chart and compass for his future life.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I want to be as brief as I possibly can in addressing the House, and to that end I have taken the liberty of taking a seat in the middle of the House so that I can be heard by hon. gentlemen opposite and by hon. gentlemen on either side of me, because I want to follow the example of the hon. leader of the Progressives in the House (Mr. Crerar), and devote myself to at least one of the most important questions now before the people of Canada. So determined am I to devote my time to the discussion of this question that I must forego the example set by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me, leave it to others to pay the compliments which have been paid to yourself and to hon. gentlemen who have spoken and give my time to the question that I propose to bring before you. I have every appreciation of the honour that has been done to you. I have every appreciation of the speeches of the mover and seconder. I am glad to see the lady member in the House. I shall pass other compliments, and come directly to the railway question to which the leader of Progressives devoted most of his time.

I come here, not for the first time, as one who is an absolute believer in public ownership of public utilities. I have been connected with that movement in regard to municipal and provincial affairs, and in regard to the railways and other public utilities of the country. I come from a city which to-day has the finest example of public ownership of a public utility in the street railway system of Toronto, run by the Transportation Commission appointed by the people to run the people's own road for the benefit of the people. It embodies the essential principle of public ownership, namely, that once the people own a utility, they are free to do with it what they like, whenever they like, even if their action sometimes involves, as it did recently, an increase in fares. Toronto to-day has the finest street car service in America—I say that after careful consideration—and while at present we have a seven-cent fare, the street railway is doing so well and is accumulating such reserves that the fare will soon be five cents and later on four cents, and, I think we may yet come back to the "eight tickets for a quarter."

We have something else to show in Ontario in the nature of a public utility owned by the people, and that is the magnificent hydro-electrical development, best exemplified by its most recent instance, that of the Chippewa hydro-electrical development in connection with the Niagara river. Sir Adam Beck has been attacked; but he has made good; he is delivering the power, and the greatest electrical development in the world to-day is owned by the people of Ontario at this new power plant on the Niagara river. Only the first generator has been started; but another will be started tomorrow and each of them will deliver 55,000 h.p. The development of power may reach as much as 600,000 h.p.; it may reach 1,000,000 h.p., and the income from that may be from five to ten million dollars. This development has not had an opportunity yet to show what can be accomplished; but it has been very severely criticised, and Sir Adam Beck has been held up to the people of Canada, even by the United Farmers' Government of Ontario, as one who has been rather loose in his estimates of the cost of establishing this hydro-electric plant. I just want to ask my friend Mr. Drury, Premier of Ontario—and I have a great deal of respect for him—when he speaks about Sir Adam Beck exceeding his estimates, what about his own treasurer and the financial statement which he has brought down to the Legislative Assembly? I want to ask my friends here from the West—and I have a great deal of sympathy with their ideas, as I will show later on—what about the good roads that have been built in Ontario by the Hon. Mr. Biggs? He was to give us the cheapest and best kind of good roads throughout Ontario and to keep well within his estimates. We thought we were going to get roads for at most $2,000, or $3,000, a mile, some for $10,000 and, perhaps, a few at $20,000 a mile, but some of them have cost nearly $100,000 a mile. When criticism is being made in Ontario in regard to Sir Adam Beck's estimates for the construction of the hydro-electric plant, that criticism, if it is to be fair, must be common to all the public men of Ontario. Therefore, I say here to-day that I am proud of Sir Adam Beck and what he has done in the direction of public ownership. He has given to all the world the greatest example of the production of electrical power for the welfare of the people, the sole idea being service and not profit.

The great difference between public ownership and private ownership is that in public ownership—and this applies to railways which is the main question that

I am going to discuss to-day—the principal object in view on the part of the men administering the public utility, after paying necessary interest, is service and not profits. Heretofore the great object of the executive administering a public utility has been profits for the owners and the stockholders; but the idea in public ownership, as illustrated by Sir Adam Beck, is service at a low cost. Notwithstanding the criticism that has come from Montreal about Sir Adam Beck's proposition and his public power distribution, we have the cheapest and best service of that kind in Canada. There is nothing to equal it. I see by recent legislation that the consolidation of the power interests in Montreal is to furnish 300,000 h.p., but we in Ontario—and mainly by the leadership of the municipalities by Sir Adam Beck—will soon have over 1,000,000 h.p., and we are going to put that electrical energy into the home of every farmer in Ontario. That is what we have in view; we are working it out, and there is fair support coming from the Legislature in that direction.

Therefore, public ownership of public utilities is nothing new to us in Ontario; we are succeeding in it, and we believe in that public ownership being extended to the railway systems of Canada. We do so for several reasons, one being that we have come into possession of all these so-called bankrupt railways, because of bad administration by the companies that had them and also probably because the country was overbuilt with railways. Now that we are in possession of them, we propose to try public ownership of these publicly-owned railways in the interest of the people and outside of the question of dividends for the shareholders who formerly owned them. We came into possession of these railways, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, because they were not very well administered by those who had control of them. Why did the Grand Trunk fail? It failed because, while it was owned largely in Great Britain, it was administered in London. You cannot run a Canadian railway from London; it must be administered in this country. The Grand Trunk would have been a success ten, twenty years ago, if it had been administered absolutely in Canada; but it was run from London and run by directors whose main object, so far as I can gather—and I have followed my investigations rather deeply—was to play the London stock market in Grand Trunk securities. That is one reason why the Grand Trunk has failed. The Grand Trunk, to my mind, is one of the greatest railway assets in America—and I speak after careful consideration—and it is the greatest railway asset in Canada. When you look at the strategic positions that the Grand Trunk has in this country, at Montreal, at Ottawa, along the St. Lawrence, at Toronto, London, Detroit, along the Niagara river and throughout the province of Ontario, and when you consider all the branch lines connected with it, it must be admitted it is the greatest railway asset in America.

It is undoubtedly the best road we have in Canada, and all it requires is good management. With a proper Canadian directorate it would prove a wonderful success, and it is just because it is likely to be a great success that we find the Canadian Pacific, with its headquarters in Montreal, endeavouring to head it off. I think I can see the hand of the Canadian Pacific, and that of its close associate, the Bank of Montreal, joined together in an effort to thwart the Grand Trunk, which is a real rival. What is the source of the inspiration of all this talk that we see in the Montreal papers and in some of the papers in the province of Ontario? This agitation does not come from the people or from the men who work on the roads; nor does it originate with the people who use the railways. No, it comes largely from the city of Montreal, whose newspapers seem to talk of nothing else but the Canadian Pacific railway. I have nothing to say against that railway; it is the one Canadian railway that has been a success. But it has one peculiar clause in its charter, whereby the company is bound to maintain a railway service forever. That obligation has never been imposed on any other road, but it has been imposed on the Canadian Pacific railway for a purpose, and that is, that the public shall always be assured of a service of some kind. The Canadian Pacific Railway is the creature of this Parliament and of the people of Canada. We have created it and given it the charter it holds, involving great powers. We gave it some $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 at the start, in addition to some **25,000,000 acres of land,** and it has had all kinds of friendly legislation put through this House in its behalf. Altogether it has been well treated not only by Parliament but as well, by the municipalities throughout the country.

This railway, on which is imposed the responsibility of providing the people of

Canada with a service for all time, now turns against Parliament, its creator, and against the people of the country, and says: "Don't you dare to start national railways in this country or we will destroy you." That is the attitude of the Canadian Pacific railway and its friends in Montreal. They simply defy the people of Canada who created them, and warn us that we shall embark on public ownership of railways in this country only at our own peril. They tell us that public ownership is bad for the country, and that if we do not abandon the idea we shall suffer. Talking about the Canadian Pacific railway and the question of public ownership, and in connection with the references that have been made to Sir Adam Beck, there is not a radial proposition that Sir Adam Beck has started which has not been denounced by these enemies of his, and yet which would not be taken over to-morrow by President Beatty of the Canadian Pacific railway. That gentleman knows all about them, and he would take over every radial and be glad to go to Sir Adam Beck for his power. And he will soon have to do so, because it will be necessary to have power to run the Canadian Pacific railway, and we shall have enough power in Ontario to operate every railway train from Detroit down to Ottawa. We shall soon have that power to sell outside the country, and I hope that Quebec will have a large share. That aside, however, I want to come back to the subject with which I was dealing a moment ago.

The Canadian Pacific railway, created by the Parliament and the people of Canada, now tells us, in the country and in this House, that we must not embark on public ownership of the railways that we have. If we heed that command, what will ensue? Let me point out to the Prime Minister that if we allow the Canadian Pacific railway to put the Canadian National railway out of business, if we stand by and let Montreal dictate to us in this matter, we shall have created the greatest political tyranny that ever existed in any country, because the Canadian Pacific railway hopes to have every road in Canada, and the Montreal Gazette already informs us that we cannot run the Canadian National railways and therefore urges us to turn them over to the Canadian Pacific. What would happen if the Canadian Pacific railway got the National railway? Could any one of us remain in politics? Would any man have a chance of getting into this House, into any provincial legislature, or into any municipal council, with the Canadian Pacific railway owning all the railroads of the country—the great political boss of the country being in Montreal, with a subordinate boss in every town and village acting as local agent of the Canadian Pacific railway? Why, Sir, political independence would cease in this country if we created such a tyranny. Yet that is the object of this great movement against public ownership of our railways.

5 p.m.

And how is the tyranny entrenched, so far as it has gone? It has been entrenched, so far, by a marvellous device known as the "Voting Trust." I do not know whether hon. gentlemen know what a voting trust is, but I have some idea of what it signifies, and as a splendid example I might mention a well-known mine in Ontario, of which sixty to seventy per cent is controlled by certain relatives. This property has been entailed, so that this mine in the future may never be interfered with, no matter what may befall the families that owned it originally. That, perhaps, is fairly within their rights; but when you entail the administration of a railway that has the political ambitions of the Canadian Pacific railway, with its railway monopoly, and an arrangement whereby only two of their board retire each year, there being a concentration of shareholders on the election of these two, I say you are entrenching a tyranny. The object of these men now established in the control of the Canadian Pacific railway is to retain that control, get possession of the other railways, and thereby become the great and only political boss of transportation in the country, and, incidentally, of the people's legislation as well.

Now, I appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House, whether opposite or on either side of me: are we, the people's representatives in Parliament, to assist the Canadian Pacific railway in acquiring all the railways of the country, simply because they warn us that, if we dare to administer our own roads, which have come into our hands as a result of the failures of those who had charge of them, we shall be put out of business? These railways that we have were forced upon us, and enormous sums of the people's money have been put into them. Is it fair that this creature of the Canadian Parliament should take that position, which I am led to believe they have already taken?

I am not antagonistic to the Canadian Pacific railway. I give them credit for what they have done. The road is a well administered one, with a good executive and good equipment, and they have done a good deal for the settlement of the country. But that is their business; let them devote their attention to it. Now that we are going to run these roads as a national proposition we will ask them to co-operate with us in the work of consolidation which I trust the Government intends to embark upon. I do not wish to antagonize the Canadian Pacific. But in connection with this matter of consolidation, it is to be noted that in the city of Toronto, for instance, all the traffic that comes, say, from Chicago has to go up a one per cent grade; and the same applies to the Canadian Pacific with its Wexford grade. Now that we have public ownership it is possible to build a line across Toronto in connection with the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railways that will reduce that grade of one per cent down to half of one per cent and by that means alone bring about a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. If the Canadian Pacific want the use of our national railways for some consideration that they will give—and I know they will give something towards it—we can give them something to help in the solution of these transportation problems; for if we have public ownership we shall be willing to work with them. We do not wish to put them out of business, but they wish to put the people of Canada out of business so far as the competition of the national railways is concerned.

I think the Canadian Pacific will be well advised, and the Bank of Montreal will be well advised if they devote their attention to working out the destinies of the Canadian Pacific railway as an entity in this country, competing with the national railways, setting a pace for the national railways, if you like. They are welcome to do that, but they are not to be allowed to achieve their ambition of taking over the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National and the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial. They would take these roads all into their maw, but on what terms? Will the Montreal Gazette tell us on what terms? Will any gentleman in the Government who has given some attention to the claims of the Canadian Pacific tell us on what terms? Do you think they would take them over for nothing? No; they would want also a sum at least equivalent to the deficits that these roads are now sustaining. They may say: Give us what you gave to the losing concerns and perhaps we will run these roads for you. It is true that they may now modify their offer; they want to get these roads because they think they are good business propositions. But we should keep them for ourselves and operate them for the solution of Canada's transportation problems.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): May I put a question to the hon. member? Would he be good enough to tell us whether he thinks the Canadian National railways have been well operated during the last two or three years?

Mr. MACLEAN: They have not had a chance; that is the whole question.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will my hon. friend permit me a further question?

Mr. MACLEAN: Certainly.

Mr. MACDONALD: I asked my hon. friend the simple question whether he thinks the Canadian National railways are well operated to-day. He says they have not had a chance. That is not an answer.

Mr. MACLEAN: Well, they have been fairly well operated. But they have got to have a chance; the Prime Minister himself has asked for a chance to see what he can do. I am going to judge these railways and I am going to judge—

Mr. MACDONALD: You are dodging the question.

Mr. MACLEAN: No, I am not dodging the question, but my hon. friend is trying to dodge it in the interests of his friends in Montreal.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have no friends in Montreal. I want to tell my hon. friend that my friends are in Nova Scotia—those who sent me here.

Mr. MACLEAN: Well, the hon. gentleman seems to have the right to speak, and he is trying to—

Mr. MACDONALD: You are not answering the question: you are evading it.

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman has the floor, and he can speak for Nova Scotia. I am speaking, not for Nova Scotia, but for the people of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN: Now then, I am going to ask the Prime Minister and I am going to ask the leader of the Progressive party in this House what they mean by co-ordination. It is a very nice word; but what the leader of the Progressive party was talking about—I notice that he is not in the Chamber at the moment—was consolidation, and that is my word. Co-ordination as affecting railway lines is putting half a dozen companies together, retaining all their separate presidents and officials and separate equipment, and keeping them bucking one against the other. I do not think the leader of the Progressive party means that; in fact a little later in his remarks he said it was consolidation into one system that he was thinking of. When the Prime Minister uses the word co-ordination, does he mean that there will be real consolidation and actual elimination of unnecessary duplications? As we have the national railways now there are several presidents, all kinds of operating chiefs, all kinds of stations everywhere, and there are a whole lot of unnecessary lines. If you want to solve the transportation problem there must be consolidation and it has got to start now. The Prime Minister intimates that as he has just come into office he wants investigation. Well, he has a first-class railway department; he has expert railway men in the service of these different companies who can give him to-morrow any advice he may require with regard to the consolidation that ought to take place. In fact, legislation has already been passed for the consolidation of these roads and can be made effective to-morrow. So that it is real consolidation I wish to see, not co-ordination in the ordinary sense of the word—and I am glad that the leader of the Progressive party does not so construe it.

Public ownership is regarded by its opponents in this country as something very bad, as something which has failed. But the real fact is—and it has been demonstrated by experience throughout the whole of this continent—that company-owned and corporation-owned railways have failed, and that is what I wish to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly those who are members of the Government. They cannot give a single instance where corporation ownership of railroads has succeeded in the United States. That it has failed all along the line I shall prove in a few minutes by the statements of the chief enemies of public ownership of the American roads,—because they have been very busy of late. Because of the failure of company-owned railways in the United States the roads were taken over by the Federal authorities for war purposes and were given billions of national money in order that they might be put on their feet for the service of the nation. They took that money and lost it, and now they are preparing a most awful bill of charges for submission to Congress, said to be based upon losses sustained by the roads while under Government administration during the war. So that corporation-owned railways in the United States, which have been referred to by some hon. gentlemen in their arguments against public ownership, have fallen down worse than have the corporation-owned roads in Canada. They have as I shall show, more unnecessary duplication in connection with the American roads than we have in Canada.

To show how badly they have fallen down, I am going to quote briefly one or two things that come from the railways themselves. The American roads have seen for many years what was coming, and they have prepared themselves. They are thoroughly organized; they have got possession of very influential papers in the United States. The most outstanding defender of corporation-owned roads on this continent to-day is the Saturday Evening Post, published in Philadelphia. It is a paper that appeals to all classes of the public, although it is specially devoted now to an appeal to the women and to social ideas. It has a great run of advertising and mixed up with its articles on the railway situation are pictures of handsome young women in short skirts and silk stockings. There are many hosiery advertisements in the paper, but the main purpose of the Saturday Evening Post—and I say it on my full responsibility—a paper that has more influence on public opinion, or thinks it has, probably than any other paper in the United States, is to save the corporation-owned railroads of the United States from the doom that is coming to them. The corporation roads over there have failed. How do I know they have failed? The Saturday Evening Post has assigned to a very competent writer, Mr. Herbert Quick, the writing of a series of articles on "America, An Experiment in Transportation." The first article has a great deal in it, but I am going to read only two or three extracts

from it. Mr. Herbert Quick, the best man they have been able to put forward in defence of the corporation-owned roads, admits that the roads have been a failure, and he says they cannot be put on their feet unless two things are done—the hundreds of comparatively small railroads they have in the United States must be consolidated into twelve systems, at the most, for purposes of economy, and it will require, so he says, at least four billions of the money of the people of the United States to be placed immediately at the disposal of these companies that have failed over there. That is rather an astounding thing to come in a discussion of this kind when we are warned as a people to beware of state-owned roads. It shows what a mess the corporation-owned roads in the United States have made of themselves.

Mr. CHURCH: Why did it take so long to co-ordinate the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific with the National Railways? The Drayton-Acworth Report recommended that nearly four years ago.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I could co-ordinate them to-morrow successfully. There are lots of railway men in this country who could do it. The question is how slow the process is to be, whether there is to be acceleration or whether there is to be great delay, and while you are delaying you are giving the Canadian Pacific Railway a chance to lay all its plans for the bedevilment of the thing when it comes on. That is why they want co-ordination instead of consolidation.

Let me read what Mr. Herbert Quick says as to this great corporation-owned systems in the United States that are being held up to the Canadian people as an example for us to follow:

> We as a nation have wagered our very existence on it—

That is, on the success of the railways over there.

> We bet our life on the fact that an agency—

That is, the railways.

> —an agency, not one-tenth as economical as the water transport, which the human race for thousands of years had depended upon as the basis of every complex communal life....could bear the burden of all the tonnage that the multiplying population could create in the heart of a continent in a new era when human wants would grow by what they fed on.

And his finding is that the railways have failed, after having dispossessed the country of the water transportation facilities they had, that they are in an awful mess financially, that the service is bad, and that the rates are high. The whole case of the farmers of the Western United States is the same as the farmers of our West—the exorbitant railway rates of these corporation-owned roads that have failed. Mr. Quick goes on to say:

> We bet our national life on that, and we built our nation in the confident expectation that we should win.

That is by the railways.

> It was the nerviest gamble of all history. It will take a long time to tell whether or not we have won it. He who is sure that we have won is over-optimistic.

That is the opinion of the best spokesman and the most expensive spokesman they have from the newspaper point of view. He says that he is over-optimistic who thinks that the transportation system of the United States has succeeded. The United States has become a great country; they have roads from the Atlantic across the plains to the Pacific, but as this writer points out, they have destroyed inland water transport; they have put several canals out of business and after having done all that, this writer says that he is an over-optimistic man who says that the corporation-owned railways of the United States are solving the transportation problems of that country. There are dozens of other arguments in this article in the Saturday Evening Post of February 25, and in the succeeding article in the issue of March 4, in which this writer admits the whole thing. I ask hon. gentlemen who do not wish to take my word for it to read for themselves these articles by this special writer in this specially friendly newspaper to the corporation-owned railways of the United States, in which it is shown that the corporation-owned roads over there have failed to solve the transportation problems of that country.

Now I want to get away from the weeklies of the United States and to read what is said in a prominent monthly in that country, the Century Magazine. It has had a series of articles on the railway question in the United States, and in its issue for March asks the question: What is the matter with the railroads? That is a problem that has presented itself to this leading magazine. The article from which I am about to quote appears in this month's issue and can be found in the library by any hon. member who wishes to read it. Here is how the writer concludes his article:

The sole alternatives to private ownership and operation are Government ownership and operation. To the majority of Americans the very idea of a further governmental control is extremely distasteful, to put the matter mildly. To them it is a very real menace. Yet the menace cannot be avoided by merely singing a song of hate about it. It can be overcome and finally prevented only by some definite national plan or policy in regard to our roads, a simple thing in which for a number of years we have been sadly lacking. If such a plan means their radical re-organization, we must begin, and the sooner the better.

The railroads have to be reorganized in the United States in the opinion of this writer in the "Century Magazine" and, he says, the sooner they begin the better. Are we encouraged then to continue that system here in Canada, or are we not justified in trying to recover our position and to see what the State can do rather than what the private corporations can do in the way of public transportation? Just to show how serious the situation is and how much the transportation problem is involved in it, let me say that the same magazine has another article by Alleyne Ireland entitled " Democracy and the Human Equation." His article is devoted to the subject: Can we save constitutional government? Let me read a few words from what he says as to what is the case in the United States and is also probably the case in Canada:

Constitutional government is to-day menaced by a serious and world-wide dissatisfaction with the operation of existing political institutions. We are confronted not only by the various forms of protest, adopted by those who wish to destroy existing institutions of Government, but also by a growing sense of helplessness and exasperation among those who wish to preserve them. There is scarcely a country in the world in which public discontent with the inefficiency and with the extravagance of government has not reached the danger point.

The plain fact is that for more than a hundred years the constitutionalists in every country have been issuing and constantly renewing promissory notes for human betterment, and that the further renewal of these notes is becoming increasingly difficult.

Then the writer goes on to point out what a marvellous change has been effected in the general conditions of human life, and how all that was promised in these respects has been delivered. In the case of transportation no relief has been delivered, and the Constitutionalists do not know where to go, and that is one of the questions that concerns this writer. He asserts that the railway question is coming up in United States and it has to be settled. According to Mr. Herbert Quick four billions more of public money, a reduction of the systems to twelve and electrification are required. Mr. Quick is out for electrification, but he wants that electrification to be done by private interests.

Now I might rest my case there, as to the failure of corporation-owned railways in the United States, on the authority of the witnesses I have cited, but you can bring hundreds more of them together to bear out what I say in regard to corporation-owned railways—that they have failed in the United States and cannot be redeemed except by the expenditure of billions of public money. But the corporations over there do not like public ownership. They want the railroads to be given to them and compensation for their administration: "Give us more money and let us run them. We will see you are charged enough freight rates, but let us run them." Now that situation has come to the United States, and I think it has come to the people in Canada. We have the roads now. Shall we try public ownership and shall we give it a fair trial? Shall that trial, in the first instance be "a consolidation" and not this more doubtful proceeding—"a co-ordination of companies." Is that what is meant by co-ordination or does it mean consolidation? I only wish the leader of the Progressive party were here now to tell me. I did not wish to interrupt him when he was speaking but if he were here he could give us a definition of a term he was constantly using, the term "co-ordination." The really important word is "consolidation" as provided by the existing statutes of Canada and I hope developments will be in that direction.

Now I want to go another step in discussing whether corporation-owned railways in the United States have failed, and I would like to cite another witness. President Harding made a deliverance in the United States in regard to transportation in that country. If you ask me what his deliverance was, it was that we must get back to the water-ways. The railroads had not paid and they had overcharged the farmers. He had been waited on by a most important political delegation, the so-called farmers' bloc in Washington, and the President of the United States had to admit that the corporation-owned railroads had failed. They have destroyed water transportation and the improvement of the transportation problem is to get back to the rivers, back to water transportation, better still back to the introduction of sea-going vessels to the great lakes of Canada and of the United States. This involves mak-

ing seaports on our lakes. Make Toronto a seaport as well as Montreal. Perhaps the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) will not like that, but President Harding says: Have seaports in Lake Ontario; have them at Toronto and at Buffalo. Have them in Lake Erie at Cleveland and at Port Stanley, and our other harbours on the north shore. Have them in Lake Huron. Have them in Lake Michigan, and make Chicago and Milwaukee seaports. It will not cost a great deal of money for we have had the finding of the International Joint Commission on it. President Harding advocates that we make ocean ports in Lake Superior so that the grain of the western States as well as the grain of the Canadian West may be loaded into seagoing vessels on those lakes. Resort to canalization if necessary, and at the same time develop water-power to take the place of coal which is owned by the greatest monopoly in America. Let the water-power be developed for the betterment of railway transportation. Now that is a pretty good witness to call against corporation-owned railways. I am citing now a recent delivery of the President of the United States, to the effect that he is in favour of developing this water power and using it for the electrification of the railways.

But there has turned up in Washington within the last two or three years a new political force, and it is turning up here in Canada now. There are 65 gentlemen in the Parliament of Canada to speak for the farmers of the Canadian West. I am glad to see them, and I hope they will speak out as their leader did to-day. I have nothing against the farmers. They have the cause of Canada in regard to transportation at heart. But what about your fellows in the United States? Do you know that the farmers in the United States, this so-called bloc, control thirty-five of the senators in that country, and any day they are asked to stand up for the farmers' interest they do so. This so-called farmers' bloc in the United States know that the great corporation-owned railways of the United States have failed. They have asked the President for relief, and they are now putting themselves on record as believing that the only relief they can give to the farmers of the United States must come through public ownership, waterways and the generation of electrical energy, to take the place of the coal monopoly in the United States.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Let me give an outstanding illustration of what transportation by sea-going vessels means compared to railways, and a wonderful illustration has come out recently in the United States. They spent millions of dollars in the development of the fisheries of Alaska, and the herring fisheries in Alaska are the equal of any in the world, but do you know what it cost to take a barrel of herring from Alaska to New York by rail? It cost $5 a barrel to take it to New York for distribution to the farmers of the United States in the eastern section where there is a large consumption of fish. A man went into a store to buy some of these fish, and inquired, "How much are they worth a barrel?" the merchant answered "So much, plus $5 for transportation." The gentleman went into another fish store, and asked the price of a barrel of herring, and was quoted a much lower figure. He said, "How can you get them so much cheaper than another dealer?" He says, "We can get all herring caught in the fisheries of Scotland delivered into New York at 50 cents a barrel." That is 50 cents a barrel as against $5 a barrel for fish sent from Alaska. Has not the President of the United States some reason for finding that corporation-owned railways have failed? Have not the farmers of the United States some reason for coming back to the waterways and government control of railways, rather than that corporation control should continue?

Now the farmers of the United States are demanding relief and our farmers here are demanding relief. I believe that the whole of the farmers, not only of Western Canada, but the farmers of Ontario, are demanding relief. We have our transportation problem. We have high traffic charges and have to meet them. If there can be an improvement by improved canalization, by generation of electrical energy in connection with the canalization and the river powers we have, why not take them over? But the province of Quebec says "Oh, you in Ontario, must not generate public power, and you must not be a party to co-operating with the United States in generating public power. You must cease doing that." But we say we do intend to generate that power as the United States are doing, and we intend to use it for the electrification of railways.

Let me speak about the electrification of railways. We have spent, I do not know how much, in the way of bringing American coal into this country to run our rail-

ways. Why not run our railways by the electrical service supplied by water-power on our Canadian rivers? In Ontario we have more than we need. The Niagara and St. Lawrence will move every train from Detroit to away below Quebec. Right here to the south of us, on the Ontario side we have the St. Lawrence river at Cornwall, with a possibility of development there near Cornwall island. About 6 or 8 or 12 years ago a very rich and influential American company called the Aluminum Company came to us in the Railway Committee, and asked us to give them a charter to take over that great water-power on the St. Lawrence near Cornwall. They pretty nearly had it, but we made opposition to it and we have it now. There is enough power in the St. Lawrence in front of us here, in the Niagara river and in the Ottawa river to run every train in Canada from the Atlantic clean up to Port Arthur, and there are wonderful powers west of Port Arthur on the Saskatchewan that can be developed. We have had fine engineers in this country who have advocated the canalization of our country from lake Superior to the foot of the Rocky mountains, and that may be one of your great reliefs in the West. You will get abundance of water-power there to move your traffic. And why do they fear—why does the Canadian Pacific Railway fear—the electrification of railways? A new instrument is put in the hands of the people, when they control the water-power and the electrical energy, and I believe that is what President Harding has in view. That is what we have in view in this country—that if the country controls the water-power that runs the railway, and if a corporation road has to buy it—and I hope the Canadian Pacific Railway will be one of those—we will be able to put the blocks to them, to use a rough term, and we will be able to make them treat the public fairly. Who owns the coal of the United States that we have had to pay such a high price for? It is owned by the railways. They control the coal supply of the United States largely, and they want to control our water-powers. This Aluminum Company, one of the greatest metal trusts in the world, was in Ottawa a few years ago, and tried to grab the water-powers on the St. Lawrence, and the Prime Minister of Quebec says "Oh, I have a great dread of the Americans coming into our country and getting hold of our water-powers. I do not want to see them get them." But I know that if the President and men like the President get some of that electrical energy generated by that water-power, it will be used fairly. I am not afraid of what he will do with these powers. He will use them fairly. But the province of Quebec says "No, we do not want the President of the United States to invade this country. We do not believe in public ownership." Still they have taken over the liquor business, and are going to pay $10,000,000 of their debt by the profits from it. Perhaps they had better try to develop the water-powers of Quebec. That province is rich in water-powers, and they have been developed to some extent there. They have established factories; they have not done much with their electrical power for the farmers, but they have done well, they have an immense store of electrical energy in Quebec, and they can use that for the control of these railway rates. With electrical energy developed from the rivers of Quebec, every railroad running from the Ottawa river down to the Maritime Provinces can be run and, perhaps, at a lower cost than with coal produced in the Maritime Provinces. If you are looking for the cheapest possible transportation and you can get it by water-power, why not have it?

It is rather an unusal thing, after hearing all that we have heard about transportation in the United States, to have someone tell this House that corporation-owned railways in the United States have failed; but they failed and corporation-owned railways in Canada have failed likewise. The railways in the United States are not publicly-owned, whereas, our national railways are, and we are going to keep them. We are going to try them out to see what relief they will give to the people of this country, and we are going to keep Sir Adam Beck where he is generating hydro-electrical power in Ontario for the benefit of the people.

I regret that the organized farmers of Ontario have started out to crucify Sir Adam Beck because he is generating tremendous quantities of electrical power in that province for the service of the people. I do not say that hon. gentlemen here take that view of the matter; but that is largely the direction in which the discussion is going in Ontario to-day, where there is a man who has surpassed the President of the United States in generating an immense quantity of water-power for purposes of transportation. I hope

hon. gentlemen from the West, and especially the new western members—we have all free transportation on the railways—will some Saturday or even some Sunday visit Niagara Falls and see the Chippewa electrical development plant that Sir Adam Beck has built on the Niagara river right at the falls. They will see the greatest triumph of Canadian engineering, surpassing anything ever before achieved by any engineers in the world in the way of electrical development. The generators were made in Toronto and the work was done largely by Canadian workmen. We have that electrical development in the province of Ontario, and at the very time of its arriving and its going to make good, there is a sudden and suspicious movement developing in this country, a movement directed mainly by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, threatening us and threatening the people of Canada. If you go into the ownership of railroads for your relief, have a care; we will see after you! That is the menace in this country. Not only has there been failure in the United States and failure in Canada, and great loss of money in railroads, but we are being told in the most defiant way that we must not indulge in public ownership. Hands off! Leave it to us! We will save it! I do not think they will.

I want to take up the question of what we can do to solve the transportation problem that faces us; and if you, Mr. Speaker, will call it six o'clock, and the House will give me half an hour after recess, I will go into that matter then.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN (York) (resuming): Before the House rose at six o'clock I was about to deal with a question that has come up in this House and in the press in connection with transportation, namely, the farmers' grievance respecting marketing. This matter was referred to by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) this afternoon, and I desire to make it clear, if possible, or at least to throw some light on the question. Now, the farmers of Canada as well as the farmers of the United States have a substantial grievance in connection with transportation. They complain, among other things, that when they have pretty well got rid of their grain the price advances, and they want to sell at the higher rather than at the lower price. Some of the farmers here have been led to believe that the railway charges were the main cause of this loss to them. The farmer will certainly get relief from transportation charges, but he will get that relief in the way suggested by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and that is by adopting the plan that is followed in the United States. There is a very appropriate expression current in the United States in regard to marketing, and that is the phrase "orderly marketing." Now what does that mean? It means, largely, just what we had in this country in connection with the Wheat Board, which was undoubtedly successful in its operation during the war. That board kept prices pretty well up, and all the grain was sold and the money pooled, and when the season was over the proceeds were fairly divided; and flour and milling companies who had filled their elevators when the market was low were not able to take advantage of the condition of the market, nor were the speculators in a position to do so. Some system like that, and in accordance with the plan now in effect in the way of orderly marketing in the United States, should be followed here. That orderly marketing will have to be backed in Canada, as it has been backed in the United States, by the credit of the Government. We require two things; better railway management, or, in other words, national ownership of railways; and government credit behind some system of orderly marketing of grain and live stock products.

I shall now deal with the question which I was considering before dinner, as to what the Government ought to do at the present time. They have told us that they intend to co-ordinate the railways. Now, what do they mean by co-ordination? Do they mean consolidation, and all that that signifies, as mentioned by the leader of the Progressive party? Or does co-ordination, as the Government uses the word, mean that the Canadian National system, comprising the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Transcontinental, and other roads, is to be operated as five different systems, with five presidents, five executives, and, as in some places, like Vancouver, for instance, with two sets of stations, entailing a large expense? How does my hon. friend from Marquette construe the word "co-ordination" in this connec-

tion? When he used the word, did he mean the separate management I have just suggested, or did he mean amalgamation, with the economies resultant therefrom? This would go a long way in the direction of reducing traffic charges, which is exactly what the people want. Is that what he means?

Mr. CRERAR: Certainly, that is what I mean.

Mr MACLEAN (York): If that is also the Prime Minister's meaning I will accept it. I do not ask him to say whether or not he means that, but that is the issue before the people of Canada to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) gives his statement to the House he will make quite clear what is meant in this respect. In the meantime, if it will help to clear my hon. friend's mind, I may say that it is the intention of the Government to have one board of directors that will manage the entire system in a manner that will effect economies and further efficiency very much in accord with what he has in view.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I hope my hon. friend means just what he says. If not, there will be an opportunity later on to move an amendment—we have lots of opportunities to submit amendments; I have been under the impression that we were limited to one amendment in this debate, but that is not so, it is on going into Supply that we are limited to one amendment. Now, notwithstanding what any of us may say as regards the interpretation of the word "co-ordination," we have the statutes of Canada to which we may turn. Here is Chapter 13 of 1919, the Act Incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company. That Act was passed mainly on the strength of our taking over the Canadian Northern and in view of the fact that we had the Intercolonial and other Government roads, and in sections 11 and 12 it clearly sets out what the Government can do. So that it does not require any considerable inquiry to find out what ought to be done in this respect; the man who assumes the responsibility of carrying on the government of this country must be ready to act, even though he cannot obtain counsel outside. It is all very well to make inquiries, and probably the leader of the House is within his rights in making full investigation; and the last Government was quoted in that respect this afternoon in connection with the tariff; but the best way to deal with a question is to deal with it. The Greeks had a very good proverb: to the effect that to play upon the lyre or the harp you must play upon it. So, to deal with this railway question you do not have to make an inquiry so much as you have to consolidate the railways. You might make inquiries that would last until doomsday and not get anywhere. The Prime Minister has taken a responsible position in this country, just as my hon. friend from Marquette has assumed the responsibility of leading a party in this House; and I want to tell that hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) without being at all offensive, what I think of his position. He is the leader of a party in this House, the leader of an opposition, and apparently he has contracted himself, in a way, out of the liability of the recognized leader of the Opposition. Here is a new precedent: Parliament has for the first time recognized by statute the position of leader of the Opposition. Heretofore the leader of the Opposition had a recognized status both in British and in Canadian politics, a status defined not by legislation but by convention. At any rate, I do not like the idea of anybody in this House escaping a responsibility, especially if he is a leader of an opposition. The responsibility is on him just as it is on the Prime Minister to find out what ought to be done with regard to such questions as the consolidation of the railways of this country. I have defined my position, and I hope to get a clear statement from the Minister of Railways, when we hear from him, as to what is proposed to be done. We want more light on this thing. I sincerely hope that before this debate concludes there will be a response to our insistence upon knowing what is meant by this promise of co-ordination and what the Government intends to do with regard to the statute passed by Parliament two years ago providing for these very things. The duty of the Government is not to get behind some inquiry which they may propose to make; it is to carry out this statute or amend it so that this necessary consolidation may be effected.

Now, I am going to pass from that to a summary of what I think the Government ought to do. First, of course, they ought to consolidate the railways. The next thing they ought to do—it has never been done in this country, but if it is not done we shall find ourselves where the President of the United States has landed and where the farmers of the United States have landed—is to make the railway services

complementary of the water services of the country so that the two will work together. In the United States they have practically murdered water competition; they have bought up all the steamboat lines and all the wharves; they have put the steamship lines out of business. One paper, from which I read this afternoon and which apologizes for the conditions with respect to railways, expresses regret that the boats have gone out of business. At great cost we have built up a system of government ships; the services carried on by these must be made complementary of our railway services and of our other waterway systems. We may have to establish seaports on the lakes as far up as Port Arthur, if necessary, in order to bring about a solution of this transportation problem. Some years ago, after a good deal of agitation in which I myself took some little part, the railways were compelled to reduce their freight rates, but their friends the steamship companies had effected a combine and no sooner were the railways forced to reduce their rates than the steamship lines put on a corresponding increase. To effect consolidation you must make the canals, the railway, the inland water services, and the ocean-going steamship services, complementary one of the other. If you are canalizing the rivers and improving the lakes you must let the steamships get up into lake Superior. Electrification of the railways is absolutely necessary, and must be controlled and maintained by the people as a public service. The proposal is to spend hundreds of millions upon this international waterway scheme; let us, therefore, keep it in the people's hands. We want to back up Sir Adam Beck in what he is doing in Ontario in the development of water-powers.

I want to tell my hon. friend the Prime Minister what I think his Minister of Railways ought to do, right away, toward consolidation. A reference to the time table of the Canadian National Railways will show that the different lines are all mapped therein—Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk Pacific, Transcontinental, Intercolonial and other roads. If you look at the map you will see where the Canadian Northern runs northwesterly from lower Ontario to lake Nipigon. At Long lake, which is thirty miles from the Transcontinental, the line dips down in a southwesterly direction and proceeds to Port Arthur and Fort William. Now, if the Minister really wants to effect this consolidation, this amalgamation, let him come down to the House and tell hon. gentlemen from the West that nobody is going to stop him from building this projected thirty miles and shortening the distance by one hundred miles between Manitoba and points east. Do you know that the Act to which I have referred enables the Minister of Railways of his own motion to have this thirty miles built and to improve the grades? The great feature of the Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern is the improvement effected in the grades; they are away ahead of the old Grand Trunk and of the Canadian Pacific.

I wish just here to make some further reference to a point I mentioned this afternoon with regard to grades. Toronto is a great railway centre. A large part of the traffic of the Grand Trunk originates in Chicago and must pass through Toronto, and it all has to go over a one per cent grade from Scarborough. The same applies to the Canadian Pacific. The Minister of Railways has engineers available who have made surveys; their draughtsmen have plans for the changing of that one per cent grade in Toronto, of the Canadian Pacific as well as of the Grand Trunk, to a half per cent grade. I was speaking the other day to Mr. McGuigan, who is an authority on Grand Trunk affairs, and he said: If we had that reduction of grade, as I told the late Mr. Hays, we would do with one engine and two men what now requires eight engines and sixteen men. Now that can be effected in the city of Toronto. And if the Minister of Railways cannot get the information in his department, and cares to ask me, I think I can show him how effective that one thing would be in helping to solve the transportation difficulties of this country. My proposal would be a temporary one, just for the time being, but it could be put in operation within eight weeks. There are four miles of a double track in a level country, but there is a long wooden trestle to be built, at no great cost, and if this were built it would effect a saving that would mean hundreds of thousands of dollars in the reduction of freight rates on traffic that goes through Toronto alone. There are cases like that all over the country. As the Century Magazine said, you have two stations in Vancouver, and another one for an American road, when half a station would be enough for all the railroad business of that territory. Think of it!—three railway stations and three equipments to do the railway business of

Vancouver. This American magazine, after speaking of this Vancouver duplication, says, "Do not think we have not got any duplication in the United States," and then it goes on to speak of duplication in the city of Spokane and all over the United States. We have duplication all over this country that makes you sick when you see it; we have station after station duplicated, at great expense, and line after line that could be cut out or a substitute put in that would give better service for half the money. Economies can be effected all over. Are these economies to be effected by hon. gentlemen opposite? —and I ask that with all respect. They have been the apostles of economy in this country. Let me tell them a story about an election speech down in Glengarry. There was a candidate there, Mr. Rory McLennan—I remember when he sat in this House. A lawyer got up to make a speech for Rory. He said, "We have a fine candidate in Mr. Rory McLennan. We all think a lot of him. There is not one of us would not take off his coat and fight for him." A Highland Scotchman in the audience, hearing that, ran down the aisle and taking off his coat shouted, "Here, Mister, now's your chance." I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, "Now's your chance." If you want to effect economies you can build this cut-off of thirty miles at Long lake, and the little cut-off I have spoken of at Toronto, as a start. I hope we shall hear from the Minister of Railways about these matters when he rises to speak, but in the meantime I say, now is the time to consolidate the railways. And not the railways only, for remember we have gone a long way further than that in the matter of public ownership. We have now not only the national railways, but we have a system of national telegraphs, for which we have paid dearly, but it is a fine system nevertheless; we have also got a national money order system, a national express system, and a national postal system. All these services can be co-ordinated and great improvements made in them right away. Get all these services together, and then go to the people of Canada and say: Boys, we have a national telegraph company; let us see that our people use it; we have a national money order system, and a national system of express, let us see that our people use that. That is what the people want to hear when this railway question is up. That is what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the gentlemen behind him must insist on if they want relief in the matter of freight charges.

There is another thing, and now I wish to appeal especially to the West. Now that you have got national railways, national telegraphs, national express, and a national money order business, and you have them all now in every station in the West as we have in the East, consolidate them in one building and make them the centre of the community. If you want to work out your own salvation, build, at your own expense if you have to, a little community centre large enough for the village or town or city and use that for the service of the public. Put these services in there. Perhaps you could also put a drug service in there too.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I do not mean the kind hon. gentlemen have in mind. The war is over and regeneration must take place in this country the same as everywhere else, and you can begin regeneration with a local centre, and the way to do it is to get all these services together in one building. You can do a lot of things like that in the West. Just put up one little building as the community centre, and invite the Government to put the national express, the national telegraph, the national money order and railway business there, and let the postmaster go after the freight and see that the national railways get it, as well as their share of the telegraph and express business.

There is something else that can be done. You can back up the good roads, and make the good roads in your respective provinces complementary of the national system of transportation. What has thrown the American railroads into consternation more than anything else is the competition of the good roads and the motor truck. The railways of the United States are deploring the fact that the competition of the good roads and the motor truck has almost put them out of business. The motor truck travelling over the good roads has this marvellous advantage over the railways, that for short distances it is a handling of freight and passengers from door to door, with no intervening cartage agent, or street car journey, or anything of that kind. The motor truck goes from door to door and is playing the very dickens with the American system of railways. They do not know how to meet this competition, and they may have to go into a receivership for

that reason alone. We must consolidate our railway service with all these other services if we want to get improved transportation, and I hope that we are going to get something of that kind now, but the beginning of it must be action on the part of the Government and our demand in this House for that action.

I have practically closed the argument that I have endeavoured to present to the House this afternoon, namely, that the fundamental problem in the regeneration of our country to-day, after the great war, is the improvement of our transportation to bring relief to our people who are so anxiously seeking it in that direction. And there is a way to do it, now that we own five of the railways, now that we own steamships, and now that we own telegraph and express services. But we have to go after the business; we have got to canvass for business just the same as the privately owned railways do. And that is what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company fears will happen. As I said I have no grievance against the Canadian Pacific railway except this—that it will not solve the transportation problem for us. As a private corporation it cannot do that; and we are not going to allow them to try, notwithstanding the advice of the Montreal Gazette. Within the past week the Montreal Gazette has told the Government to get rid of these national railways—put them on the scrap heap or give them away. Is that the view of the people of Canada or of the members of this House? I do not think so. We are going to try and work out some improvement, and we expect that improvement to come from the new Government following up legislation already on the statute books. We will expect it most of all from the new Minister of Railways; and we will be only too glad to welcome the fact that the Government, now that the opportunity has come to it, is going to consolidate all these railroads and steamships that we now possess in order to secure lower traffic charges in Canada.

Just one word more. Much was said in the speeches of yesterday—and they were good speeches—but I think the leader of the Progressives, in the effort he made this afternoon, endeavoured to bring the situation right home to the people and to the members of the House. It is a fine thing to make an exhibition of swordsmanship such as we had yesterday between the two leaders, a fine thing to make the respective groups of followers cheer, but that is not dealing with public questions. We want these questions taken up and dealt with from the transportation point of view. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) endeavoured to do that this afternoon, and in my humble way I have followed in the same direction, and I am going to try and do a little more later on. As I have already stated, during my election campaign the electors indicated their preference for a discussion of the transportation question and the subject of the consolidation of our railroads. We have these railroads now and it is our duty to make a success of them as far as we can. I want to tell the leader of the Government that there is a newspaper in Toronto called the Globe and it is taking up these questions, while Montreal papers such as the Gazette and the Star are talking in an altogether different way. The people all over Ontario are thinking in terms of public ownership, but a large number of the newspapers of this country are passing away from public ownership, and are supporting corporation ownership of our railways. Such a policy as that will not succeed.

Before resuming my seat I must apologise to hon. members for the time I have occupied, but I have spoken at length in order to ventilate what I deem to be a more important view of the transportation questions of Canada than has hitherto been expressed.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I fully appreciate the privilege accorded to me of having the opportunity to address the House at this particular time. I highly appreciate the dignity and importance of this, the Parliament of Canada, and I only hope that I may be able, in my small way, to maintain its past traditions and that I may be found worthy of the place which I occupy in this Chamber.

In commencing I desire to compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the commanding position of First Commoner. Your high character and great attainments as a public man are not unknown even in the remotest parts of this great Dominion of ours, and I am sure that you will brilliantly adorn the high position to which you have been promoted. I listened with a great deal of attention yesterday to the excellent speeches of the Mover and Seconder of the Address. I must compliment Mr. McMurray, who belongs to the same province as myself, upon the ability which characterized his speech, and I am sure that he fully maintained the reputation

which he enjoys in the west as a public speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FORKE: I am sorry to have transgressed the rules. I should have alluded to my hon. friend as the hon. member for North Winnipeg. Perhaps it would be only right for me to say that I am a new member and therefore unfamiliar with the procedure of this House. For that reason I would ask the indulgence of hon. members, and I can assure them that I will endeavour as quickly as I can to conform to Parliamentary methods and usages.

I was sorry that I was unable to follow the speech of the hon. member who seconded the Address. I have, however, read a short synopsis of that speech translated into English and have therefore familiarized myself to a certain extent with the views which he expressed. From the style of his speech and the sentiments which he uttered I should deem him to be an eloquent and able speaker. It is a matter of deep regret to me that I am unable to understand the French language. Let me say that were I a young man nothing would give me greater pleasure than to begin the study of that tongue and to acquire such a mastery of it as would enable me to follow the speeches of hon. members from Quebec when they use the language of old France.

I listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches that were made yesterday by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). The former has certainly lost none of his old-time ability, and he can still drive with rapier-like thrusts at the enemy across the way. I am one of those who admire the ability of the right hon. member. He is a dweller in our province, and although we do not agree with his political opinions we are proud of his ability and glad to see him once more in Parliament.

I read very carefully the Speech from the Throne, and I was glad to observe that a good many of the things for which we have been hoping were promised therein. I trust the promises will come to fruition and that some day we shall reap the harvest that has been sown. For one thing we have been promised wider markets. The leader of the Opposition yesterday in his speech ridiculed the idea of reciprocity with the United States. I am sorry to observe that attitude on his part because in the West it is something unusual to find such a brand of opinion—as will be recognized from what happened there during the recent elections. I can assure the House that one of the great problems that we have to meet in the West to-day is the getting of wider markets for farm products. The question has been asked: Of what advantage would the United States markets be to the western farmer? Let me tell the House that last fall and during the early part of the winter, notwithstanding the emergency tariff, trainload after trainload of cattle left the St. Boniface stock yards, paid the American duty of 30 per cent and were taken to Chicago and St. Paul and there sold at a profit over what those cattle could have realized at Winnipeg. What would have happened had there been no outlet for that trade, with the cattle market in such a depressed condition? Had there been no market in the country to the south to take our surplus at that particular time our cattle would have been unsaleable during those fall months. So that, you see, even with the 30 per cent duty, that American market at the present time has been a great advantage to us in respect to the marketing of our cattle.

Then we have a mention of freight rates in the Speech from the Throne, and with this I shall deal a little later on. We need relief in that respect. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speech of the hon. member, (Mr. Maclean, York) who preceded me. I should like to tell him that I am in thorough accord with him as far as the consolidation of the National railways is concerned, and I think he will get the support of this portion of the House in that policy. I am a new member of this Chamber, and do not know the position of the different members in the House very well yet, but I could not help wondering to what division the hon. gentleman who has just spoken belongs.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am a public rights man, and I hope you are too.

Mr. FORKE: I intend to be, and I say so, with all due respect to the remarks the hon. gentleman has made, and I do not say it in any carping or criticising spirit. Some reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the tariff. I agree with the leader of the Opposition, the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) in some of the criticisms he made in this respect. The reference to the tariff in the Speech may mean a great deal or it may mean very little. I have an optimistic temperament, and I have no doubt the Government will implement its promises,

and that we are to have substantial reductions in the tariff, more especially in the matter of agricultural implements and the materials we need in agriculture. If we do not get relief in this way, there is going to be disappointment in the West, and, more than that, there is going to be disaster unless some remedy is brought forward to meet conditions as they exist at the present time. The prairie provinces are in need of immediate relief; the situation out there is not good, and no one can face the circumstances without realizing that some relief must be afforded. We are aware of the fact that the climatic conditions have been unfavourable for a number of years, but anyone who knows the situation will realize that the overhead expenses of agriculture at the present time are far and away out of all proportion to the value of the crops that are being harvested. Now, that sort of thing cannot continue; it must come to an end; you cannot carry on business year after year if the balance is on the wrong side of the ledger. Something will have to be done to remedy those conditions. The prosperity of these provinces depends entirely upon their natural resources, and the greatest of those natural resources is that three or four inches or more of fertile soil that covers the land from eastern Manitoba to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. This land must be developed, can be developed and will be developed if right conditions prevail and right opportunities are afforded to the cultivators of that soil. I believe the economic conditions can be made, will be made and ought to be made, that will afford to those people who are living out there and developing that country an opportunity to make a living and enjoy more of the comforts and decencies of modern civilization. The constituency of Brandon, which I have the honour to represent, is just about one half urban and one half rural; and yet, after all, we are all in the same box, city, town, and country are dependent upon agriculture. The prosperity of one is the prosperity of the other, and, as I said before, we are all in the same box. Not only that, but I think the people in the House will recognize the fact that if the manufacturing centres, such as Brantford, Toronto, and Hamilton, are going to send their implements out there and are going to get paid for them, they will have to depend to a very large extent upon the prosperity of the western provinces. So that you will see, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, our interests are one; you cannot divide them. The Prairie provinces come close to the general interests of the Dominion of Canada, and we must have immediate relief.

We have listened to a very interesting address on the railway problem, and there is no doubt that this is one of the great problems we have to meet at the present time—perhaps the most pressing problem of all. We have on the one side excessive freight rates, on the other side large deficits on Canadian national railways year by year. How are we going to overcome the difficulties of the situation? Again, let me repeat here that I am in thorough accord with the consolidation of all the government-owned railways, to be worked as one system. In regard to the deficits on the national railways, I would like to say that I have had the privilege and opportunity of travelling on those lines to some extent during the last year, and I may say that there is a very great difference in the spirit, the movement and the arrangement of those lines from that which prevailed at one time. I noticed a different spirit among the employees and a different spirit in the public, who realize that this is their property, and that they have an interest in its development and prosperity. When speaking to a prominent Canadian Pacific railwayman the other day, he said that last year was the first year that they ever fully realized that they had a great competing system in the Canadian National Railways. Speaking to a mine owner in Drumheller, he made the statement also that the Canadian National Railways were out after business, and were looking after the business of the country in a way that was never done before. I can see daylight ahead. I can see hope in the future. We have a valuable property and we are going to maintain that property, develop it and keep it, and the day will come when we will be proud to have it.

Just a word in connection with freight rates. There is an old railway maxim that the rates should be made all that traffic will bear. I do not think it would be very difficult to prove at the present time that we have overstepped the mark, and that the rates are a great deal higher than the traffic will bear. It seems almost presumptuous that a layman should attempt to criticise railway management, and yet I think it is perfectly evident to anyone who knows the situation that freight is not being carried, business is not being

done, because it is not profitable to do it. Of course, the farmers in the West have to ship their wheat, and that, perhaps, is one reason why the rates in that respect can be kept up. But I was told the other day that in British Columbia a great many lumber mills were shut down a year ago because the business did not pay, they could not afford to sell lumber and pay the freight. Not only that, but in those mills that were running they were burning a great deal of stuff that could have been sawn up and used as building material for the farmers on the prairies had the freights been lower. Now it seems to me a reasonable proposition that it would have paid those railways to carry that stuff at a little lower rate, rather than have men thrown idle and wheels not moving at all. We have that situation, a most difficult situation—high freight rates and large deficits in railway operations. But whatever may be done, we cannot have freight rates any longer strangling industry and making agriculture impossible in this Dominion of ours.

I would like to say just a few words regarding taxation and immigration. We know that our taxes are very high at the present time. I am not going to enter into any discussion nor offer any criticism as regards the way in which this high taxation has come about. We are all acquainted with the facts; we know how our Dominion taxation has been increased. We have gone through a long and terrible war and through sorrow, suffering and great financial loss. The country has great indebtedness which will have to be met, which we are bound in honour to pay. As regards the provinces, they have been anxious to develop their territories; they have helped to build good roads, they have given aid for public works. And our municipal corporations and our rural districts also have tried to build roads throughout their territories, thus bringing the farms into closer communication with industrial centres and marketing points. Perhaps, we might criticise a little just how this was done and why it was done at this particular time, but I will not enter into that now. The debts have been incurred. Besides other questions, we have the question of education which is one of vast importance in the Prairie provinces and, I believe, also throughout the rest of this Dominion. For this, we are incurring large expenditures of money, money which we are ready to pay, but which we find a difficulty in getting. These expenditures are going to continue, and as many of the debts which we have incurred are fixed charges, we can look forward to the years to come, knowing that our taxation is not going to become any lighter.

How are we going to meet the difficulty? The different speakers have spoken about immigration. Double your population, they say, and you will have no need of these taxes. Well, not exactly, but you are going to go a long ways towards reducing taxation. Double your immigration and you are going to help to solve your railway difficulty and your taxation difficulty; you will create traffic for the railways and lighten the burden all along the line. But then it might be asked again: Why increase your population when you find dissatisfaction and discontent amongst the people who are living here at the present time? The question is all one of remuneration. The farmers out on the prairies have a good deal of education handed out to them as to how they can improve their position; but let me tell the House that the first thing which will help to stop the flow from the country to the town is higher remuneration for the people who are engaged in agriculture. We are living in a day when education is easily got almost anywhere. We find our young people out on the farms becoming well educated, knowing what conditions are in city, town and country; and, knowing the conditions, they make their choice, and they flock where the better living is to be got and where, perhaps, the conveniences and comforts of life may be more easily obtained. Until opportunities are equalized as between country and city life, we are going to have that flow towards the city of which we complain so much. I believe those conditions can be improved; that we can arrest that flow if we have the right country conditions. I know very well that if any one wishes to make a vast amount of money, he is never going to make it in
9 p.m. agricultural life. We all know that. But there are in life some things that are of greater consequence than money, and when we have found a congenial occupation, when we have found a fair remuneration, when he have found independence of livelihood and conditions to suit us, that is wealth and all the wealth that anyone will want. That state of things can be brought about in rural life, and we are going to get it if we get proper economic conditions. I believe in that way alone we shall solve our rural problem. I know,

conditions at the present time are to a certain extent abnormal; that we are suffering in the West, in some sections at least, as I said before, from climatic conditions. But we have also certain economic evils that we believe can be remedied and will be remedied. I believe many of the conditions on the farm life are going to be improved in this way. The large farms on the western prairies are going to disappear, and we are going to have smaller farms. We are going to have more intensive cultivation and closer community centres, and a great many of the disadvantages of rural life are going to disappear.

What does the Government intend to do as regards this question of immigration? We need the people, but we want the right kind of people. There are in the British Islands, on the continent of Europe, more especially in Scandinavia and perhaps in some other countries, people who are suited to the land, who have been born and bred to that calling, and who would make the very best of citizens if we could get them to come out to Canada. I believe that, notwithstanding all our disadvantages, there are people over there with land hunger who would like to come out to Canada and have a piece of land that they could call their own, who would make the very best of settlers if we could get them to come to this country. We have had a large number of immigrants from eastern Europe. I would not be ready to condemn those people offhand, I know many of them who have made good; but I would not like to see a very large inrush from that portion of Europe at the present time. Perhaps most hon. members are aware of the fact that many of these people from eastern Europe are, in the second generation, taking the highest places in our educational institutions, in the West at least, and they are going to make good citizens. Those of us who are of French or Anglo-Saxon extraction will have to look to our laurels or we shall find many of those people enjoying the highest positions in the land, and if they are worthy of them they have a right to them.

What is the Government going to do to stop this trek from the land to the city? I have tried to point out what I believe to be, in part at least, a solution of that problem. We do not, however, want immigrants from the manufacturing towns of Great Britain. Perhaps, this is a hard thing to say; but I have had some experience in immigration work, and if you get artisans from the banks of the Clyde or factory workers from the towns, when they come to Canada they will inevitably drift to the cities. We have plenty of those people in this country now. I have no fault to find with them, but when we want those people, we can soon get them. I have no hope of taking the city born-and-bred man and woman and turning them out to make a livelihood on the land. They are going to have an up-hill fight and, perhaps, they will never achieve any success. As I said before, they are most likely to drift back to the cities and help to build up a city population greater than is necessary.

We are passing through difficult times, and we must use our best endeavours to pass through them successfully. We have a great new country and I have not lost faith in this land of wide horizons. We have our difficulties in the West; but it is a great land, and during the last thirty or forty years, notwithstanding all our difficulties, there have been many happy homes and happy households out on those prairie lands, and we are going to have them in the future. We have not lost faith in our country. Canada is a great land and we do not want a divided country. We do not want any "East" and we do not want any "West"; we want one Canada. We need to get together, forgetting disrupting differences, and finding our own prosperity in the common good and in the development of our country. I shall close with a quotation from Viscount Bryce, who said:

> Canada is well able, by the character of her people, by their intelligence and law-abiding habits, to face whatever problems the future may bring, finding remedies for such defects as may have disclosed themselves in her government, and making material prosperity the basis of an enlightened and pacific civilisation.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of trepidation that I rise to take part in this debate, because, like the hon. gentleman who preceded me, I am inexperienced in public speaking and lack of knowledge of the forms, the procedure, and the traditions of the House. I therefore request your indulgence, Sir, if I err in any way, as I intend—we all intend, no doubt,—to bring myself in harmony with the rules of the House and in harmony with the spirit and ancient traditions of Parliament, while still holding to my own principles and my own ideas.

We have come here, a great many of us, as new members, in the hope of being able to impart some of the ideas which have been growing in our minds through the past years, and also in the hope that we may be able to assist in bringing about better conditions in this country. We have not come here in any spirit of hostility or of antagonism, but rather with the desire to co-operate as fully as possible in the endeavour to secure needed reforms and such legislation as is necessary for the country as a whole, and, perhaps, for the West in particular, if we are to emerge from the morass in which we are struggling at the present time and to set our feet on dry ground again. I believe that the task will require the intelligent co-operation of every thinking man and woman in Canada, no matter in what part of the country they may live, and irrespective of racial extraction, occupation, or any other consideration. I believe that the task before us will demand their intelligent co-operation if Canada is to be the country we all think it should be. That is the spirit in which we have come here.

I have read with a good deal of interest the Speech from the Throne, and have heard with equal interest the debate which has been held upon it and which has to some extent explained and amplified it; and I find myself very much in accord with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), because, in spite of the somewhat gloomy pessimism of the right hon. gentleman who leads the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen), I, like my hon. friend from North Winnipeg, intend to retain my optimism until the Government itself, by any future action, shall destroy it. We come into Parliament believing that the Government intend to carry out legislation along the lines of their old platform and their pre-election promises. We are taking that for granted until the Government itself shall do something to deprive our minds of that confidence in them. We intend to do the Government justice to that extent, and to afford all the assistance possible in the carrying out of their programme.

In looking over the Speech from the Throne I was particularly pleased with one paragraph, referred to by every hon. member who has spoken, and that, the reference to agriculture. There is one respect, in this connection, in which I must congratulate the Government. For a good many years we farmers have suffered from a superfluity of advice from bankers, lawyers, manufacturers, politicians, and a good many other people, as to what we should do and what we should best produce, what class of farming we should follow, whether we should grow wheat or go in for mixed farming, or raise cattle, and so forth. We have had an abundance of that sort of advice, and while we recognize that these things may be important, I am very glad indeed to see that the Government, in the Speech from the Throne, has realized that the foundation of agricultural prosperity lies not so much in them, but in proper marketing and transportation, and in lower production costs. It seems to me that this, to a large extent, covers all the ground; it covers the tariff, the railway situation and marketing; and if these three things are settled, and settled so that farmers may work under them to advantage, I do not think we have any great kick coming; we have, I think, very little left to ask for. I am not going to speak at any length on the question of marketing. That has been dealt with before, and no doubt it will be spoken of by others. I will only mention that we have come to this conclusion, after a great deal of thought and experience—that if we are to succeed in business we must have some method of controlling the marketing of products. By that I mean some method by which the producer controls the marketing and flow of his own products until they arrive at their ultimate destination. We are not particularly desirous of controlling the price. We recognize that it is impossible for the farmers of one nation to control prices, but we believe that by controlling the flow, so that the products arrive at the markets of the world, throughout the year, as those markets can absorb them, we can stabilize the prices and receive the highest average world price throughout the year. As to the form that this control should take, I am not prepared to say; that will have to be settled later on. I believe that the ultimate solution will be some form of co-operative organization by the farmers themselves; but I also believe that, for the present, some form of Government board will have to be adopted. That, however, I will leave to the future; it will be discussed in Committee, and I shall not go further in detail in that respect just now. There is also the other point, of lower costs of production, which links itself most intimately with the tariff, because the one thing that causes our costs of production to be higher than it should be is the increased

price of farm machinery and farm equipment due to the protective tariff. I am not going to say much about the protective tariff. Protection has been a political football for so many years that I cannot say anything new on the subject. That is a remarkable thing, too. Election after election, and session after session, this football has been kicked about from one party to another, and yet it remains about the same size, and is about the same colour and texture as it was a good many years ago. I think it is a remarkable instance of endurance. I do want to point out one thing, and that is our attitude on the subject of protection at large; —I am not referring to tariff for revenue; that should properly come under the taxation and not under protection, I am referring to the principle of protection. That principle we believe to be morally wrong and economically unsound. We believe it is morally wrong, because anything is wrong morally which gives to one class of individuals in a community the power to exploit other classes to their own personal advantage. And I am including farmers in that; I do not believe that farmers or any other class should have any form of special privilege which will enable them to exploit other classes. We believe protection is unsound economically because it delays and hampers the development of our natural resources of all kinds—farming, mining, timber and other resources—by increasing the cost of the machinery used in that development. We believe that in the development of the natural resources which God has placed within our country in such plenitude lies the future of this Dominion. There is another point in this connection: adopted as a principle protection becomes futile as a form of taxation, because the more perfect it becomes for the purposes of protection, the more adequate protection is, the smaller your revenue becomes; protection carried to the extreme degree would completely shut out all imports, and then, of course, no revenue could be produced. We say, therefore, that the protective tariff is an illogical form of revenue. We believe, furthermore, that taxation of this kind proceeds altogether in the wrong direction because it is a consumption tax, and in principle the consumption tax is less desirable than any form of direct taxation because it bears most heavily upon those who are least able to bear it. You can easily see that the poorer a man is the larger the proportion of his income that goes for the necessities of life, and if he is taxed on the necessities of life, the larger the proportion of taxation he has to pay. But, leaving that out of the question, we believe that it is an illogical form of taxation in the present condition of the country. Most people in this country—and strange as it may seem, this question becomes linked up with that of immigration as well—most people, no matter what their party affiliation may be, regard the great need of this country as population; they believe we should encourage an increase of population by any means in our power. Logically speaking, a bachelor tax might be all right for the purpose of encouraging population,—and mind you, I am not attempting to embarrass the Government by advocating a tax on bachelors. I simply wish to point out that taxation through protection is a baby tax, and a baby tax, where population is our greatest necessity and where native-born population is the best population, is, I contend, Mr. Speaker, not a logical tax. And what else can you call it? You who have children know that for every additional child in your family you must buy additional shoes and garments of various kinds; and many other things, and you are taxed on every one of those things you buy. It simply means that under a protective tariff, for every child you have in your family, you are subjected to additional taxation; and if that is not a baby tax, what is it?

Now, I am going to leave that subject for better men than I am to tackle later on. But I want to say a word, just in passing, on the subject of immigration as connected with conditions pertaining to agriculture. We wish to bring in a great number of immigrants who shall go on the farms; as I understand it, that is the object of any immigration policy we may adopt—to bring in men and women more or less experienced in farming, who will go upon the land, open up undeveloped areas, particularly in the West and through parts of Ontario, and thus increase production. Mr. Speaker, the foundation of any form of immigration which can possibly be successful in attaining that object must be the prosperity of those already on the land. That, I believe, is the only policy of immigration which is worth the paper it is written on. When you have made the condition of the farmers already here prosperous, tolerable and decent as far as possible, others will come in to share their prosperity. But until you have done that, what is the use of trying to induce others

to come here only to share our poverty and distress. Now, that sounds like strong language; yet is it too strong? I say poverty and distress. After I came to Ottawa I was speaking to a gentleman who was fairly well acquainted with city conditions and he remarked that we were very fortunate in Western Canada in that whatever our conditions were, however hard the times might be, no man, woman or child in that part of the country was suffering for want of food; all were farmers and all would have plenty of food in their cupboards. I told that gentleman, as I can tell the House now and as some hon. members must know, that even among farmers whose occupation is the production of food there are hundreds—I believe I am within the mark in saying thousands—who are dependent upon the municipalities and upon the Government for their daily bread at the present time. This statement is not exaggerated; the conditions are such as I have described. While it is true that these conditions are confined to a few areas the fact remains that in a great portion of Western Canada at least—I cannot speak for the farmers of the East—the farmers are simply living on their reserves; they are farming at a loss, holding on, hoping for a better day to come when prices for what they have to sell, prices for what they have to buy, and transportation rates, will come to such a point as will make a living possible. We have been told—and there is a great deal of logic in it—that a decrease of freight rates can only follow an increase in population. I can see the force of that argument, but at the same time I believe that increase of population must be preceded by a decrease in the freight rates; otherwise the population will simply not come in.

There is just one other point to which I wish to refer briefly. It is a point without political significance and with respect to which all members of the House will, I believe, be in accord. It is in connection with the re-establishment of the former members of the Canadian expeditionary forces. I would like to call the attention of this House to the condition that at present prevails among the greater number, I believe, in the West at least, of the returned men who have been placed upon the land through the work of the Soldier Settlement Board. I believe that board has done its duty faithfully and carried out its work sympathetically, so far as I have seen, and I have no desire to criticise it. But it is time, in my opinion, that the policy of that board should be amplified—indeed, that a different policy should be pursued. Most of these men went on the land in good faith, when the price of everything was at its peak. They went there at a time when prices were abnormal, when prices had reached a stage which they may not reach again for many years. The cost of machinery was at the peak; prices of stock and everything else that was needed for their farming activities were at the peak, and they bought at those prices. They bought land when land was selling on the basis of two-dollar wheat and cattle were bringing profitable prices. They bought machinery at the highest prices which have been known. They bought cattle when milch cows were bringing from $100 to $140. And now where are they? They went into debt for these things—for that land and that stock and the equipment purchased at these high prices, and at present their indebtedness to the Government on that stock and equipment exceeds the total value of the property which they possess. This, Mr. Speaker, is a serious condition and one which this House will have to take into account. These men went overseas; they fought and suffered both physically and financially in order that this country and the world might be free. They were put upon the land, in good faith, as a kind of mark of appreciation—as a method of assisting them to regain their places in civil life. The idea was right, and I believe the expectations were well founded. But what has happened? All these men, or a very large proportion of them, at all events, were called upon to pay about ten per cent of the value of the land when they got it. If they leave their farms now they lose not only the government land, not only all the work they have put in upon it, but every cent they possessed before they went on the land as well. Is that fair, is it just? It is absolutely impossible—and I speak from experience because, though inexperienced in this House, I am experienced in farming conditions in that part of the country—for any one of these men to make good under that burden of debt. Even old experienced farmers with their holdings free from debt cannot possibly make interest on their holdings under present conditions. How then can we expect these newcomers to make principal and interest on an over-capitalized farm? It is absolutely impossible. To a large extent they are foredoomed to failure under present conditions, and will leave the land. That sounds like

a very gloomy prospect. What suggestions have we to make? My suggestion is simply this, and it is one which has been endorsed pretty generally by the farmers who would have to help to pay the bill, that the land, the stock, and the machinery, bought in that way should be re-valued and brought down to a value comparable to the values prevailing at the present time, and that the difference between the debt which these men assumed and the present value be taken over by the country as an addition to our public debt. I know that sounds unpopular, but that loss is more apparent than real, because every time one of these men goes under, and they are doing it every day, a salvage sale is necessary and the stuff is sold at present prices, or at less than present prices at a forced sale, and the country has to take the loss. Sooner or later,—and I make a very conservative estimate because, although I am Progressive in my principles, I am very conservative in my statements in most ways—I believe at least seventy per cent of these men are doomed to failure and to leave the land, and when they leave the land the country will have to stand the loss of the difference between the value of their stock when they leave the land and the value of their stock when they bought it. But the country will lose far more than that. While these men are on the land they are producing citizens, self-respecting men supporting themselves; they are an asset to their country, because production is necessary; they are working. But if they are forced to leave the land, what happens? They become a liability. Under present conditions they will simply have to join the ranks of the unemployed and in one way or another they and their families will have to be kept by this country. I do not say that every one who leaves his farm will have to join the unemployed, but with tens of thousands of unemployed in this country to-day, every one of these men who has to leave the land will either remain unemployed himself or force someone else into the ranks of the unemployed; the ranks of the unemployed will be swelled in either event, and these men will no longer be an asset but a liability to their country. More than that, in their own character, in their own purposefulness, in their own power to make good citizens, they will have been lost. They will have lost heart, they will have lost courage, they will have lost belief in the righteousness, the fairness and justness of their fellow-men, in the country they live in. While I am not attempting to embarrass the Government in any way at the present time, I hope that this matter will receive the most serious consideration of the department concerned and of the Government as a whole. I can assure the Government that any action along the line I have suggested will receive the hearty co-operation and support of my friends here.

There is another question, and though it is a small one, it is still most important. For the next year or two it will be practically impossible for any one of these men to make payments on his land, and I think it would be good policy—I simply throw that out as a suggestion—to extend the time of payment for two years. Give them two years free of principal and free of interest during which they might be able to get on their feet financially, and in that way help them to make good.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken long enough for the first time, but before taking my seat I want to make just one brief statement. Being, as I am, quite inexperienced in this House, it will probably take me some time to thoroughly imbibe its atmosphere. We were all treated to a very fine exhibition of oratory yesterday and part of the time to-day, and if that is a sample of the eloquence of the statesmen in Parliament, if the courtesy and the absence of all personalities displayed was a fair sample of what commonly goes on in Parliament, I am afraid it will be a very long time before I and some of my associates can hope to climb to such heights.

In conclusion, I would simply repeat what I have said before and what others have said before me, that we are here to work, not for the good of any one part of Canada, but we are here as Canadians to do all in our power to assist others to work for the common good of our country.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, our Labour group in this House is small and inexperienced, but we feel that we represent a section of the community that is of no small importance, and that in connection with this debate we should try as best we may to represent the thought of that section of the community on the various public questions which have come before this House.

In an early section of the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the world-wide economic disturbance, but passage is quickly made to an easy optimism which foretells a substantial revival in trade. It sounds very much as if prosperity is just

around the corner. I think, however, we must concede that we are beginning to understand more clearly than ever that prosperity cannot be had just for whistling, that prosperity may come only as we are in accord with great economic laws, and that at this particular time we cannot hope for prosperity for Canada short of prosperity for all the nations of the world. If there is one thing that this war has taught the world, it is that no nation lives to itself, as no individual lives to himself, and Canada to-day can hardly hope for permanent prosperity short of the stability and prosperity of the whole of Europe.

I take it that our economic future in this country is inextricably bound up with that of the United States. We may maintain our own political identity, but economically we are bound to have the very closest relations with the great country to the south of us. It is many years since Goldwin Smith pointed out that the natural lines on this continent run north and south. Artificial lines have been run east and west, and along these artificial political lines we have built up our trade boundaries. That makes it very difficult to pass freely across those boundaries. We must recognize that although we differ in a very important sense economically from the United States—in that we are a debtor nation while they are a creditor nation—at the same time the ties between us are so intimate that we cannot hope to prosper unless they also prosper. The situation, it seems to me, with regard to the United States and ours was quite clearly put in an article which appeared two weeks ago in the "New Republic." May I be permitted to read an excerpt therefrom:

> A large part of our agricultural products must still be sold upon an international market, and must come into competition with the output of the European farmer. If the inter-dependence of agricultutral crop values and manufacturing output is valid, it must hold for Europe as well as for America. Unless something is done soon about German reparations, German industry will certainly pass through a period of paralysis early next year. Everywhere the political situation is such that business enterprise will be at a low ebb.
>
> The present economic order is essentially a co-operative one. Its co-operation is effected through exchange, and between all the exchanging groups, there is an intimate degree of interdependence. The American manufacturer and the American farmer must depend upon each other. But the American farmer is tied to the European price level by the fact that he produces for export. The European farmer is in turn dependent upon Europe's manufacturing communities. So we can do little for the American farmer unless we help the European manufacturer and his laborers. Whether we like it or not, the organization of industrial society has made us our brother's keeper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in this way we must recognize that the great demand is for markets. But we must also recognize that all other countries are also seeking for markets at this time; not only Great Britain but the various countries in Europe. The United States is also calling for markets; even the Orient is calling for markets. We in Canada cannot very well hope to compete successfully at this time with other countries along the lines of manufacture. Our whole industry in the past has been connected with the Atlantic ocean. Possibly there is a trade that might be opened up across the Pacific, but that would involve a complete diversion of the trade which has been going on for a great many years, and probably we could not look to that in the immediate future as bringing about the required solution.

But, Sir, I believe there is a market closer at hand than Europe or the Orient and that is the home market, the most neglected of all our markets to-day. I think it is admitted by the Minister of Labour that we have something like 200,000 people unemployed in Canada to-day—probably those figures are very conservative. This would likely mean that there are a million people in Canada that are to-day affected by unemployment—that are either directly unemployed or under-employed. Now I imagine that if these million people could buy shoes and clothes, and groceries, and furniture, and other things which are necessary for living, we would have, right at home, a large market which to-day is being neglected. Under our present economic system we cannot start the wheels of production moving unless there is some buyer who stands ready with money or with credit; and to-day we have so managed our affairs that there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are not buying simply because they have not the money or the credit with which to buy. I speak particularly of the large numbers on farms in the West and also in our cities and industrial sections from coast to coast.

I sometimes wonder whether we who sit in these comfortable halls quite recognize the actual conditions that prevail in many sections of this Canada of ours. A few years ago I belonged to a labour organization on the Coast that had rather a curious regulation which prohibited any

paid official of the union from holding office for more than six months at a time. It was felt that after six months the official tended to acquire the official mind, and ought to go back again to the ranks to find what the real conditions were. Perhaps if that rule were applied in this House, and in some of our Government departments, we might get a little bit nearer to the actual conditions of the people across this country. I am sure that some of my friends from some of the farms, who till our fields, as well as some of the artisans in the cities who build houses and carry forward a good deal of the work of this country will understand what I mean when I say there are a large number of people across this country to-day who, if not actually unemployed and in dire necessity, are passing through a period of very great anxiety. And this, by the way, is not confined merely to those who are commonly called workers but to a large number of our business men who also do not see their way clearly at this time.

I should like to take up the time of the House for a few minutes in reviewing a little of the unemployment situation across the country. A few weeks ago I had the opportunity of visiting the relief camp for single men maintained by the city of Vancouver. Nearly eight hundred men, almost half of them returned soldiers, were gathered together in a large camp at the exhibition grounds at Hastings park—the returned men termed it "the internment camp." One building had been transformed into an immense bunk house; and near by, in what had been the automobile section, there was what the men called "the filling station"—the dining room. Here these men were given three meals a day and a bed at night. All that the community received in return was the few hours work which was frankly a work test. These men—many of whom, most of whom in fact, had been declared by medical health officers to be fit—had skilled trades, a great many of them had served, as I have said, overseas. And yet this is all that we had to offer them at the present time in a country and in a province that had on every side crying needs for development work of almost every kind. The prairie farmers are needing lumber and hundreds of these men were skilled loggers, but we could not get them to work and we could not get the lumber out to the farmers. Coming east I stayed off for a day or two at Drumheller where there are immense coal deposits, as we all know. Many of the miners there had been employed only part of the time for thirteen and a half months One man told me that he had had only sixty-two days work in the year 1921. Drumheller is on a government railway, quite capable of bringing that coal which we so much need on the prairie, but the freight rates were said to be prohibitive. Coming on down to my own city of Winnipeg, there are and have been approximately 5,000 men unemployed there during the past months. According to a memorandum furnished the provincial government a few weeks ago, the cost was averaging about $265,000 per month, part of this on relief work, and part of it on special work, most of it granted to meet the unemployment situation, but for a very considerable part of which, the community received a very small return indeed. In Toronto I was told there were some 16,000 or 18,000 registered unemployed, but those nearest the situation declare that there are 25,000 unemployed. The House of Industry alone assisted this winter some 6,482 families, 1,761 of these families being families of returned men. This is saying nothing of the large number of single men who are being provided for more or less by other agencies. The expense for the month of February alone was between $80,000 and $100,000. I wish we could visualize what this unemployment really means. I wonder if I might be permitted to read a paragraph from a report of the city of Vancouver by a visitor accompanying one of the Victorian Order of Nurses. The paragraph reads:

> I visited a score of homes of the poor and sick and saw privation and dire want with my own eyes. It was pathetic. I had known poverty before when every member of the family had to work incessantly to make both ends meet, but for the adults in these homes there was no work to be had anywhere and the people are almost starving. The men are willing to do anything. They seek steady employment and are eager to do ther best. Their wives would take any work that they could get, but there is none. There is a dreadful calm and weariness about the children of these people, and an unnatural quietness in their childishness due to malnutrition. They have been hungry for so long that they do not realize that they are hungry. Many of them go to school, but it does them no more good than if they stayed at home. "You cannot fill a child's head when his stomach is empty, and what we need along with compusory education is compulsory feeding" was the way one keen observer put it.

And then there follows case upon case of the actual conditions which prevail even in that young city. Then I will read one

paragraph from the December Health Bulletin of the city of Toronto:

> In discussing the minimum income the medical health officer said: "In determining this, we must do so, not only in the interest of the family, but also of the state, inasmuch as the essentials for proper nutrition and proper methods of living mean the difference ofttimes between a physical asset and a physical liability to the nation. The minimum standard of living must be such as to make it possible for every child to be well born and have an adequate opportunity for normal development, and the maintaining of physical fitness for every adult. A fitness that will enable men to give 100 per cent efficiency to their employers and the mothers to give 100 per cent efficiency in their homes. A standard should be fixed below which no family can safely come."
>
> While these are only a few investigations that have been made in connection with children, and only a limited number of the figures and facts available, yet they seem to prove beyond doubt that not only is poverty largely responsible for malnutrition, but they are ofttimes in direct ratio.
>
> In an investigation made by the Bureau of Child Hygiene and Child Welfare at Washington, they found that the mortality among the lowest-paid ranged from 2 to 3 times greater than among those with the largest incomes.

Now, in the face of such a situation as that, in face of the poverty that prevails in so many of our cities, I can hardly understand the callousness of some of our financiers as they look over the situation that prevails. For instance, in the annual statement of the Bank of Montreal—and I believe there are directors of that institution members of this House—the general manager states that unemployment is a natural corrective. As I think of these cases brought to our notice by the Victorian Order of Nurses and by social workers in all our cities from coast to coast, I can hardly conceive of any man or any group of men really understanding the situation and declaring that unemployment is a natural corrective. I claim that we have come to a period in the history of our country when we must decide once and for all which shall prevail, profits or human welfare. I feel confident that there is a group of men here, new members of the House if you will, who have clearly made up their minds that, in so far as they can decide it, human welfare is to be given the precedence.

I should like to suggest certain points which gradually emerge as the unemployed themselves have discussed this great problem of theirs. First of all, it seems to me that it should be recognized that, under the present system of large-scale industry, unemployment is involuntary. I am quite free to admit that there are among the unemployed a certain percentage who are lazy, drunken and inefficient—and any one who has studied the subject knows that, to a very large extent, their laziness, drunkenness and inefficiency are the result of our haphazard system—but at the same time we must further admit that that percentage is a very small one indeed. A few months ago most of these men who are now unemployed were at work, and if work offered they would be at work again. The difficulty with a good many of us in this country is that we have only recently passed through the pioneer development of our country. Some of us have grown up on the farm. Others of us who have not directly grown up on the farm still have more or less of the farm background and the farm traditions. We think back to the day when if a man could not find work and could not make a success it was his own fault. It was a time when almost every family was largely self-sufficient, and if a man was a hired man one year and did not like to continue the next, he could go to the back concessions, and make a home for himself. We are living still in thought in the time when in this country there were almost unlimited opportunities. But I submit that that time has passed away. The free accessible lands then in Canada have almost gone. If one would to-day have a freehold homestead he must pass almost beyond the reach of the railways. I say this, having full knowledge of the fact, that across our western country there are almost 30,000,000 acres of arable land held out of cultivation. But the free, accessible lands are almost a thing of the past. A hundred years ago settlement on this continent consisted of a few scattered communities along the Atlantic seaboard. It took practically a hundred years and three or four generations of the peoples, in their westward movement, to reach the Pacific. To-day the large part of our natural resources within easy reach have been exploited, and the opportunities, which were present in the early days in this western country of ours with its rapid developments, are not so numerous. We forget that we live in an age of collective production; that we live in an age of "large scale" industry; that we live in an age of more or less monopoly of the necessities of life.

For example, on a large railroad like the Canadian Pacific railway, so many thousand men may be laid off, as they were about Christmas time. Those men become

temporarily unemployed, and it is impossible to say that those men ought to find work. Where can they find work? We cannot build a Canadian Pacific railway in a year or in ten years, and is is impossible for those railway men to find work at their own trade. The same thing is very largely true of other fundamental industries. If for any reason logging operations at the Coast close, ten to twenty thousand men are thrown out of employment immediately. Where can they find work? They cannot go and cut trees as some of our forefathers did in the backwoods of Ontario. The timber limits are held to-day by great companies, many of them with headquarters in the United States. The same is true of mining; the same is becoming more and more true of fishing; and even in agriculture, it is becoming extremely difficult, under present circumstances, for a man to get a start. Although the farmer to-day is farming his own bit of land, so soon as he steps off his own quarter section, he comes into contact with, and more or less under the dominance of, the great, big world outside. He is dependent upon the outside for his machinery, for his transportation, for his markets. Therefore, it is not easy to-day for a man without capital to obtain a start. Under these circumstances, unemployment is involuntary, and we ought not to treat the unemployed man as if he were more or less of a criminal. Until we get that clearly into our minds, we are not going to be very much further on in getting this matter on to a firm basis.

Let me state another point and that is this, that under these conditions the state is under obligation to provide work. I am not very much concerned personally, whether by the "state" we mean the municipality, or the province, or the Dominion. I would say, however, that whilst the Speech from the Throne would seek to evade, on the part of the Dominion, the responsibility of this problem of unemployment, in my judgment it is impossible to do so. The body that has to deal with great questions like immigration, the fiscal policy of this country, and our international relations, cannot say that it has no responsibility towards unemployment which is one of the consequences of, or intimately related to, our fiscal policy and our relations with other countries; and this House, before it rises, must deal with this question of unemployment. We should provide work. I am not thinking now merely of the work test which is provided in connection with charitable institutions, I mean suitable work; I mean, further than that, work not done as mere charity and on rates lower than those paid to ordinary workers in the same kind of work, and I am not thinking of such work as has been undertaken very largely by our municipalities—work that is unproductive in character. Surely, in this country, with its small amount of development, there is work, productive in character, which can be undertaken by the state. As a taxpayer, I objected decidedly in my own little municipality to paying out taxes and receiving nothing whatever for those taxes; and, as more or less representing these unemployed workmen, I object to work being furnished as a sort of charity; that work degrades any man who undertakes it. We have in this country, surely, enough opportunities for work that any man who is willing ought to be given a chance.

I want to go to a third point, that until suitable work is provided there ought to be adequate maintenance. This is the very principle underlying all unemployment insurance schemes. We are behind many of the European countries in that we have not so far been able to make provision for unemployment insurance.

10 p.m.

The principle of unemployment insurance is not a novel one. We have it in our Workmen's Compensation Acts, where to-day we recognize that an industry ought to carry its own burdens, and that if a man is injured while pursuing his work, the industry itself ought to be charged with, at least, the financial part of his injury. The same thing is true with regard to seasonal unemployment. If it is necessary to have men in this country employed during rush seasons, we ought, at least, to see that they are kept over during the slack season. Hon. members who are here from the farming community will bear me out when I say that they winter over their horses in order that those horses shall be in fit condition to be used in the spring time. Should we treat with any less care or less wisdom the human machines that are necessary to carry on the industries of this country? Industry itself should carry the burden of unemployment.

One last principle which I should like to give in this connection is this. You may ask: How shall unemployment schemes be financed?—how shall we make provision for unemployment on a large

scale? I would say that the financing of any such scheme is a first charge on the natural resources and credit of the country. Surely there is no reason why we should insist that railway dividends should come up to a certain mark in order that railway investors should be able to go forward with their work, or why banks should be permitted to retain their interest and dividends, and yet that we should refuse to labour even the minimum, a decent living.

There are three factors, and three only, necessary to production; I think I am on safe ground when I make that statement. We need, first of all, natural resources; we need, in the second place, the equipment necessary to work those natural resources, and we need, in the third place, human labour. I use this term "labour" in no narrow sense, but rather in the broad sense of labour as they put it in the Old Land, labour of hand or of brain. The labouring man is the man who makes a real contribution to society. We need those three factors, and we have in Canada at the present time all those factors necessary to production.

I need not take up the time of the House in speaking about our natural resources. They are here in abundance. At every great public function, at almost every Canadian Club meeting, speakers grow eloquent over the wonderful natural resources of this country. They are here; we do not have to import them from Europe or from the United States. Further than that, we have also in this country the equipment with which to carry on the work of developing these resources. We have been told that we have six or eight thousand miles of railway more than we need. We have factories across the country from coast to coast that are closed down; we have in the West lumber mills that are closed down, We have mines closed down, and last year some of our canneries were not running to their full capacity. We undoubtedly have the facilities in this country for carrying on our industries. Some hon. members may remember that before the war—I am not sure whether it was in 1913 or 1914—Sir George Paish the editor of The Statist, told the people of Canada that they had already the equipment for carrying forward productive work of a volume two or three times greater than that which was at present being done, and at that time he advised the investors of Great Britain to put no more money into constructive enterprises but rather to invest a little bit more in enterprises of a purely productive character. He warned them that, unless they did this, Canada would not be able even to pay interest charges on money already invested in this country. We already have all the equipment in the country. But what is the trouble? The trouble is essentially that we have allowed natural resources to be monopolized by private individuals or corporations, and have allowed the equipment to be handled very largely by these persons and corporations, who are looking to their own profits rather than to the welfare of the people. It is as though we had fenced off these natural resources and all this equipment and labour stood outside the fence unable to get at these things in order to carry forward the processes of production. At the gateway, is the privately-controlled credit system of our banks and financial institutions that determines on what terms we may go in or out; it determines on what conditions the business of the country shall be carried on. It seems to me that the great task of statesmanship in this country in the coming years will be to break down that fence and to bring together these great factors, labour, natural resources and the equipment which we already have in such abundance in Canada.

I should like to speak for a few minutes with regard to the reference which is made in the Speech to the transportation question, which is undoubtedly one of the great questions before the people of Canada to-day. I desire to congratulate the Government on the assertion of its determination to give Government ownership and operation of railways a fair trial. Some of us have learned this with considerable relief, for there had been an impression that public ownership might not be given a fair trial. We were glad to have the assurance of the Prime Minister in this respect, and I think perhaps we can trust the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to see to it that the Board of Management which controls the Canadian National Railways shall be composed of men who are free from any suspicion whatever of having their own private interests to look after. Representing the Labour group, I should like to see the Government go even further than they have proposed to do in the way of bringing the various systems under control. Most of us have read with interest Lord Shaughnessy's plan for consolidation. I agree with the idea of having one great railway system in this

country, which, as Lord Shaughnessy says, is logical and economical; but I cannot agree with his suggestion that this be placed under the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think that our Government owned railways will be ultimately successful until we have a unified system of all the railways in the Dominion.

The Speech foreshadows some changes in the customs tariff. We are not told just what those changes will be, but it is, to me at least, a keen disappointment that there is no indication that there are to be any radical changes in the fiscal system as a whole. There is a great war debt which is an intolerable burden on the backs of the people of Canada, a mortgage on the efforts of future generations in this country. A very short time after the war was concluded, a rather interesting computation was made with regard to war debts. A pamphlet, published by the Mechanics and Metals National Bank, estimated the war debts of Europe and the United States at something like $200,000,000,000. I quote:

> The pamphlet is frank as to the meaning of this huge tax burden that the war has placed upon the people of Europe. It says: "France, if we make no allowance for indemnities to be received, apparently will require upwards of 40 per eent of her people's peace time income, as that income was formerly figured, to meet the interest obligations and upkeep expenses of the nation in 1920. Great Britain will require 28 per cent. Russia, when its obligations ultimately are honoured, will apparently require more than 45 per cent of her people's income, as that income was figured prior to the war. Before meeting any indemnity obligations, Austria-Hungary will require 48 per cent and Germany 31 per cent..... It means a great deal to say that, following the conclusion of peace, from one-fourth to nearly one-half the income of the different peoples of Europe will belong to the government. Yet that is plainly the indication."
>
> It is a gruesome indication. It means that of his working year of 300 days the average European workingman will be expected to devote over 100 days to the service of the war debt. The pamphlet analyzes this in detail. The English workingman, according to the figures, will have to give the income of 84 days, the German workingman 90 days, the French workingman 120 days, the Russian workingman almost half his days, the Austrian more than half.

What about Canada? Hon. members may remember that in the first budget after the war Sir Thomas White made a statement with regard to the heaviness of the burden which we had to carry. He said:

> I do not in the least desire to minimize the gravity of so great a debt as now confronts us

on the threshold of the new year. It will constitute a burden upon the people of Canada for generations to come.

But Sir Thomas White found a great deal of consolation in the fact, that from a national standpoint, the public debt when owed to the nation itself is not nearly so serious an obligation as when owed abroad. The interest paid upon the debt is disbursed at home and remains part of the national resources. Now, it may be a considerable consolation to members who hold large blocks of Government bonds to find that a great part of the war debt of Canada is owed to people in Canada, but I submit that it is an altogether different matter when we consider that the rank and file of the people have to bear these interest charges. It means that we and our children after us, if this thing continues, shall be simply hewers of wood and drawers of water for a few privileged individuals who made profits during the war and managed to put them by safely. There is something here that will have to be settled sooner or later by the people of the country. I think of the way in which a great many fortunes were made during the war. I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Central Information Office of the Canadian Liberal Party in 1918. We read in this pamphlet a good deal about war contract scandals, in regard to horses boots, trucks, binoculars, etc. You heard of that from almost every platform in the country. Hon. gentlemen across the way were very keen on pointing out the horrible extravagances of the government during war times; let me suggest that they now have an opportunity of having some voice with regard to the war fortunes that were made in this way. It is no less than a disgrace that while some men were asked to give their all in the time of war, and while many did give their all, as they thought, in the service of their country; while men and women all over the land worked and saved and toiled during those long years, others did not hesitate to coin money. I say it is a disgrace that they have been allowed to retain so long their ill gotten gains. Is there to be no equality of sacrifice? Mr. Speaker, we heard a good deal about conscription during the war. Men were asked to go to the front; lives were taken to be given to the service of the state. I would like to repeat here the stand that some of us took during the war: that if it is right to conscript men it is right to conscript wealth. Surely we have come to the time in our country when there

should be a levy on wealth. In the Old Country they are talking about a capital levy for the reduction or abolition of the war debt; I should like to advocate a capital levy in this country for the abolition of the war debt. That would mean at least something like equality of sacrifice.

One more point ought to be brought to the attention of the House from the labour standpoint. The Government proposes to institute a Department of Defence. I have no doubt that from the standpoint of military efficiency that is a move in the right direction, but there are other considerations than those of military efficiency. A study of the budget for the past year reveals the fact that we are paying something like $25 per head in Canada for wars past and for prospective wars. That is, according to our estimate of a family of five, $125 per family for the burden entailed by the wars of the past and the burden of preparation for wars to come. The people of this country were asked to go into this past war on the promise that it would be a war to end war. Is war ended, when now we are proposing to create a Defence Department? I think the time has come to get away from all the high-sounding phrases that we had during the war. Let us get down to business. Let us ask ourselves against whom we propose to defend ourselves. We have a large country toward the south of us—friendly neighbors; we have boasted that along that extensive front we have not had a single fort and that on those Great Lakes we have not had a single battleship. Do we propose to defend ourselves against our American cousins? If this country ever becomes a part of the United States it will not be in my judgment because the United States invades us with a military force. The Americans are buying up the country, and possibly it may come in that way. But I do not think we can say seriously that it is a practical thing for us to propose to defend ourselves against an incursion from the United States. Do we propose to defend ourselves against possible attack from Europe? To-day the enemies of Great Britain lie prostrate. I tell you there is a very real danger that having conquered militarism among certain of the peoples of Europe we should at this time be militarized. Speaking as a Canadian of some three or four generations, I say that my forefathers did not come across to this country in order that we should set up here a new feudalism or a new militarism. Are we proposing to defend ourselves against the peoples of the Orient? I had hoped that Pacific questions had been at least temporarily settled at the time of the Washington Conference. Surely we cannot in cold blood, now that the fever of war has died down, contemplate with equanimity the preparation for another war. I want to read a paragraph from an issue of the Manitoba Free Press published in my own city of Winnipeg on the 15th of October, 1921. It is not very often that the Free Press quotes me; I shall do it the honour of quoting it:

> All the information in those vast collections of war books is of the same character. It tells of loss of life, loss of health, lost of property; of unbridled violence, of premeditated and deliberate destruction of wealth. Go into any public library; go to the "war-section," and the books you pull out will tell you about "crashing shells", about "gross mutilations", about regiments being "annihilated", about cities destroyed by artillery fire, about refugee women, about homeless and starving old people and children, about forced military service, about "industrial dislocation", about financial disturbance, about war taxation, about unemployment, hunger and national destitution. As a comprehensive narration of ruin, misery and disaster, the contents of the war departments of the world's libraries are easily the greatest within human knowledge.
>
> To talk about the war being a forgotten thing of the past is to talk foolishly. The millions of unemployed on both sides of the Atlantic are one powerful reminder of the war; there are very few people who are not injured somewhere or other in their lives, and the injury comes from the war—either very obviously, as in the loss of relations, or of health, or less obviously in the increased price of commodities, or in lack of employment. Looking at it dispassionately—

And I hope that we are now able to do so.

> Looking at it dispassionately, at the miserable legacies of the war everywhere around us, at the records of the four years of battle preserved in the literature of the war, war on the very face of it is so calamitous, ruinous, and cruel, that it becomes difficult to understand how anyone would be in favour of it, it seems difficult to imagine anyone wanting to have another great war.
>
> There is no profit in war; the loser loses, the victor loses, the neutral loses, everybody loses. The last war exposed and exploded all the arguments urged on behalf of war—they were all seen to be false. Nobody gained, everybody suffered, vast numbers are suffering still; war was a failure, total and ghastly; it was left without argument or apology, something which is demonstrably a total loss to the human species.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that after the experience of those dread years of war, we should surely be looking forward to some other method of settling our international disputes than by the resort to physical

force. Two or three years ago, just after the war was over, we were all buoyed up as it were with the great hope of a new social order that was to dawn in the world. There was much talk of reconstruction, but the years have gone by and there has been a great disillusionment in the minds of many, and the reconstruction has somehow or other settled down to be more or less a reconstruction along the old lines. Yet there are many men, and I think among the younger men in Canada, who are still looking forward to a new type of life here on this North American continent and in the world as a whole. I hope that idealism has not quite gone from our midst, but as we look forward to this new world we see that there are going to be radical changes in our social system. I have sometimes said as I looked at the unemployment and the desperate straits to which thousands of my fellow-citizens were driven, that if this kind of thing went on very much longer there would undoubtedly be an outbreak of bloodshed of some kind. I am making no threat, but the whole of the warnings of history point to the fact that unless men and women and children are cared for, the whole nation inevitably suffers as the result, and my thought at this time, as we enter upon the sessions of a new Parliament is this: that as the war and the policies of the war have been swept aside, we have in this Canada of ours a wonderful chance for the working out of a great new policy. I like the spirit of some of my friends here, the Progressive members, who are determined not to play parish politics and not to play party politics any more, but who are here rather with the idea of the welfare of the country as the dominating motive in their public lives.

Mr. Speaker, we are too small a group to have very much effect in this House, I fear, but I would like to tell you that behind the divisions and, often, the crudities, of the Labour people, who are at the very foundation of the great industries of this country, there is an intense idealism, a looking forward to the period of world brotherhood, and I would not be true to that group did I not stand here at the very beginning of our parliamentary sessions and express the hope that as we work out these detailed policies for our own country, we will not lose sight of that larger hope which is inspiring at least very large numbers of the workers the world over.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House for the first time, I wish as a member from the back concessions of rural Ontario to make clear the attitude and conditions of the farmers in this province. I shall not detain the House at any great length. It is not my intention to discuss any question pertaining to the provincial government of Ontario, I shall not enter upon a discussion of the Hydro policy of Sir Adam Beck. But for a brief space of time I wish to deal with a few matters that have come under my observation which are of interest to the farmers of this province.

I have listened with delight, as a newcomer to this House, to the debate as it has progressed so far. With some of the questions that have been brought forward I am heartily in sympathy; there are others, however, that do not meet with my approval, but I shall not take up the time of the House to discuss any minor questions that have been brought forward during this debate.

It is gratifying to me, and I believe to a great many people in this Dominion, to know that in the election campaign which terminated on the sixth day of December last the women of this country had an opportunity to cast their ballot. I think we in this country were long in coming to the point where we recognized the worth of the women of our land. I think we were very slow in granting them the franchise and according them their proper place as citizens of this great Dominion. They contributed no less a part than the men in the construction and pioneer life of this country. Many of them came to Canada from the Old Land when this country was a wilderness, and they helped their husbands hew out a home, and raised families which were a credit to this Dominion. They contributed their part in the home life, and also in the social and religious activities of the community. And yet for years and years they were deprived of the franchise. But at last the women have been accorded their proper place as citizens of this country, and I join with previous speakers in expressing gratification that this House is to-day honoured with the presence of a lady member, the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). Personally I feel somewhat honoured by having the privilege of occupying the same desk as our hon. lady member. I do not know whether that honour has been conferred upon me because of my good looks, or whether it is because I am a close neighbour of the hon. member for Southeast Grey. What-

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

ever the reason may be I certainly deem it an honour to be permitted to sit in the front row in this Chamber and at the same desk as my fair colleague.

The recent Great War has brought about changes in the political attitude of many of the citizens of Canada, and I think it is because of that fact that so many farmer members occupy seats in the present Parliament. I well remember, and it will be in the recollection of many members of the House, that but a few short years ago on our side roads and back concession lines political contests were fought out largely on the lines of party politics. At that time both Liberals and Conservatives would raise the cry " Stay with your party," and on many occasions neighbours, even though their interests were identical, would often be divided by party issues almost to the breaking point. I certainly think that the Great War through which we have passed is partly responsible for the change in that respect in the rural sections of our country.

The farmers have now become organized and I do not think any one will complain because of their doing so. They have long been organized, and have long co-operated in the carrying on of commercial enterprises, and therefore it is only logical for them to advance a further step and to organize on political lines. Owing to that organization the farmers of this country have now a representation in Parliament such as they never had in the past. They have not embarked upon this political movement for the purposes of securing class legislation, although during the recent political campaign it was advanced that they had become associated for selfish purposes and to bring about laws favourable to their class. We are willing to admit that possibly there is just as much selfishness among the farmers as among any other class, but we are not willing to agree that they are more largely influenced by selfishness than any other portion of the community. We have entered into this movement in order to lay our views before the country and assist in the legislation of the Dominion. Surely it will be admitted that no persons are better able to understand the conditions of the farming industry than those who themselves are engaged in agriculture. The merchants of the country have a grasp of mercantile conditions, the manufacturers have an intimate knowledge of industrial necessities, and farmers are best fitted to understand and give expression to the conditions of farm life. We have therefore come here to help in legislating on broad and comprehensive lines and to explain as best we can the requirements of the farming community of Canada.

One thing we certainly require, and it is a necessity to which frequent allusion has been made—greater markets for our farm products. We heard a great deal of the depopulation of the rural sections of Canada, and especially of the rural sections of the province of Ontario. Certainly the latter statement is true; the rural sections of Ontario are not nearly as well populated as they formerly were. If this be the case what is the reason for it? There must be some explanation when farmers leave the farm, when farmers' sons will not remain at home but make their way to the great urban centres of the country. To my mind one great cause of that movement is the lack of adequate remuneration received by the farmers for their labour. The farmer's son is not going to remain on the farm when his city cousin receives a great deal more for his labours than he himself does. Therefore, in order to increase our farm population and augment the production on the farms, markets must be provided for our farm products. We are living in a comparatively new country, possessing immense agricultural resources as yet undeveloped. On the great prairies of the West there are thousands of acres still uncultivated which could be made to produce in abundance; and even in rural Ontario—I mean, what is known as Old Ontario—the production could be greatly enhanced. But, as I said a moment ago, men leave the farms. They do not leave the farms because those farms are a gold mine; men will not run away from a gold mine. One thing that we need is larger markets, more extensive markets for the products of our farm. How are we going to get them? We are hedged in to some extent because we have to face the Fordney Bill passed by the great nation to the south of us. Then the embargo on our cattle in the Old Country has not yet been removed. We are hopeful that by and by it will be removed; but it is still a settled fact that that embargo remains against our cattle entering the Old Country, at least they have to be slaughtered at the point of entry, and it is a handicap to the farmers in marketing the cattle because it reduces their value. Then, as far as the United States' market, which is our most natural market, is concerned, we are hedged in by the Fordney

Bill. We are looking to the present Government and hoping that they will be able to negotiate some agreement whereby we will have greater access to the market of the great nation to the south of us. True it is that we had the reciprocity agreement brought before us in 1911. True it is that it was voted down by the people of the Dominion of Canada. True it is that many of us farmers are guilty in that we did not support that reciprocity agreement. But why was it not supported, or why was it turned down? To some degree the great issue was camouflaged, and other matters were brought into that campaign of 1911 to divert the minds of the farmers from the great issue at stake, and to side-track them in some way so that they would not support the reciprocity agreement. There was a cry of "No truck nor trade with the Yankees." There was the cry that if that agreement was brought about it would be a step in the direction of annexation, and matters were introduced into that campaign that should not have been introduced, and the things had a wonderful effect in connection with the vote of many farmers in this country. But we have a different viewpoint in regard to that matter to-day. You know that after the campaign of 1911, the United States Government saw fit to remove the duty on our live stock, and our live stock went to the United States' market free. Every farmer that raised stock and every farmer that was engaged in mixed farming is well aware of the result, which was that we got an increased price for our cattle and greater advantages in marketing our stock. But when the Fordney Bill was passed we were again hedged in, and, as no doubt many honourable members of this House are quite aware, the great Union Stock Yards in the city of Toronto at times were almost overstocked with cattle, and the market price of the cattle was low. Now we are looking to the Government and hoping that they will again undertake this task, as we believe they are contemplating, in order to bring about for the farmers of this country greater advantages and an open market in the country to the south of us.

The farmers have to abide by the law of supply and demand. The greater the production the greater the supply and the lower the price. So that with our surplus products we have to compete with the open markets of the world. Just by way of illustration: About two years ago

[Mr. Woods.]

farmers in our immediate vicinity, and I think generally in the province of Ontario, received very high prices for their potatoes in the spring of the year; some of them obtained $4 and even $5 a bag for them. We often heard people making the remark that the farmers were getting wealthy. What are the facts of the case? The facts are that they did not have the supply, and many of the farmers, even with the high price of potatoes, had to buy their seed to plant that year, and had to pay the high price of $4 or $5 a bag for their seed. What was the result the year following? The year following there was an abundant supply, and the price went away down, so that they were sold at from 15 to 25 cents per bag on the open market. I personally knew farmers who drew their potatoes out and dumped them in the field, because they could not sell them at all. We are face to face with competition, the law of supply and demand, and have to accept what our products will bring on the open market.

The farmers of this country are looking for a relief in taxation. That has been referred to on more than one occasion by hon. members of this House. I refer to indirect taxation through the protective tariff that is in operation in this country. We are not looking for any favours, but we are looking for a policy that will make it easier for the poor man to live, a fiscal policy for this country that will not make the rich man richer and the poor man poorer. We are looking for relief along that line, and as the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) stated, we are looking for a revision of the tariff and we are looking for that revision to be downward.

In conclusion, I say that we, as farmers, are not concerned about politics. We are not here to build up any political party as a political party, neither the Liberal party, the Conservative party, nor the Progressive party. We are not here to build up any party as a party; we are here to support the Government or to support any party that will bring forward legislation that, we believe, will be in the interest of the great masses of this country. That is our object and our attitude as farmers, and that is the position which we occupy in this House. We want better conditions for the great masses of the people, and, as I said before, a fiscal policy that will not make the rich man richer and the poor man poorer.

Mr. THOMAS E. ROSS (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour it would seem almost a mistake that I should rise to speak on this debate. At the same time, there are a few thoughts which I wish to lay before the members of Parliament, and in availing myself of this opportunity of doing so, I shall endeavour to be brief; in fact, I may make the promise in the beginning that I will not detain hon. members any great length of time.

In the first place, I would like to refer to the fact that we have with us in this Parliament the first lady member of the House of Commons of this Dominion of Canada. I am glad to note that the situation is such that we have at the present time an opportunity of having our Canadian womanhood represented in the Parliaments of this country. I am glad to know also that the young lady member for South-east Grey (Miss Macphail) belongs to this large Progressive group of which I myself am proud to be a member. I consider that is as it should be, owing to the fact that the rights of our Canadian womanhood have been won for them by the organized farmers of Canada. The honour for bringing that about is due to the Canadian Council of Agriculture; it was through the pressure that they brought to bear that our Canadian womanhood at last received what I always contended was only their just right of which they had been deprived so long.

Yesterday afternoon, while I was listening to the speech of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), my attention was attracted by a statement which he made to the effect that the British Empire had been built up on the foundation of personal liberty, and I take it for granted that the hon. member, in speaking of personal liberty in that way, expects us to interpret it in that broad sense of having all due respect and appreciation of the rights of others as well as being careful to see that we receive our own individual rights. To my mind, the true foundation of all national life, as well as private life, rests on practical religion, which includes not only the worship of God, but brotherly treatment of our fellowmen. If we adopt this principle as the basis and the only true foundation of success, whether in private or in national life, it will have the effect of removing from our minds the thought, and from our lives the spirit, of selfishness, and of replacing it with the spirit of service. We shall then be in the proper position to be worthy representatives of the citizens of this great country of ours, who have committed to our hands the trust of guardianship, the responsibility of stewardship, and who are looking to us to see that this Parliament shall secure for the people of Canada a government by the people and in the interests of Canadian citizens as a whole. I hope and trust that we shall have that spirit of brotherly treatment of all men, and that legislation may be based upon the principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

In looking over the Speech from the Throne, I notice that reference has been made to that decline in prices of farm products for the year 1921 as compared with those which obtained in former years. It might not be out of place for me to point out in this connection, that market values of farm products are set on the basis of supply and demand and not on the basis of cost of production plus profits, as is the case of many other lines of production, also that the feature of supply and demand is so greatly affected by weather and climatic conditions, over which we have practically little or no control, that it is quite beyond the score of men who engage in agriculture to regulate the market values for their products. While this may be true as to the world's market values of the products of agriculture, there is still another feature which has much to do with determining the price received by the producer and also that paid by the consumer of these farm products which are essentially classed in the lists of the necessities of life. The price re-

11 p.m.

ceived by the producer and also that paid by the consumer are very largely determined by access to adequate markets and marketing facilities, also to the cost of transportation of the products from the producer to the available markets and of the system of distribution of the same. I might also say that I consider the system used at the present time in regard to the distribution of the natural products of agriculture is far from being satisfactory; that it operates to the direct disadvantage of the producer; that it is the means of greatly increasing the cost of living to the consumer, and that it is of profit, in most cases, only to many who have done little if anything to help along the real work of production. I would like to see the whole system of distribution investigated to the end that the producer and the consumer might be brought closer together, and that a system of co-operation

might be evolved which would work to the mutual advantage of all parties concerned. I am glad that, as intimated in the Speech from the Throne, the Government have taken account of those facts; that they are already seeking to get more favourable conditions as to the sale and marketing of the products of the farm, and that they are seeking to make arrangements with the railway authorities with respect to reduction of rates upon our agricultural commodities. I hope that this "seeking" spoken of may be brought before the House in the form of proposed legislation, and I believe it will have the strong support of all parties of the House.

There is another matter which I should like to mention, in fact it was mainly because I wished to press it upon the attention of the House that I rose to speak at this late hour. In connection with the decline in prices of farm products at the present time I desire to point out that this produces a very serious condition of affairs, in its effect upon soldier settlers. Many of our returned soldiers who risked their lives and endured so much for this country to which we belong and for the welfare of humanity as a whole, stand to lose all they had as well as to have a heavy debt hanging over them, because they became settlers under the provisions of the Soldier Settlement Act and under the conditions imposed by the Soldier Settlement Board. My own personal knowledge of and acquaintance with many of these men lead me to believe that they are honestly trying to make good. Some of them, I am free to admit, have not proved to be men who are fitted to become successful farmers, but the great majority of them, I believe, are, and I have found them to be honest in their endeavours, appreciative of the consideration and assistance given to them by members of the board, and not unreasonable in their requests. I have in my possession a number of letters from soldier settlers on the farms, and I may say that they are very reasonable. They are loyal to the board and do not in any way complain of the treatment they have received. However, they feel very bitterly the situation in which they find themselves to-day. We must remember that the farms, as well as the stock and equipment which were purchased for these men who took advantage of the Government loans provided for the purpose, were purchased during the time of the unusually high prices, and that the men are now forced to place the products of their toil and enterprise on the market at greatly reduced market value. They have no alternative, as they are forced to dispose of whatever marketable product they may have in order at least to try to meet obligations in connection with the repayment of loans received from the Government. In my opinion, viewing the situation from the standpoint of one who is, and always has been, in close practical touch with farming conditions, especially as they prevail in the province of Ontario, the annual payment which these men are required to make is too high, in many cases being entirely beyond what they can realize on the produce which they can sell, without running themselves short of feed and of seed for the succeeding crop. I sincerely hope that hon. members will give this matter their most careful and sympathetic consideration, and that some legislation may be brought forth during the present session which will very greatly remedy the serious conditions to which I have referred. I may venture to suggest, in this connection, that at least an extension of time might be made in reference to the repayment of loans for stock and equipment, and that the regulations be so changed as to provide that the repayment of the stock and equipment loan extend over a period of ten or more years instead of over a period of four years, as at present provided. I would also suggest that the time of payment be changed from the first of November to, say, the first of March of the following year. Those of us who are intimately acquainted with agricultural affairs know that the first of November is a very inopportune time at which to be compelled to meet payments. It is not necessary for me to go into details in that connection, because it is generally realized that this is the time when we are least prepared to meet payments, by reason of the pressure of fall work. We have not been able, possibly, to get our crop threshed and have not had an opportunity to feed our stock to fit them for the market. I would therefore ask that the date of payment be changed from the first of November to the first of March. Further, I would ask that an immediate and thorough investigation be made of the administration of the Soldiers' Settlement Act under present conditions. In this connection I shall read, in part, a letter which I received in my mail to-day from one of the soldier settlers:

> Since writing you I have found out that several settlers who made partial payments

last November are practically out of feed for their live stock, have no seed grain on hand nor the means to get it..

Thanks to local help I am not in quite that predicament, but I have been talking to several neighbouring farmers, and they told me that as soon as I was assured a reasonable chance of staying on, and that the amount of payments would be so revised that I would have a reasonable chance of meeting them, that I might take some bags and they would give me some seed grain, but they wanted to be sure I was to get the benefit and that it would not be seized to help cover up the deficit from buying when everything was at its height. I feel sure that unless something is done in the next two weeks, or before seeding commences, that several around here are going to notify the S.S.B. that they cannot support their families from the income from the cows and hens after buying the extra feed, and so have decided to quit and work out. The majority seem intent on going to the towns or with building contractors.

They expect to lose all they paid down and that there will still be large deficits. I believe an early announcement that those so situated might sell part of the present live stock to buy feed for the rest and seed grain where necessary, or that seed grain and feed would be supplied at once, would prevent a good deal of loss and trouble, and that the best of them would try a little harder to hang on and weather it out.

I know you have a great deal of very important business to transact, but doubt if any is much more urgent than at least an immediate investigation into this matter. The boys are thoroughly sick of red tape, but have all the old pep when they see a thing worth while.

This is an example of the letters received, and it also reveals the feeling that is prevalent among the soldier settlers. I do hope that something will be done at this session of Parliament with a view to relieving the serious situation in which these men are placed. In the constituency of North Simcoe, which I have the honour to represent, there are a number of soldier settlers. This letter which I have just read was entirely unexpected. It does not come from any soldier settler in my riding, but it brings its own message, and is a statement of the actual condition in which these men are placed.

In reference to the re-establishment, medical treatment, and vocational training for former members of the Canadian forces, I feel that nothing should be omitted which might be done to safeguard the interests and promote the general welfare of our returned men. I would especially urge that immediate provision be made for those classes of ex-service men who have been rendered unemployable through war service, and who are at present without adequate means of support; also that suitable provision be made for their dependents as well as the dependents of those reported missing. This is a matter that closely touches me in my relationship with the riding I represent. We have many in that constituency of the class I have mentioned, and I feel that we cannot do too much for them.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is one which possibly, I think, will not be very popular with hon. members. In that, however, I may be surprised. It affords me great pleasure, in speaking on the subject of economy, to note that the Government has taken into serious consideration the question of retrenchment in the administration of the public affairs of the country, I hope that the bill to be submitted regarding the Department of Militia and Defence, and the co-ordination of the various branches of defence forces under one ministerial head, may become law. We all realize the very urgent need of strict economy in the management of the affairs of our country at this time. In this connection may I be permitted to suggest that a good place to start on the road to practical economy in public life is with our own individual personal interests. It seems to me that we might well give proof of our sincerity in this matter by introducing legislation to reduce our present sessional indemnity from $4,000 to the former amount of $2,500, and I for one am prepared to support the Government on the introduction of such a legislation. I am fully aware that the labourer is worthy of his hire and I realize also that the cheapest man so far as salary is concerned is often the dearest man in the end when ability and efficiency are taken into account. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that the increase of $1,500 in the sessional indemnity was not justifiable at the time it was made, nor is it justifiable in the face of existing market conditions as we know them to be. As I have said, therefore, I for one am prepared to support any legislation brought forward to reduce the indemnity. I may add that this suggestion is an entirely voluntary one on my part; I am in no way under obligation to my constituency to act in the matter, and they have not at any time asked me to bring it up or even suggested that I should do so. My constituents elected me not because of any pre-election promises, for I never made any, but because they were thoroughly tired of what they had been receiving in the past and were looking forward to obtaining a government by the people, an administration which would

bring down measures in the interests of the citizens of Canada as a whole. I am glad that in looking back over the events of our campaign in North Simcoe I can say that so far as the Progressive party was concerned that campaign was confined entirely to leading questions of policy and to the public questions of the day, and that we did not stoop to personalities of any kind.

In concluding, I must confess that I am inclined to be quite optimistic as to the sincerity of the intentions of the Government as set forth in the Speech from the Throne. I hope that this session may prove to be one of true co-operation on the part of all parties in the House to bring forth legislation which shall be for the advancement of our nation as a whole.

I desire to thank the hon. members for their courtesy and the patience with which they have listened to me at this late hour.

On the motion of Mr. Baxter the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Wednesday, March 15, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, March 14.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and St. John and Albert Counties) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, allow me to offer you my congratulations upon your elevation to the Speaker's Chair. You do honour to your race and I therefore join with others who have spoken in congratulating you. I regret not being able congratulate you. I regret not being able to perfectly understand the French language when it is spoken. I have read the speech of the hon. member for Westmount and St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) and I congratulate him on his eloquence.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried, though in an imperfect way to signalize at the first opportunity I have had of addressing this Chamber, that great wealth which I think pertains particularly to the Dominion of Canada in that it is so much richer than the rest of this continent in possessing the, I hope, united efforts of two great races, with two great languages, and, one might almost say, two great philosophies, and two great aspirations. I trust that we may so conduct the business of this Parliament that any shadow of difference that may have existed in the past may be dissipated and that we may go forward with a more happy vision of the future of Canada, our own Canada, which can only be great in proportion as her sons and her daughters know one another and respect each race, each creed, each portion of the country for that which is best in its aspirations and ideals.

I speak, too, from the standpoint of a party which is by no means yet dead in this country, even though its strength in this House does not proportionately represent its strength in the country. I speak as the member of a party that looks back to those great men, Macdonald and Cartier, who in an infinitely more powerful way than I could do, put before the people of Canada the things that I shall humbly try to express to-day. That spirit still lives in the Conservative party, and the country will yet see its strength, because we are a party that holds true to the old aspirations, a party with a definite and a fixed policy, so that the man or woman in this country who is asked to pass judgment upon our professions knows exactly what those professions are. They do not vary with the longitude and the latitude of the place where they are expressed.

I do not wish to detain the House very long; I merely wish to pass briefly in review some of the things that have impressed me in the debate so far as it has gone. I think that there developed during the discussion three principal questions. The main question seemed to be the railways; second, the revenue required to meet our obligations; and third, possibly incidental to one of the others, the reflection upon that general depression of business which unfortunately prevails and the distress which is actually consequent upon it in some localities. I heard my right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) call attention to those matters in his discussion of the Speech from the Throne and I awaited with interest the reply which would be made by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King), the leader of the Government. I expected that there would be a fuller disclosure of the purposes of the

Government than naturally would be made in the speeches, excellent as they were, made by the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply. I expected an amplification of the Speech from the Throne. But, what did I find? I have tried to summarize honestly and fairly the topics touched upon by the leader of the administration. I do not know whether it would be in answer to the comments of my right hon. leader on this side of the House upon the railways, upon revenue, or upon business conditions, but the leader of the Government made as his first important statement, "Quebec is not the only province you lost." Now, really, I do not see how that can dispose of any important question. The people have spoken and this party must, as it does, accept the verdict of the people, and does, as it shall, build for the future to convince those people that they should give a more favourable verdict upon another occasion; but I fail to see how the mere assertion that the party of which I am a member lost the support of any province in the Dominion helps the people of this country to solve the question of the management of the national railways, or tells them particularly what the future of the revenue will be. It may be very good tactics from the purely party standpoint, but it seems to me that this House would perhaps be quite as ready to welcome a discussion of the vital matters of to-day, matters which those on this side of the House have been sent here to discuss, matters which have caused unrest among the people, and which must be dealt with, and dealt with rightly and successfully, if our country is to have a future such as we desire. If the leader of the Government wished to place the discussion upon the plane of party politics, if he wished to place it upon the plane of—one might almost say, with all respect—stump speaking, he might at least have balanced the account by informing the House how many actual supporters he himself has from the three Western provinces; and it might not be out of place to make an analysis of the reasons why my hon. friend has not a larger following from these provinces. It is true, members supporting this side were not elected there, but has my hon. friend been successful? The leader of the Government did enter into a calculation based upon the election returns, a calculation in which, I think, his arithmetic has betrayed him into a slight error; because if you apply the principle of proportional representation, as was suggested, I think by the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), or some other hon. member during the debate, it will be ascertained that the Conservative party is entitled to a very much larger representation in this House than it possesses at present. My hon. friend said that the entrance of a third party gave the Conservative party in many cases the opportunity for victory; but he will find that in many constituencies which his own party carried, their success was very largely due to the same fact—I am told, his own constituency, for example. I do not know whether down by the sea it is only a wraith of political mist, but something drifted to us there in the atmosphere—perhaps it came over from Prince Edward Island—that there would not have been entire sorrow or great heartburning in my hon. friend's party if there had been a minority instead of a majority for him in North York. This appears to be the first point that my hon. friend made in answer to the leader of the Opposition.

The second point he made was when he told the leader of the Opposition: Oh, we should not take campaign literature too seriously. I trust, Sir, that that statement was meant in a jocular sense. If my hon. friend was in earnest it will be well worth the time of this House, and the time of the country, to analyze the statement and to consider what it really means in the political life of Canada. To-day if you go into another chamber in this building you will see upon the walls representations—somewhat crude it is true but still representations—of the power of the printed word; and every member of this House knows that there is nothing more potent in electoral contests than that which appears in the periodical press and in the pamphlets that are issued by the respective political parties. Now, Sir, if it has really come to this, that we should not take these things seriously; if the pamphlets and the newspaper publications issued in behalf of a party are mere trash, and wind, and idle show, then what sincerity can we expect in political life? I will say this, Mr. Speaker—that so far as the literature issued in the last campaign on the part of the official Opposition is concerned, it said exactly the thing that we meant. We put before the people that for which we were standing and what we proposed to do if we were returned to power. It is because of that in a large part of the country we did not get sufficient votes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: Under the influences that were at work the people did not want our policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: It is so pleasant, Mr. Speaker, to find hon. members on the opposite side in such cordial agreement with me that I will invite them to continue that attitude. I accept that agreement and I trust that my hon. friends in the future will make good use of it. I will say for the Progressive party that they too used no camouflage and no subterfuge in putting their case before the country. Our party and their party did not agree on vital principles of public administration, and the electors that supported the one group of candidates would not support the other group; we were not standing for free trade, we were not standing for the abolition of tariff barriers.

My hon. friends opposite have welcomed the suggestion I made, that the country did not accept our policy. Let us for a moment examine the reason why the country accepted their pamphlets;—I will not say, their policies, because their leader has told us that these things are only idle words, representations, apparently, for the purpose of catching the votes of the people by a means which does not bind anyone to make good the suggestions or promises contained in the printed word. Now, viewing the case in this way why was it that my hon. friends to your right, Mr. Speaker, did not win in many more provinces and did not win many more constituencies? We had throughout the campaign repeated assurances from the present leader of the Government that there was practically no difference in aim between his party and the Progressive party, or between the platform of the Liberal party and that of the Progressive party. We were told the Progressive party went a little further but that it was a more advanced form of Liberalism; and the other day there was some discussion as to whether this was merely a tendency or an attitude. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely plain. The Progressives did not support my hon. friends opposite because they did not believe those gentlemen would keep the promises they professed to make. If the Progressives had had faith that hon. gentlemen opposite would go so far along the road of the Progressivist doctrine as they claimed naturally they would have supported them, every man; but I fear the Progressives knew they could not trust them.

The leader of the Government gave as a third answer to the leader of the Opposition the claim that the present House is representative of the people. I know that we have gone through all the formalities of the ballot, expressing the will of the people in a constitutional way; but I would rather think that this House, in some respects, is perhaps representative of the will of some people who stepped into the campaign at a rather late date and had a very invigorating effect upon it from that time until the polls closed, and I think this will develop a little later on. Though we have been told that we are to look to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) for a declaration upon the railway question as it affects the country, I think very probably there will be more postponements, and that possibly there may be consultations, and many consultations, with those interests which so greatly affected the result of the elections in the way that I have indicated. I hope the Parliament is representative of the people. I know there are some people who will not fail to have their interests well indicated in Parliament.

My. hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) dealt with the return to the Prairie provinces of their natural resources, an interesting subject, and one which has been before the country for a considerable time. I shall not attempt to emphasize that which has been very well said by my leader, but I would like to deal with this subject for a moment, not from a provincial standpoint, but rather from the attitude taken towards the subject by the people of the provinces. I feel that the subject is one which ought to be approached in a large and capable way. There should be generous appreciation, there should be fair dealing; but, at the same time, unless we are to see an abandonment of the last shred and vestige of Liberalism in this country, we surely will retain that respect for the provinces as autonomous units, which was so much enforced by the Liberal party in Ontario, and by those great men who were sent to this House in times gone by representing the Liberal party. Here is what I find fault with: Whether you call it an arbitration or not, or whether you call it an accounting or not, or whether it is final or whether it is not to be final, the proposition as I analyze it from what the leader of

the House has put upon Hansard, is simply this: that he or his Government, or someone for them, shall sit in at an accounting, or an arbitration, or a conference of some kind, with the provinces interested and then submit the result of that to this House for approval. What then becomes of the right to be heard of the old Maritime provinces, by whose sacrifices and contributions the development of the great northwestern portion of our country was made possible. I do not say, from the standpoint of New Brunswick, that anything short of absolute and complete justice should be done to each province or one province—that ought to go in this country without saying; but I do say that, if there is to be a revision of the terms, this Parliament ought not to pass upon what is done for the parent provinces of the Dominion without hearing these provinces. Where, in this proposition, is there any opportunity for an accounting of the burden that has been borne by Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick? Where is there a suggestion of any revision of the terms that they are to receive, or that they have been receiving in the past? I know—and I have said it myself once—that I could get along splendidly with anybody, that all I wanted in this world was just to have my own way, and if I got that I did not want anything else. That is all we want in the Maritime provinces—if you will just give us our own way in the sense of giving us a fair, square deal when you are dealing with other parts of the Dominion, and if you will undertake not to decide matters behind our backs, but realize that we have a right to sit in with any consultation that may be undertaken, I can see my way clear to be in accord with some solution of this problem. But neither the Speech from the Throne nor the explanations given by the hon. Prime Minister of this particular passage throws any light in the direction I have indicated. I throw out the hint to him knowing his good nature, and I think possibly he will be quite willing to act upon it.

Possibly the fifth point that was made by my hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) was in connection with the dispute with my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) on this side of the House as to what took place at a certain conference in London. I am not going to deal with that. It will be effectively dealt with probably on some other occasion. I only want to say this: that if we have fair play, if we have that appreciation in public life of the real efforts of devoted public servants, this country, and this House—the three sides of this House—will join in paying tribute to my hight hon. leader for the stand that he took when he insisted, with respect to the great international matters, that this country and the United States should come together in consultation, and that no world policy should develop unless there was first laid down the principle of harmonious co-operation with our great neighbour to the south. This country has shown an admirable example. For more than a century it has been untouched internally by the ravages of war, and nothing, I think, in the present heterogeneous condition of the European countries will save this old world from the utter wreck and ruin, and bankruptcy of war, but the great alliance of Great Britain with her dominions, I might say with the galaxy of equal states, and the United States of America joining hand in hand to enforce upon the world the simple law that there shall be no more murder.

Mr. PUTMAN: And no trade reciprocity.

Mr. BAXTER: I think I would even go that for the satisfaction of my hon. friend. His leader referred to the former speeches on the subject of the tariff which he said had not been implemented by action, but at the same time I think it was the boast of the party, a member of which has just touched upon this subject, that now, for the first time in many long years, constitutional government had been restored to Canada. With the realization of constitutional government one would expect, of course, the disappearance of that autocratic mystery in regard to the speeches from the Throne to which my hon. friend so much objects. This was a time for a new beginning. The old autocracy, I will say, has only given place to the new. I will commend that to the judgment of my hon. friend who asked me to refer to this subject. May I ask that hon. friend of mine if he is not really in his innermost heart, or somewhere in the deep recesses of his mind, just a little disappointed with the paucity of the Speech from the Throne, and the remarks of his leader upon this subject. I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance as yet, but I hope to make it. However I have

not the slightest doubt he was present at the Ottawa convention, and I have not the slightest doubt that he enthusiastically cheered the platform and that no part of the platform appealed to him with greater force than that bearing on the customs tariff of the country, except possibly the paragraph which bound the party, in the most solemn manner, to put that platform into force at the first opportunity they had of doing so. I have not the slightest doubt that he applauded, either in this House or out of it, the efforts which were made on at least two successive occasions on the then Opposition side to present that platform by resolution in this House and to ask the House to adopt it. This party which has succeeded to power, so suddenly and possibly so unexpectedly, is not like an aggregation of individuals coming together for the first time to shape a policy. They had their policy for more than two years before they got an opportunity of putting it into force. The thing is all ready-made, just as ready-made as one of the nicest suits of political garments in the hand-me-down store of politics. Why did they not bring the article down and lay it on the table of the House at the opening of the session? They did not need any time to stitch it, or alter it, or baste it, or do anything else with it. They had it ready for two years, and if they really meant what they said when they went to the country, then their political literature was not mere camouflage, and they ought to be ready at this very hour to put into force the tariff planks of the Ottawa convention. Another convention is not required to bring that about. We have, however, possibly the first of a long array of excuses that will be offered during this Parliament and several successive Parliaments. We are told that we should not take this class of literature too seriously.

To my hon. friend who asked me about reciprocity, I commend the devious course which the Government that he adorns is beginning to pursue so early in the session. As to reciprocity, I will tell him, as he probably already knows, that the party of which I am a member, does not stand for reciprocity, and we told the people so. There was a celebrated occasion when his party told the people that they were in favour of reciprocity, and at that time the people did not think they were sidestepping; the people thought they were going to bring reciprocity into effect, and they did not give them an opportunity to do so. I do not see why I cannot do business in my shop, and another man have a right to do business in his shop across the street; I do not see why we cannot compete justly and honourably, each man looking after his own business, each man trying to support from that business those who are dependent upon him, without the one man sacrificing his business to the other to make the latter more opulent and the man who makes the sacrifice more dependent. That is my view of what reciprocity with the United States means; but it is not necessary that people who will not make a treaty of reciprocity should ever contemplate the horrors of war as a means of settling their commercial differences. I might tell my hon. friend that I have a bit of this poor, discarded, rejected literature. When this whitey-brownish sheet first came out, probably it was whiter than it is now.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not headed "Meighen or Whom"? What is the caption of the pamphlet?

Mr. BAXTER: My hon. friend shall have the caption; he shall have the address, and, Heaven help him, he shall have the contents. The caption is "Women and Politics". The address is "National Liberal Committee, 115 Sparks Street, Ottawa." Then there are the names—"Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P., Liberal leader, Andrew Haydon, National Organizer and General Secretary, issued October 1921, publication No. 20". This pamphlet makes an appeal to the women of the country. It first takes a hypothetical price for a pair of shoes, and then it says—I am going to give my hon. friends an opportunity to applaud:

> Mr. King thinks first of the people and secondly of the industry: All the people are greater than a few manufacturers. Mr. King stands for all the people.

And the phrase "all the people" is in capital letters.

> Mr. King is against high protection. In the example of the pair of boots just referred to, Mr. Meighen would stand for the manufacturer getting 50 cents for himself on each pair of boots. That is the tariff should be 50 cents per pair. But Mr. King would say, No.

A great big capital "No.", just as emphatic as anybody would want to make it. I commend this to the attention of the hon. gentleman who was so interested a moment ago. Let him listen to these words that follow:

> Twenty cents a pair is enough.

Do not give the bloated manufacturer fifty cents a pair; give him twenty cents. Take it out of the people just the same! It is a song of degrees. My hon. friends on either side of the House I notice, are not familiar enough with a certain book to appreciate the remark "a song of degrees." The pamphlet continues:

> Let the manufacturer have this amount to aid his industry, but let the other thirty cents per pair be allowed to the woman who buys the boots, making the price to her $5.20 instead of $5.50.

Mr. Speaker, just as one man to another, do you not think, and does the House not think, that looks very much like thirty cents? But we get a little further on a bit of the policy of the great party which has come into power. Before I go on to that, let me read this which is even more interesting:

> The twenty cents per pair as duty collected against foreign goods will still go to the Government in customs duties. This explains the difference between a tariff for protection and a tariff for revenue.

My right hon. leader has never been able to understand the difference between them, the very thing that has been explained in this pamphlet, so I am going to hand it to him, just as it has been put out by the Liberal party. The difference is just thirty cents. The pamphlet states:

> But, someone argues, that on such a reduction of duties the customs revenue will fall and the Government will fail to get money with which to carry on. The answer is reasonable lowering of tariff duties and means a great increase in trading. A great increase in buying by the consumer, because he can get much more for his money and consequently a sure increase in Government revenue.

That is some of the literary pabulum that was distributed amongst the ladies of Nova Scotia as an invitation to vote for the Liberal party, and they did so.

I do not know whether they will be quite so well satisfied when they are told that they should not have taken this too seriously. But they have taken it seriously, because they voted accordingly. Now, let us see what happens. The answer is, lowering of tariff duties means a great increase in trading. A great increase in trading with whom? With somebody beyond our borders; otherwise there could not be any customs duties paid upon these shoes or any other articles that are referred to. Now we have this party, which sought power and obtained it, saying, if they are to be bound by their assertions at all, that it is a desirable thing to have the footwear of Canadian people made outside of Canada by other hands than those of Canadian workmen. If that is their doctrine, and it seems to be, I for one do not subscribe to it; I am a protectionist in order that there may be industries within our cities. Furthermore, respecting agriculture as undoubtedly I do, I do not conceive it to be in the best interests of the country that we should become merely an agricultural people, without as large an industrial development as it is possible for us to create. I believe that the one reacts upon the other; if you give the proper safeguard to manufacturing industry you thereby stimulate your agriculture and increase your home market thus developing the country within its own bounds. My face is therefore set against any current running in the direction of large imports of those things which we can make for ourselves. Before they get through with the task of squaring the circle, the task of doing the impossible, my hon. friends will hear from the great and powerful industrial province of Quebec, that the industries of that province shall not be destroyed merely in order that a pamphlet like this may be vindicated before the folk in the provinces down by the sea. In the light of that I can understand why the leader of the Government begs and prays my right hon. leader not to take campaign literature too seriously.

We were also given, as the seventh and, I think, the last point of answer to my right hon. friend, a definition of Liberalism. It was liberal enough to include, I thought, this world and a great part of the next,—of course, there is a certain part of the next world that I wholly expect to be reserved for those with whom I am associated.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: Hon. gentlemen opposite know, of course, that I mean Heaven; I know that there is something else in their minds. Now, we have as an answer to the criticism of my right hon. friend, an extract from a speech made by the leader of the Government at the Liberal convention, a very nice quotation couched in most excellent language and read very mellifluously. But my mind seized, to a certain extent, upon one small paragraph wherein, in accepting the heavy task of leadership, my hon. friend said that he might look for guidance and counsel to the great forces assembled about him. In what I am about

to say I do not mean to be in the least offensive, nor do I pretend to draw an exact parallel. However, I could not help thinking, in this connection, of a certain bit of historical language that is to be found in one of the most celebrated of British novels. We have all enjoyed reading of, and have sympathized with, the tribulations of poor little Oliver Twist, and no doubt hon. members will all recall the occasion when Oliver found himself in the house of Fagin on that eventful morning when the old man with the red hair and white eyebrows walked up and down the side of the room imitating a gentleman looking in the shop windows. It will be remembered that the old man had a number of articles of value about his person, among other things a stickpin, of paste diamond, in his necktie. The Artful Dodger and Master Charley Bates were on the scene, and the trick was to see how much they could take away from the old fellow without his feeling their touch. Fagin, calling Oliver's attention to this performance, used this language respecting the great forces that were assembled about Oliver: "Make 'em your models, my dear, make 'em your models. Do everything they bid you, and take their advice in all matters, especially the Dodger's, my dear. He will be a great man himself and will make you one too, if you take pattern by him." Now, I do not know who is the Dodger on the other side; I will leave that for my hon. friends to find out. I do not think the Artful Dodger was present at the Liberal convention, when my hon. friend accepted the duties of leadership, I think he appeared upon the scene shortly before the election. Some of us, no doubt, can see the way in which he appeared, and the very useful influence his presence had on the results. But I again advise my hon. friend to take pattern after the Dodger; it will be very useful for him to do so in the strategic policy which will have to be pursued with regard to some very interesting matters of state during the next few years.

Those sum up, I think not unfairly—I do not mean them to be unfair at all events—the professed answers of my hon. friend to my right hon. leader. But at the outset I said that, as well as I could discover, there were about three principal questions before the House. The first of these is the question of railways. As was said yesterday by an hon. member on this side of the House, the act is there; and the machinery is ready to be put in force, what is the use of talking about co-ordination unless you co-ordinate? The power is there to do it now; it does not need Parliament to do it. "Solvitur ambulando" is the best answer to a good many political questions.

In dealing with the railways I want to deal with something that is of peculiar interest to part of the Maritime provinces. I believe that in what I am about to say I shall have the wholehearted sympathy, and, I trust, the support of my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) and also of every other member from New Brunswick who sits on your right, Mr. Speaker. During the campaign a very strenuous attack was made upon the then Government party for its alleged actions with regard to the harbour of Portland, Maine. I felt, in fact I knew, that the newspaper allegations were not based upon facts. I want to say to my hon. friends that the problem now is theirs, a problem which otherwise the preceding Government must have faced. From the standpoint of the city of St. John, where millions of the money of the taxpayers of that city had been expended, as well as many other millions of the money of the Dominion of Canada, for the provision of wharves and railway facilities, I say, that the time has come to do our business through Canadian ports; and if we are to have the obligation upon us of a vast railway system, we should at all events get for Canadian ports, and for no other than Canadian ports, every pound of freight and every passenger that that system of railways can carry. When the hon. Minister of Railways does deal with this subject in the House, I trust we shall have an assurance that this Government will practically cut off the connection between Montreal and Portland, Maine, and will divert the traffic to our two great winter ports—ports that are fairly well equipped, but will stand better equipping yet—the ports of Halifax and St. John. I would not like the Government to think that there is any rivalry between our Atlantic seaboard ports in regard to this question. Our true position is to insist here with all the power at the command of every one of us from the Maritime provinces that Canadian trade, as was said by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, shall flow through Canadian channels; and, to ensure this, we must develop not only the ports of Halifax and St. John but, in time, other ports in these provinces, to take care of the immense

trade which this country will produce. But when this system of railways is co-ordinated we must not continue to utilize an outlet in the country to the south of us to the detriment of our own ports.

I did not find in what has been said any very definite suggestion as to the raising of revenue, outside of the casual allusion to the customs tariff. I do find in some speeches made by the leader of the Government during the campaign that he estimated the annual expenditure of Canada at about $560,000,000, and he said that it would be advisable to cut it down one-half, or that at least one-
4 p.m. third might be lopped off if one-half were too much. Now, while I want to see a policy of reasonably rigorous economy enforced, I should like at some time a fairly detailed account of the method by which the lopping off of expenses is to be achieved. I fancy that when my hon. friends come down to a minute study of the situation, no matter how vigorous their efforts may be, they will find the difference between the practical necessary expenditure and that which has prevailed in the past is not nearly so great as they were wont to imagine it to be when they were going about the country giving reasons why the people should support them at the polls. If we are to have lower customs duties it will require, as the little Halifax pamphlet indicated, a very vast increase in the quantity of importations in order to raise the bulk of the revenue from the customs, a thing that I shall feel very sorry for, and I think the whole industrial portion of the country will join in my sorrow, because it means that for every dollar raised in customs duties an opportunity will be lost to Canadian workmen to manufacture the needed goods at home. However, I await some announcement as to how the Government is going to curtail expenditure and also increase revenue.

I do not know how it appeals to hon. members, but possibly some have given a little consideration to the state of business in the principal centres of Canada. I do not want to point to any gloomy outlook, I do not want by any word of mine to add to any feeling of insecurity that may be felt in some quarters at present, but as practical, sensible men I think we all know that in the cities throughout the Dominion there are a great many business houses just wavering and supported by the banks in the hope of trade revival than there have been for a great many years. Considering this, coupled with the fact that we realize that in every large centre of population, yes, in every fairly large centre of population, there is considerable unemployment, considerable real distress, I would suggest that possibly we have been spending a little too much on frills, laces, fol-de-rols and show, in this very House, in connection with this very Parliament.

While I take the stand on protection that I do—and I cannot see anything that is likely to change my mind with respect to that as a sound policy for the country—I cannot be oblivious to the fact that all over Canada, outside of the question of the tariff, the plain every day men and women have become dissatisfied with the methods of administration of the past, no matter by what party those methods were pursued, and those people do not want mere glitter and show. We may think them mistaken in some of the views they enunciate, but down at the bottom of all is the desire somehow or other to get for this country a dollar's worth—real worth in the old Scotch sense—for every dollar that is expended, as well as equality of opportunity for every man, woman and child who is happy enough to dwell within our borders. I sympathise with that feeling, I believe that all of us have got to take it into account more and more in the future, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the country will be better and happier the nearer we get down to those old bedrock principles—to the homely virtues of ordinary common honesty and decent living.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, will you permit me at the commencement of the brief remarks which I intend to make, to offer my congratulations to you, Sir? You and I came into this House many years ago on the same day, and at that time we were, I think, the two youngest members of the House. I regret to say that in this House only three then elected, besides your good self and myself, are with us. Memories have endeared the friendship which existed in a personal way between your Honour and myself, and no one in this House is more pleased than I to see you to-day occupying the position of First Commoner of Canada.

I have listened with close attention to the remarks of my good friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Baxter). He and I have occupied many platforms and addressed many audiences upon subjects dear to our hearts, one of those subjects being the rights of the Maritime provinces, but I regret in

the eloquent speech which he has just delivered, my hon. friend did not devote some of his attention to the great interests that lie within those provinces, particularly the operation of the Intercolonial railway.

My hon. friend has regretted very much that a line has been acquired, leading to Portland. He states this Government should get rid of the line between Montreal and Portland in order that Canadian seaports shall not be endangered. My hon. friend will be surprised to know that when, in 1920, the Grand Trunk was being acquired by the late Government, and a resolution was moved by a Liberal member of this House seeking to protect the Maritime ports of Canada, his leader (Mr. Meighen) and every follower behind him helped to vote that resolution down.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He is young yet.

Mr. LOGAN: Now, when he is out of power, he tells us to get rid of this horrible port of Portland that is going to do so much harm to the Maritime provinces. My hon. friend also told us that the party to which he belongs is not dead. Is there need to proclaim in this House that that party is not actually dead? It was not dead, he said, it was the same old party of Macdonald and Cartier.

If I may be permitted to read in that connection part of an editorial published in a good Tory organ last evening, I think the answer will be found to my hon. friend's statement. It is an editorial from a paper admired very much by the Conservative party in years gone by—the Montreal Daily Star.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Loaves and fishes.

Mr. McKENZIE: You have not got any now.

Mr. LOGAN: The editorial reads in part:

> What brought the Unionist Government to disaster was stupid, inconsistent, un-Conservative leadership. Conservative feeling throughout the country was discouraged, disgusted and dismayed.

I commend that to my hon. friend's attention.

> It saw policies which it had always been taught by its great leaders to regard as economic heresy eagerly adopted and warmly advocated by the presumed "Conservative" leader. It saw State socialism preached as Conservative doctrine—

Now listen.

> —a flagrant reversal of principle which should have made Sir John Macdonald turn over in his grave.

[Mr. Logan.]

Yet my friend has the temerity to say this is the party of Macdonald and Cartier.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to devote my attention to a matter which I think is of vital importance. Our good friend the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Crerar) stated, in the admirable speech which he delivered the other day, that we should get down to business and talk about things which are really vital to the welfare of this country. I desire now to discuss the question of the Intercolonial railway, and I shall confine my remarks to the position of that railway in Canada. I do so for many reasons, one being the gross lack of knowledge that seems to permeate the whole country in reference to the Intercolonial railway. When we in the Maritime provinces speak of what we believe to be our rights, we are immediately assailed by people who say we desire to bring back the old patronage system, bring the road back into politics. There is not a member of this House, at least on this side, Mr. Speaker, who desires to bring the Intercolonial railway back into politics, and there is no man on this side of the House who desires it should be operated as it was many years ago.

As far as the employment of men on the Intercolonial railway is concerned the statements made only show the lack of knowledge of people who discuss this matter, because the facts are that the men on the Intercolonial railway are employed, not at the dictation of a political party or its adherents, not even at the dictation of a minister, but very largely at the dictation of the labour unions of the country. Whoever says that we in the Maritime provinces are anxious that the road should be a political road or that we desire to exercise patronage in connection with it does not know what he is talking about. As far as my experience goes, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties of patronage are never welcome to any member of Parliament supporting the Government.

But there is a vital question for the Maritime provinces, and that is the management and operation of this road. My good friend the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) speaking in this House yesterday and referring to the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919, stated that that Act was passed in view of the fact that we had the Intercolonial railway and others. The hon. gentleman does not know, and there do not seem to be many people in this country who do know, that the Canadian National Rail-

way Act never did absorb the Intercolonial railway, and never could absorb it under the constitution of this country. Does my hon. friend not know that the Intercolonial railway to-day is operated under an Order in Council? There could not be a statute passed to take over the Intercolonial railway and place it under any company, be it known as the Canadian National Railway Company or any other, because, as I shall show, the Intercolonial railway is part of the pact of Confederation and guaranteed under a section of the British North America Act.

What did the late government do? They passed an Order in Council providing that the managers of the Intercolonial railway should be—mark you, not the directors of the Canadian National Railway—but the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway, and even afterwards when they endeavoured to put the name "Canadian National Railway" upon the cars, the signs, the paper, etc., of the Intercolonial Railway—not only "Canadian National Railway" but those old and familiar if not always welcome letters "C.N.R."—they found they required to pass an Order in Council, a copy of which I now hold in my hand, showing that the name was simply for purposes of identification. Let me read a part of the Order in Council to which I refer.

Canadian National Railway

At the Government House at Ottawa, Friday the 20th day of December, 1918

Present:

His Excellency
The Governor-General in Council:

Whereas the Minister of Railways and Canals reports that by the Order-in-Council dated the 20th day of November, 1918 (P.C. 2654) the persons, from time to time comprising the Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company (Which controls and operates the Canadian Northern Railway System) were appointed a Board of Management of the Canadian Government Railways;

That as a matter of convenience in connection with the operation of both systems under one management, the use of one name as a collective or descriptive title for both systems is highly desirable, and refers to the established use of the term "Canadian Northern Railway System" as a descriptive (but not corporative) title for all lines of railway owned or controlled by the Canadian Northern Railway Company and also to the use of the name Canadian Government Railways, which is also merely one of description;

That the use of such a title is a mere matter of description for convenience of reference and does not create a new legal corporate entity or affect in any manner whatsoever the legal status or the rights or obligations of the individual corporations collectively so denoted.

Therefore His Excellency the Governor-General in Council is pleased to order and direct and doth hereby order and direct the Board of Directors aforementioned to use as a collective or descriptive designation the name "Canadian National Railways," in lieu of the names Canadian Northern Railway System and Canadian Government Railways wherever such last mentioned names are or may be at present used—

And so on. With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, let me trace the history of the Intercolonial railway because it is highly desirable the facts should be brought to light in the discussion of these matters. Do not, I implore you, be carried away by the idea that we in the Maritime provinces are influenced by selfishness. Before I resume my seat I will show you that we are only demanding our rights and not asking for any charity from this country.

What is the history of the Intercolonial? The road was suggested after the Rebellion of 1837. Lord Durham, in his wonderful report of 1838, recommended that this road should be built for military purposes, and in 1849 an Imperial Commission investigated the proposition. In their report it was declared that while the building of the railway might be justified for political and military reasons, its commercial value was doubtful.

From the standpoint of the Maritime provinces let me tell you what the conditions were previous to 1867. We were a very prosperous people. We were dealing with our natural market the New England States of America. From the little province of Nova Scotia went forth three thousand ships, manned by 19,000 sturdy seamen, carrying our goods to the New England States and bringing goods back from those states to our province. Let me give you a few figures illustrating the condition of trade in the Maritime provinces at that time. In 1864 the trade in New Brunswick, that is the per capita trade, was $66; in Nova Scotia it was $46; in Canada that is Old Canada, it was only $35, showing the prosperous condition of our country, at any rate in comparison to the condition of Old Canada.

We did not desire Confederation; we thought the difficulties involved were too great. Probably one of the greatest optimists, as well as one of the greatest leaders of Canada, was my illustrious predecessor in the representation of the county of Cumberland, the late Sir Charles Tupper. But in a speech made in the House of Assembly in 1864 that distinguished statesman, after moving a resolution in favour of Maritime union, said:

"The difficulties of Confederation with Canada are insuperable." What were those difficulties? They were difficulties of distance, difficulties of transportation. We had a sure market with the New England States; we feared the tariff policies of Canada. We feared that the tariff between this country and the United States might be raised. Our fear never reached the point of thinking the duties would be raised as high as they are to-day, but nevertheless we feared the tariff that might be imposed by the United States against Canada.

Sir Charles Tupper, and the other leaders in the Maritime provinces, called a convention at Charlottetown in 1864 and for what purpose? For the purpose of bringing about Maritime union—that is union of the three Maritime provinces. While the convention was in progress probably the greatest galaxy of statesmen that ever entered a harbour of the Maritime provinces landed in Charlottetown. Who were they? Such men as Sir John A. Macdonald, the great leader of the Conservative party; Hon. George Brown, the illustrious and great leader of the Liberal party; D'Arcy McGee, the incomparable Irish orator and statesman; Sir George Etienne Cartier, the wonderful French leader of Quebec; Sir Etienne P. Taché, the prime minister of Canada at that time; Sir Hector Langevin, and a number of other distinguished public men. They came to our little Maritime Union Convention and said: Come in with us. We asked why? "Because," they said, "we have reached an impassé in Canada between Quebec and Ontario. We have not done any business for three years." I think according to the statement made by Sir Etienne P. Taché, which I will read later on, they had had five changes of government in three years They said: "We desire Maritime ports. We cannot make of Canada a great country without access to the sea throughout the entire year." They held out the railway bait to the delegates of the Maritime provinces, and after some time Sir Charles Tupper, and the other Maritime province leaders, agreed to discuss the matter with them.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, recall some of the remarks which were made at that time and which constituted the bait to secure our entrance into Confederation and our forsaking the surety of the New England market. Hon. D'Arcy McGee, in one of his fascinating orations delivered in 1864, pointed out that Canada would give the Maritime provinces direct connection with the wheat producing regions of the great West all the year round and continuing said:

> In this connection if they do not get through Canada, they must ultimately get through the United States, and one reason why I, in season, and perhaps out of season, have continued an advocate for an Intercolonial Railway has been that first, closest and most lasting connection of these Lower Provinces with the Continental trade system, might be established by and through and in union with Canada.

In Nova Scotia, among other things, we were selling to the New England States large quantities of coal. In the Assembly at Quebec Hon. Mr. McGee described in splendid language the extent of the coal fields of the Maritime provinces, and went on to say:

> These exhaustless coal fields will, under our plan—which is in fact our Reciprocity Treaty with the Lower Provinces—become hereafter the great resource of our towns for fuel.

And further on he stated:

> We consume in this country (Canada) as much fuel per annum as they do in New England, and therefore we offer them a market under the Union equal to that which these theorizers want to persuade their followers they would lose.

Speaking in the Mechanics' Institute in the city of St. John he said:

> I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot have a commercial league, without other means of intercourse than we now possess.

Further on he said—

> Although I have usually put forward defensive and commercial reasons for the road, I confess to you frankly, that I place as high, or even higher than either, reasons more purely political.

Hon. George Brown had been an opponent of the building of an Intercolonial railway, but during the Confederation negotiations he stated in a powerful speech delivered in the city of Toronto—

> It would be better for us to build a half a dozen Intercolonials rather than that the union of the provinces should not take place.

And in Parliament speaking of the proposed road he said:

> Have honourable gentlemen forgotten that the United States gladly paid twenty millions in hard cash to have Louisiana incorporated in the Republic? But what was Louisiana then to the Americans in comparison with what the Maritime Provinces are at this moment to Canada?

And further on he said—and let me call attention to this, because this was the inducement they held out to us:

> They in the maritime provinces will bring their fish and their coal and their West Indian produce to our three millions of inhabitants.

Mr. Brown always pointed out that the railway could not be a commercial success, but that it was an absolute Confederation necessity.

Sir George Etienne Cartier, speaking in Montreal in 1866 said—

> The Intercolonial is the price being paid in order to secure the maritime ports in the Union.

Sir John Macdonald repeatedly referred in his public address and in Parliament to the road as being a political necessity but said that it would never be a commercial success. Hon. Mr. Ross, in the Confederation debates, among other things said—

> Upper Canada will do well to build the road on its own account if all the other provinces refuse.

Sir E. P. Taché, Premier of Canada, in the Parliamentary debate February 30th, 1865, referred to the lack of winter ports in Canada and defied anyone to take a map of the world and point to any great nation which had not seaports of its own open at all times of the year, and proceeded as follows:

> Canada did not possess these advantages but was shut up in a prison, as it were, for five months in the year in fields of ice, which all the steam engineering apparatus of human ingenuity could not overcome, and so long as this state of affairs continued we must consent to be a small people who could at any moment be assailed and invaded by a people better situated in that respect than we were. Canada was in fact just like a farmer who might stand upon an elevated spot on his property from which he could look upon fertile fields, meandering streams, wood and all else that was necessary to his domestic wants, but who had no outlet to the highway.

He referred to the attitude of the people of the United States and particularly of the Northern states who believed we were in sympathy with the South. He stated they threatened to abolish the transit system and that reciprocity was to be discontinued. He referred to the passport system, and said the only thing which remained to be done was to shut down the gate altogether and prevent passage through their territory. He continued:

> Will we, a great people, coolly and tranquilly cross our arms and wait for what might come next? For my part the time has now arrived when Canada should establish a union with the great Gulf Provinces.

What for? For the purpose of securing winter ports for Canada. Further on, he said:

> Legislation in Canada for the last two years has come almost to a standstill, and if anyone would refer to the Statutes back since 1862 he would find that the only public measures there inscribed have been passed simply by the permission of the opposition. From May 21st, 1862, to the end of June, 1864, five different governments had been in charge of affairs. The country was bordering on civil strife.

Hon. Mr. Ross, speaking in the Canadian Parliament in 1865, said:

> I believe this work a great and grave undertaking but it is one that cannot be avoided—it is a necessity. It is called for by military reasons and a commercial necessity, and the date of its construction cannot be safely postponed. Why, what have we seen within a recent period? Restrictions have been put on goods sent through the United States by the establishment of Consular Certificates to such an extent that you cannot send a bale of goods through the United States without accompanying it with one of those certificates, the cost of which I am told was nearly $2 perhaps more than the worth of the package.

And further:

> It, the Intercolonial, will be a costly undertaking, but it is one we must make up our minds to pay for, and the sooner we set about its construction the better.

Sir Leonard Tilley, in the city of Quebec, speaking for the Maritime provinces as one of its great leaders, said if the Maritime provinces could not secure the Intercolonial railway they might as well stop talking about Confederation, and every other political leader of all shades of politics in the Maritime provinces stated that the road must be constructed immediately. And for what purpose? To get over the difficulties of distance, to create and carry on trade between the Maritime provinces and Canada as it was known in those days.

As the result of all these addresses and negotiations, among the union resolutions passed at Quebec was one providing that the Intercolonial should be built immediately, and this resolution containing the reasons for the construction of the road was incorporated in the British North America Act, passed by the British Parliament, being section 145. This section 145 is a section of an Imperial statute, providing for a distinct railway to be built for a certain purpose, and, I contend, we cannot change that purpose by any Act of this Parliament. Changes can only be made at Westminster and not at Ottawa. Section 145 is as follows:

> Inasmuch as the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have joined in a declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial railway is essential to the consolidation to the union of British North America and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that

provision should be made for its immediate construction by the Government of Canada; therefore, in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the Government and Parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement within six months after the union of a railway conecting the river St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission, and the completion thereof with all practical speed."

Notice the specific terms of that section. It is not often we see the reason for a section embodied in the section itself.

It must follow that the rates charged on this road must be based, not upon commercial consideration, but for the purpose of interprovincial trade, and rates which prevent that trade are a distinct violation of the most sacred promises made to the people of the Maritime provinces in order to secure their consent to the consolidation of the union. If the people of the Maritime provinces had been told before 1867 that this road, after construction, would have been operated on a commercial basis alone there would not have been any British North America Act, nor any confederation with the Maritime provinces. If it is denied that the Intercolonial railway is to be operated for national purposes and for the creation and carrying on of interprovincial trade, then the assent of the people of the Maritime provinces in 1867 was secured under false pretences.

The money for building this road was secured by Imperial guarantee. That guarantee was given with a condition. Surveys had previously been made for the road leading from Nova Scotia across the centre of New Brunswick, known as the Valley route, the shortest and the best route, but before the Imperial Government undertook to give the guarantee they insisted that a survey made by Major Robinson, a military man, should be adopted. This survey was around the north part of the province of New Brunswick, away out of the direct line to Canada. Why? To get away from the United States border. We had had the Trent affair; we had had the war between the North and the South; we had had some feeling between the North and Canada; so the Imperial Government insisted upon this northern route, and in the Lord Elgin despatch, the following words are used:

The Valley route would deprive the Intercolonial railway of those Imperial and Military advantages, which alone would justify the granting of Imperial credit.

The road was built. Incidentally, the people of the Maritime provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, threw into the system railroads already constructed which had cost over three million dollars, and away back in 1867 that was a large sum of money.

Prior to a few years ago the terms of Confederation were maintained. A very valuable trade was developed and carried over this railway. Suddenly the railway was linked up with the Canadian Northern system. It was taken from the direct control of the Department of Railways; its management was transferred to the city of Toronto and placed with the directors of the Canadian Northern railway, and its rates were increased to such an extent as to practically prohibit interprovincial trade, which trade was the very purpose of its creation. Take, for instance, the trade in coal, which is one of the big products of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and from which the Governments of those provinces derive a very large amount of their revenues. Under the old management and the old rates our coal was shipped in large quantities into Quebec, particularly into the Eastern townships and Montreal, and even into Ontario as far west as Brockville. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Hon. D'Arcy McGee which I quoted a few minutes ago about the burning of our coal in Canada. You will bear in mind the statement of the Hon. George Brown, which I have already cited, that we would ship our coal to a market of 3,000,000 people. But within the last five years the rate on coal westward bound has been increased nearly 150 per cent, with the result that interprovincial trade in this most important commodity is absolutely killed, and not a pound of coal from the Maritime provinces is to-day being shipped by rail out of those provinces. What is the use of talking about the alluring promise of the Hon. George Brown—"We hold out a market of 3,000,000 inhabitants for your coal"—when the freight rates are placed so high that you cannot ship the coal? That is the situation as it exists to-day.

We do not desire to make unreasonable requests; we desire, however, to point out that transportation in the Maritime provinces, the wharf of this country jutting out into the broad Atlantic, is a most vital question to the people of those provinces, because they are far away from the big markets of this continent. Our forefathers

knew that; the forefathers of Confederation knew it. Sir Charles Tupper knew it when he said that the difficulties of Confederation were insuperable on account of the distance to Canada.

Prior to Confederation, another question was raised by people in this country. If you read the debates, you will find that another understanding was reached, namely, that the canal system of Ontario and Quebec was to be increased and the canals were to be deepened and extended. What are the facts? I am not going to detain this House this afternoon by quoting figures in detail; but permit me to say, according to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, there has been spent on the canals of Ontario and Quebec $35,000,000 more than has ever been spent upon the Intercolonial railway. A few years ago, however, instead of increasing the rates upon these canals of Ontario and Quebec, they were made as free as the ocean itself, and to-day the people of those provinces boast of their 1,200 miles of free inland navigation. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is fair to punish the people of the Maritime provinces who came into Confederation, not only with a promise, but with a distinct Imperial statute in regard to their rights under Confederation, and to allow the other promise to the people of Ontario and Quebec in respect to their canal systems to be kept? As I said a moment ago, we do not ask for charity; we ask only that the rights given us under the constitution shall remain inviolate. We do not shirk for a moment our obligations in Canada; we are not mendicants at the door of Parliament. In the last twenty-five years a billion of dollars—it is nearer one and one-half billions, but we will call it a billion dollars—has been put into the railways of Canada, either by cash or by guarantees. During these twenty-five years practically all the railways constructed in the Maritime provinces consist of a line between Edmundston and Moncton, N.B., the line in Halifax county running thirty or forty miles east of Dartmouth, and the short line from Halifax to Yarmouth. Yet there has been a billion dollars provided in this country for the purpose of increased transportation facilities, particularly in Western Canada. We agreed to that; we supported it, and when the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental railway projects were put before the people, we sent back to this Parliament a solid eighteen from Nova Scotia in order to provide the middle and west of Canada with better transportation. Unfortunately, owing to conditions, the Intercolonial operation being one of them, our population has not materially increased, and we come back with only sixteen members; but we are solid just the same as we were before.

We come back to demand our rights under the constitution of this country. We realize that, as regards the interest on that billion dollars, the share of the Maritime provinces taxpayer is probably six or seven million dollars per year. We are paying our share as Canadians. We do not desire to break up this Confederation; we are too proud of the name of Canada to want to destroy the union. We are willing to pay our share towards opening up the great unknown lands of this country. We are willing to do what we can to roll back the map of Canada northward. But we insist, and shall insist, that the Confederation pact shall be kept, and we state to you that we resent, and will continue to resent, the treatment as a scrap of paper of the promise made at the time of Confederation to secure our consent to coming into the union, in order that Old Canada should obtain winter ports and be in a position to carry on in a truly national way.

In conclusion, let me say my contention is, the Intercolonial having been built for purposes distinctly constitutional, cannot be linked up with any other road in Canada in its operation. I for one advocate that it should be divorced from the illegitimate marriage contracted with the Canadian Northern Railway and be restored to a position where it can be managed from Moncton, the centre of the Maritime provinces, under the control and direction of the Minister of Railways. It is obvious, if the terms of Confederation are to be honoured, this road cannot be operated in conjunction with any other road of a commercial character.

You could not fix rates to be applied to the whole Canadian National Railway to meet constitutional obligations towards the Maritime provinces.

I say therefore that the road must be operated distinctly by itself under the terms of Confederation. It should be operated in such a manner as properly to carry on interprovincial trade and to restore to the Maritime provinces a measure of that prosperity which they enjoyed up to the time of Confederation, when the people were happy and contented.

Mr. R. M. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on the motion under consideration, I can share quite fully in the feelings that actuated my hon friends yesterday. I speak for the first time, naturally, with considerable diffidence. I should like to associate myself with those who preceded me in expressing congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to the high office you hold. I desire also to congratulate ourselves, particularly us who come here for the first time, on the assurance we have, and the evidence you have given us so far, that if, notwithstanding our undoubted desire at all times to observe the best traditions of the House, we sometimes err, as inexperienced members are likely to do, your ruling will always be more in the way of guidance than of reproach. I am not unconscious, Sir, of the honour that has been conferred upon me in being sent to represent my constituency in this House. I have worked for some time towards the attainment of an ideal which I trust will be fully attained in our own province, and I have been selected, with other hon. gentlemen from the province of Saskatchewan and the western country, to uphold that ideal, which we have been preaching for some years and which is something new in the political life of Canada. There have been new developments in this country, and it was my intention at the outset to speak to some extent on political movements and activities. After listening to the exchange of courtesies between the other two parties in this House, however, I feel somewhat at a loss just what to say. I must confess that during a number of years I have been saying things which perhaps may have been interpreted as being somewhat unkind to our political opponents; but so far I have never been able to attain to that degree of feeling which I have seen demonstrated by hon. members of this House. I think, therefore, that I had better follow the example of those of the Progressive party, particularly my leader, who have spoken in this debate, and get right down to the subject before us, namely, the economic government of the country, a subject in which we are more vitally interested than we are in the attainment of victory by any political party, even our own.

True, there was a reason for the establishing of that party. I think that the reason is well known for the conception and advocacy of those ideals which we here propound. I am not one of those who believe that parties are necessarily evil. I do not believe that we can have successful government of a country or of a province without the grouping together of those who hold like principles. We must have that combination and co-operation. But while we have constituted ourselves a party in that sense, I hope, nevertheless, that we in this corner of the House, at least, shall always place the ideals which we champion before mere party existence. I have read with a good deal of interest and studied with some care the Speech which was delivered to us the other day, and I want to thank the Government for holding out to us who come from Western Canada, and who believe that we have vast problems to solve and are handicapped in carrying on our chosen occupation, the degree of reform which is promised in the Speech. I cannot agree with those to the right of our group, who have so far spoken, in the statement that there is nothing, or at least, that there is very little, to the Speech from the Throne. We in this group do see a ray of hope. But I must confess that, after a careful study of the Speech, I think it leaves a great deal to the imagination; we are left to guess, in some cases at least, what the specific reforms will be. When they come up in detail to be discussed before the House we shall have something to say about them. I have no doubt that the Government intends to carry out its pledges so far as it is possible for these pledges to be carried out. But just how far that will be possible from their own side of the House remains to be seen. So far as those pledges are in accordance with the declaration of principles which we enunciate in our platform, I want to assure hon. members on the other side that they may count on our wholesouled and hearty co-operation. They may count also, if any section of the Government's side of the House seems to predominate and to exercise any influence that prevents the Government from carrying out these reforms which we advocate, that there shall be just as hearty opposition from this corner of the Chamber.

I desire to deal with a few specific things referred to in this Address. I am glad to note, at the outset, an indication—whether we have all perceived it or not—that the business barometer forecasts a change for the better in business conditions. I believe that is correct. I think it is true that business is improving in Canada and is likely to continue to improve. The experience of those who come from other provinces is that

the situation could not be much worse; so that if there is a change it is bound to be in the direction of improvement. There are some things in connection with it, however, that cause me to wonder, and while, I believe, no responsibility can attach to this Parliament, I do notice on behalf of business interests advertisements and propaganda asking for the boosting of business conditions—something, I fear, in the nature of the real estate or business booms which we had in Western Canada some ten years ago, and which were not warranted by the circumstances then existing. When business is improving we want it to be along steady, solid lines so that the improvement will be of a permanent nature.

I come now to that section of the Address which is more particularly of interest to us who are agriculturists. Having been a farmer since going to the West from this province of Ontario some thirty years ago, I think I can claim to know something of agricultural conditions obtaining there. We were not always in our present position. Sometimes in past years we had a large degree of prosperity, but conditions were not as they are now. The great upheaval of the war was responsible in large measure for disrupting business not only in our line but in other lines as well. If we had the advantage of enhanced prices during the war, we also were the first to suffer when prices began to drop after the war. I want to read a few lines from the Speech from the Throne:

> The decline in prices in farm products in 1921, as compared with the prices of previous years, has seriously affected agriculture in many parts of the Dominion.

That is true, Mr. Speaker, but I do not claim that the prices of agricultural products are now too low. The difficulty is that there has not been maintained a reasonable parity of values between the products which we have to sell and those things which we have to purchase and which enter into the production of our crops. I well remember, and I know that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) well remembers, the time, twenty-five years ago, when in the Prairie provinces we were able to sell better wheat than we have ever been able to produce since at as low as 50 cents a bushel and make more money than we are making at the present time. To-day the price of wheat is almost double 50 cents, but the prices of commodities which enter into the production of that wheat and other grains and cattle are more than double what they were at that time.

I notice reference in this paragraph to restricted markets being responsible for some of the conditions which prevail. It is very true that restricted markets have been detrimental to western agriculture. There is reason for that, especially in connection with our meat products—our cattle and hogs. The market for those products has been very seriously affected by tariff measures enacted in the United States. We had nothing to do with that, it is not our responsibility that our friends to the south of the international boundary line have placed those restrictions against imports from this Dominion. Those tariff restrictions have not affected our grain to the same extent because our market is mostly on the other side of the ocean. I do say we were not responsible for that action on the part of the United States. And yet I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if that is wholly true. I believe that had the Canadian people in 1911 seen fit to adopt that 5 p.m. measure of fiscal reform which was then offered to them, we to-day in Western Canada would not be suffering from those tariff restrictions. This is a serious handicap. I think it is false economy that this Dominion, or any other country, so far as it is possible to prevent it, should allow restrictions of that nature to be placed against the marketing of its natural products.

I notice further in this same paragraph from which I have quoted reference to the fact that improved methods of agriculture with better grading and storage of farm crops would help materially the agriculturists of Canada. I think it would, Mr. Speaker. I believe that a great work has been carried on by our experimental farms and expert agriculturists throughout the Dominion. But that is not our whole trouble. I agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) when he said yesterday that we are " experted " to death in some of these things. We have received too much free advice. I do not know whether hon. members will agree with me in the statement I am about to make, but I think the most severe blow that western agriculture, particularly in its field crops, ever received was the Greater Production Campaign of 1918. On a wave of patriotism—and we responded to the best of our ability—we were asked to produce to the limit of our capacity. We wanted to do it. But those who are familiar with agri-

cultural methods, particularly in Western Canada, know that nature does not respond to the methods that we were then urged to adopt. They know that just to that degree of efficiency with which we cultivate our farms will nature repay us, and if you attempt to drive her one litle bit you will not only not get the immediate results which were hoped for at that time—we did not get them—but you will be handicapped for many years after.

As to the grading, storage and general physical handling of our products, I have little to say. Some improvement is desirable perhaps in our system of grading and also in our system of marketing, but the system for the physical handling of the product of the western plains has probably no superior in the world. We are not complaining of the methods, which have been carefully built up for the physical handling of our grain. Our elevator system, even our transportation system, both are doing a great work in that respect. We have nothing to complain of in respect to our our terminal elevators. But we are seriously handicapped in the facilities for the marketing of our grain after we get it to the terminal elevators at the head of the Lakes. For many years my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture had a part in, and will remember, the fight which was put up some years ago by the agriculturists of Western Canada to establish better marketing conditions for the product of the western farms. Some betterment was obtained it is true, but still our product was exploited, it paid too much tribute, and it has continued to pay too much tribute from that day to this to those who come between us and the ultimate consumer. The war was responsible for introducing a new system of marketing grain; I refer to the system which was in operation in 1919. It had developed through various phases up to that time, which I need not now enumerate, but in 1919 the government of the day took the matter in hand and appointed a board which should be responsible for the marketing of the entire wheat crop of Canada. Quite a little objection was taken to it at the time it was established, but I think I voice the opinion of everyone around me, at least in this part of the House, when I say that after the experience which we had in 1919 practically all opposition has been swept away. I do not think that it is the most perfect system that can be devised. I agree with my leader in the remarks he made the other day, and which were confirmed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) yesterday, that perhaps a co-operative system owned, operated, and controlled by the producers themselves would be the most ideal. But we are still living in abnormal times so far as the marketing of our grain in Western Canada is concerned, and we cannot wait until we get back to normal times for the building up of that ideal co-operative system which we shall strive to attain in the near future. That means that if the farmers of Western Canada are to prosper—I regret to confess that they are not prospering to-day; I believe that on the Prairie provinces this last year ninety per cent of our farmers produced their crops at an actual loss; I do not believe that is too high an estimate; I myself have seen during the month of November farmers in different sections of the province of Saskatchewan drawing their wheat to market from thirty to fifty miles to the nearest town, with three or four horses to a wagon, and taking from two to four days to make the trip, only to get when they got to town less than eighty cents a bushel for their wheat, which cost them a very great deal more than that to produce. It is very difficult to say what it cost to produce that wheat; the cost would vary, of course, in different localities, and it varies as between new farms and those who are better established, but I have made a calculation which I think would apply to the average farm. I do not believe the wheat of the Prairie provinces this year could be produced and pay a profit at less than $1.10 at the nearest point of delivery. To that you have to add freight and other charges, these amounting to about 25 cents per bushel from about the centre of the Prairie provinces, although the last reduction in freight rates did reduce that a little. That means that the crop of Western Canada to be produced at a profit must bring at the head of the Lakes not less than $1.35 per bushel. At the opening of the season of 1921 the market opened I think around $1.64 for delivery at the head of the Lakes—I speak subject to correction, but I believe that is correct. That should give us a profit. But immediately the wheat began to move, the price dropped until it touched the minimum of $1.07 at the head of the Lakes. To-day it stands somewhere around $1.40, so that it is probably paying a little to produce wheat at the present time.

But what have been the conditions? During the period of depressed markets, when prices were falling, our farmers in literally hundreds were forced to sell wheat under the circumstances which I have outlined, and to take less than eighty cents a bushel for their wheat. Something must be done in this matter, and I was pleased to note in the Speech from the Throne and in the remarks of the Prime Minister that something is promised, though it is not so definite as I would wish. I should like something more definite from the Government at this time as to what they really intend to give us. We were told that an inquiry was to be made, that the matter would be turned over to the Agricultural Committee of this House for discussion. Now, I quite approve of this inquiry being turned over to the Agricultural Committee for consideration and decision as to the best means of providing marketing facilities, but I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the decision whether or not the Wheat Board which the farmers of Western Canada are asking for should be established in the immediate future, should be delayed no longer. The country cannot afford to wait. There is plenty of evidence available at this time that under the present circumstances it is a desirable method of marketing the wheat crop of 1922. From Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains the farmers of Western Canada have, almost unitedly, repeatedly demanded the re-establishment of the Wheat Board. We had the Wheat Board in 1919, and it was an unqualified success. We do not expect that we shall get anything like the price that was obtained by the Wheat Board of 1919; all we are asking is the world's price to our farmers.

There is something more, and I want to draw the attention of the Government to this, if it is expert testimony they require beyond the demand of the farmers who produce the wheat, and the experience of 1919. During the 1920 session, I think it was, of the Saskatchewan legislature the government of that province appointed a committee to go thoroughly into this marketing situation. Eight specific questions were laid before them to which they were invited to give an answer. I shall not weary the House by reading these questions, but the whole thing is summed up in one short paragraph at the end of that report, which was brought in by two gentlemen who are recognized by all in the Canadian grain trade as being better qualified, probably, to deal with the subject and to bring good, sound business judgment to bear upon it than any other two men in Canada, and possibly on the North American continent. This is what they say:

> In the first place we believe that the most perfect form of a centralized wheat marketing agency at the present time can be created only under the control of a national organization.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what the farmers of Western Canada are asking for 1922. I wonder if I am putting it too strongly when I say it is what they are demanding. It is undoubtedly what they demanded before they would elect a single representative from the province of Saskatchewan. I know that we fifteen Progressives in this House from that province stand solidly behind that demand, and I know further that it is in the campaign literature of the Minister of Agriculture in this Government (Mr. Motherwell), and that his supporters in the constituency of Regina made it their chief plea, that the hon. member if elected to the House would secure the re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board. While it is all very well to make an inquiry, and I believe in getting the very fullest possible information, I say that we have this information before us now.

There is another statement which I wish to make, and I know it will go unchallenged by those who come from the Prairie provinces. If the country does not get almost immediately the promise of the re-establishment of the Wheat Board to handle, as a national selling agency, the wheat crop of 1922, production for this year will be seriously curtailed. Reports coming from Western Canada in the last few days indicate that they are going to have an abnormally early seeding. In sections of the West the snow has gone already and probably by the first of April men will be on the land. All the wheat should be sown in the West during the month of April. If the wheat is to be sown during the month of April the farmers of the three provinces must have this assurance or they will not sow nearly the acreage which they otherwise would have done. I have little more to add. This is the thing which is of most vital importance to us of Saskatchewan, and I am sure to the other two provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

I would like to make a passing reference to other things contained in the Speech

from the Throne. The next paragraph that I note refers to the tariff. I do not propose to deal with it at any length; I am not an expert in tariff matters, I am an ordinary farmer claiming ordinary horse sense; and as an ordinary farmer claiming ordinary horse sense I have never yet been able to see any merit in a protective tariff, although I have honestly tried to find it. The word "protection" is, to my mind, a misnomer; I think the word which should be used is "restriction"; it would more nearly define the operation of a protective tariff as we know it in this Dominion. I think it is false national economy when any section of the community may be allowed by law to exploit the balance of the community for their special benefit. True national economy to my mind attains the highest degree of perfection when the greatest number of the people of the country are engaged in productive enterprises neither hampered by artificial restrictions nor pampered by special privileges.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) with reference to the return of their natural resources to the three western provinces. I could scarcely agree with all he said in reference to that subject. When two men are engaged in a business transaction it is beyond my comprehension, Mr. Speaker, why some one else, who in remote times of the past had something to do with it, should wish to butt in on the proposition now. This question, I believe, is one which must be dealt with by the Government and by the individual provinces concerned in the return of these natural resources.

Enough has been said for the present, I think, on the public ownership of railways. I want, however, to endorse what was said yesterday by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) in his advocacy of the consolidation of the Government-owned railways into one system, one gigantic Canadian system, of which we shall be proud and to which by means of consolidation we can look for reasonably efficient and economic management.

I have allotted myself half an hour and I observe that my time has nearly expired. I am now going to pass on to the last paragraph of the Speech from the Throne wherein the Government is advocating economy not only in administration but in the appropriations which are to be voted and the undertakings which are to be carried out. With such a policy I am entirely in accord; and I think that sentiment will be approved by every member of the Progressive group. We have been too lavish in our national expenditure in the years gone by, and the time has come when we must economize, when we must retrench. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government will be ill-advised if it does not take into careful consideration the exact nature of those economies which it contemplates. Certain investments have been made by the people of Canada in the national railways or other publicly-owned utilities. These investments have been made on the strength of promises given by our Governments in the past and they must be safely guarded.

I wish to assure the Government again of what I said at the beginning of my remarks—that so far as they can see their way clear to live up to their platform, to their own declared platform which in so large a measure is identical with that which we have advocated, so far as they will live up to the promises which they have made in almost every plank of their platform, they will get the hearty support, I am sure, of the members in this corner of the Chamber. If the Government do not carry out those reforms which they have promised they will have to reckon with us. I believe the present administration has the biggest opportunity that has ever been within the reach of any Canadian government. We have lived in recent years through strenuous times; to-day we are living in a new world. Civilization has been re-born; people are looking at things in a different way from what they did a few years ago. We are proud of our heritage, proud of the country we have developed; and the responsibility rests upon the Government of the day of seeing that that greatness shall not only be maintained but that it shall be made even greater yet.

Mr. THOMAS LANGTON CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, as one of the new representatives from the Toronto district I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you, Sir, on your elevation to the office of First Commoner of Canada. Sir, you are well and favorably known in the province of Ontario, as you are in other parts of Canada and of the Empire, and I congratulate you upon all you have been privileged to do for your country.

Permit me to say at the outset that I am glad to observe the moderate tone of this debate, more particularly as the membership of the House comprises approximately 134 new members. I think it is only fair to say that hon. gentlemen on both sides de-

serve great praise for the keen attention they have so far given to the discussion.

Sir, in Canada we have in the past been taking our politics too seriously. There has been too much party politics in this country. Ever since Confederation we have been too apt to consider what was for the good of the party first and what was for the good of the country afterwards. That is one reason why a new party—a new body of men and women—has come into existence.

Let me say explicitly that I am not a farmer; I do not know, and I do not pretend to know, anything about farming. But all political parties in Canada have vied with one another in the past in seeking the support of the farmers. All wealth, after all, is derived from the soil; and the backbone of the community is very largely composed of farmers. I have been associated for a quarter of a century with farmers as president of several of the Hydro Electric organizations, which embrace 376 municipalities in my native province. I have been president of the Union of Canadian Municipalities and am the 1922 president of the Ontario Municipal Union, whose membership is representative of the cities, towns, incorporated villages, county councils, and so on, of Ontario. I have generally found the farmer to be a pretty hard headed man and that when casting his vote at election time he does not need very much assistance from outside parties. We are all here to do the best we can for the people of Canada.

I have known the hon. leader of the Government for many years past, since I was a boy. His father was a professor in the old law school at Osgoode Hall and an old teacher of mine, and I had a great deal of respect for him. I congratulate the hon. leader of the House to-day on his having attained the position he holds. As a sportsman I offer him my congratulations on winning. A winner is admired, but it is a different thing to bear adversity in defeat, and so I want to congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) because he was a bonnie fighter and a good loser and took defeat like a true sportsman. It was not his fault that his party lost.

If I had had my way there would not have been any Union Government in this country. The Conservative party would have been better off without it and my friends on the opposite side of the House, the Liberals, might have remained in opposition for a quarter of a century. As for the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, everywhere that he went in the late campaign, closing on 6th December, he preached the same gospel, whether in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario or the West.

I also desire to congratulate my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). He is an old friend of mine and a man of his word. I admire his candour on the stump in the recent election, because he said what he meant as to the tariff, and I believe in the House he will stand by his principles. I do not believe that the U.F.O. members in the Ontario Legislature stood by their principles. Of course, if the Progressives do not stand by their principles, so much the worse for the movement in the House and the country. But I believe the Progressives in this House are men of a different stamp to the U.F.O. official party in Ontario, and will carry out the principles for which they were elected to this House. I was more than pleased yesterday to hear the leader of the Progressives say that he did not wish to enter any Liberal administration, but that what had been proposed to him was to enter a form of Union Government. Well, I am a Conservative and was elected from a Conservative city. It has always been a Conservative city and always will be. But my constituents also desire me to exercise independence of thought and action, and if the Government will bring forward any measures for the general welfare and good of the country they will have my support and they will receive, I am sure, the support of the party to which I belong. But I will oppose anything that is not in the interests of the people of Canada. I may say that I have supported farmers in many constituencies on the stump for twenty-five years. I did not support them because they were farmers, but because they were the best men. I do not believe in the group system of government. Of course I must admit that the party system has its defects, a great many of them, because the party system leads men sometimes to go to extremes of word and thought and action, as I shall show in a moment. It is sometimes said that in Ontario and in Quebec and in other parts of the Dominion there are race jealousies and religious differences which cause a great deal of discord and bitter feeling. This country is too big to have any more of what we have heard in this House and outside on many occasions. There are some of these people in Quebec and a few

in Ontario, who have these feelings of jealousy, but I hope the day has gone by when these felings of jealousy will occur, in view of what Canada has done in the war. The time has gone by for religious bickerings and strife in this country. We are all Canadians, and must look at the matters which come before us from that point of view. As I stated, the party system has its defects and sometimes leads men to go too far in thought, word and action. But when you criticize the party system on account of its defects don't forget its virtues; don't forget that under the party system the Mother Country prospered, and they have their free institutions and a great form of government. We have our Liberal party and our Conservative party, and all the good is not in one party. They say that the Liberal party and the Conservative party have both done a great deal to build up this country. I was born a Conservative and a Conservative I will die. That is my politics, and that is good enough for me. We need not be ashamed of the party of Macdonald and Cartier, the party that built the Canadian Pacific railway and opened up the West, the party that created the national policy and did a great deal to help win the war. I will not say they won the war, because I am not boastful sufficiently for that, although people on the other side of the line say they won the war. The Conservative party was sound in regard to the war and made a good war record, and proposed what they did for the war in the best interests of Canada. I do not believe there is any reason why we should have a group system of government. I agree with what the Right Hon. Austin Chamberlain, the great leader in the British House of Commons, said; if the two old parties would carry out the reforms they should have carried out long ago, many of the questions which my hon. friends have spoken about yesterday and to-day would have been settled. We might have had lower freights, and we might have made this country a better country for the working people as well as for others, for those in the rural portions as well as for those in the urban centres. As the Right Hon. Austin Chamberlain says he does not believe in the group system of government, and, speaking at the Carleton Club banquet in his honour, he said he hoped that system of government would never prevail in Great Britain. I am free to admit that the party system sometimes has its defects.

There is too much party in this country, and we are sometimes too bitter, and sometimes forget that those on the other side of the House have a heart. We should always remember that those on the other side of the House have a heart, and my friends, the Progressives, are good-hearted people too. Therefore, as a young member of this House, coming from the city of Toronto, a city in which there is no bigotry—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CHURCH: Hon. gentlemen may laugh and smile. I think many of you have known me a great many years. I have not a particle of bigotry in my make-up, and what I say of myself is true of the city which I have the honour to represent. As mayor of the city for seven years, and as representative in the council for seventeen years, I may say I have never seen any bigotry in that chamber, and I defy any one to say it. The late Attorney General of the province of Ontario, Hon. Mr. Foy, a Roman Catholic, represented an Orange constituency in the legislature and became attorney general of the province. Hon. A. Claude Macdonell, a member of this House for twelve years, represented South Toronto, an Orange constituency, and he was one of the best members we ever had in this House. I say with reference to the people of the city of Toronto, the Catholics and Protestants —and I speak of Toronto and also of the province of Ontario—that I do not think there is any bigotry there. The people of Ontario are too busy endeavouring to make a living to sit up all night long wondering or bothering what Quebec is doing. I was very much surprised; and if I had known as much as I do now, I would not have wanted to be a member of this House if I thought for one moment that such a state of affairs existed in this country, because, after all is said and done, we are all Canadians, trying to do the best we can for Canada. The leader of the House (Mr. Mackenzie King) lived in Toronto while he was leader of the Opposition; he knows something about the city of Toronto, his father and mother lived there for years; and I do not think he would state, from his seat in this House, that there was any bigotry in that city. I was very much surprised to read an address delivered the other day before the ladies of the liberal club of the city of Ottawa by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr

Lapointe), who, I hope, will visit us in Toronto soon because, I think, when he comes there, he will change his mind. I understand the hon. member for Quebec East was invited to visit Toronto and address the Liberals of that city. When he does so, I hope he will make the same speech to the Liberals of Toronto and of Ontario as he did to the ladies of Ottawa and the same as he did at the banquet in his honour in the city of Quebec. I should like to read from the Globe the report of a speech delivered by the hon. genetleman for Quebec East at a banquet. There were ladies present and I dare say the gallant young man was doing his best to entertain them. This is the report of the able speech which he made on that occasion, reported in the Globe of Monday, March 13:

The Hon. Mr. Lapointe spoke briefly, but to the point.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CHURCH: Well it is in the Globe, the Bible of my hon. friends opposite. The leader of the House was formerly one of the reporters on the Varsity when he was a student at Varsity, and he gave a very good report. I used to read the Varsity at that time, when I think he was one of the sporting editors. I do not know whether there is any vanity in the report of a sporting editor, because he has to write things as he sees them. The Globe goes on to say:

Hon. Mr. Lapointe spoke briefly, but to the point. He contrasted the positions of Liberalism and of Conservatism. He declared that the Conservative party was marked by duplicity and hypocrisy; that its life depended upon the accentuation of race and religious differences. Liberalism thrived upon conciliation. It respected all respectable parties.

That is the first time I have ever heard that I do not belong to a "respectable" party. We try to be a respectable party in this country. The report continues:

It cherished high ideals and sought manfully to realise them.

I might say to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) that I am very much surprised, as a young citizen of this country, to read in the Globe, the paper of George Brown, Baldwin, Lafontaine, and men of that description, a report of such sentiments as were expressed that day by one coming from a sister province. I hope the hon. member will visit Ontario and Toronto; and if he does so, he will obtain a different idea of the Liberal-Conservative party. The hon. member should agree with me that there is some good in all parties. The party which I am speaking of to-day was the party that gave the province of Ontario the hydro-electric development; that gave the province the best government, by Sir James Whitney and Sir Adam Beck, that any province has had, a party by the people and for the people, and that did a great deal for the people of that province. At that banquet also, I was very much surprised to learn, the head of the Government said that he must put his foot down "to keep down Toryism." If he would do something to keep down freight rates, he would be doing something worth while, and if he would do something to try, as the captain of the team on the other side of the House, to keep down racial and religious jealousy in this country, he would be doing something better than trying to keep down Toryism. As long as I am in this House, whether that period be long or short, this is the last occasion that I shall have anything to say on this particular subject of Ontario's bigotry, because as a humble citizen of this country, I do not like to hear that kind of talk. I thought one of the lessons we would have learned from the war would have been to realize in all the provinces that we should be for Canada first, last and all the time; that those who had the honour of being elected to this House would do the best they could for the people of Canada, instead of drawing red herrings across the track by bringing up subjects that had nothing to do with the government of the country.

I wish to refer to two or three matters while the leader of the Government is in the Chamber. In the city of Quebec, there is the Battlefields Commission, and I remember a speech delivered by you, Mr. Speaker, on that particular subject. After all is said and done, the people of Canada are not mindful enough of those who have served them upon the battlefields. In Quebec, the Batlefields Commission has done a great deal to preserve the great ruins of the early days of this country and the memory of Wolfe and Montcalm, and I would suggest to the Prime Minister that in Ontario and the West a Battlefields Commission should be constituted to preserve the historic ruins there. If you go to the Niagara district to-day, as you enter the mouth of the Niagara river, on the right, there is Fort Mississauga, a mass of ruins. Further up the river is Fort George—where Brock had his breakfast the day he was killed. Further up the river at Queenston are the

ruins of a house where was published the first newspaper in Upper Canada. The roof and the mortar have all gone to ruin. Further up the river is the Village of Chippewa where the battle of that name was fought. I asked someone there to point out the spot where the heroine Laura Secord lived, but no one seemed to know. Going further on to Fort Erie you will find the fort there with the roof shot out, but a progressive American manufacturer has pasted all over the walls chewing gum, and tobacco advertisements. I would suggest that the work of the Battlefields Commission be extended to embrace not only the great province of Quebec, but Ontario and, in the West, Fort Winnipeg, Cut Knife, Battleford and other places and sites of the 1885 Northwest rebellion. We have to take a leaf out of the book of the American people when we see how they preserve the memorials of those who have gone before. As Macaulay has said of the heroes in the Seven Years' war:

> The various tombs of the captains have been sought and repaired and embellished. It is impossible not to respect the sentiment which manifests itself in these tokens. It is a sentiment which appeals to the higher and purer part of human nature and adds not a little to the strength of States. A people which takes no pride in the noble achievements of their noble ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered.

The Canadian people are far behind the Americans in this respect, at Chattanooga, in the valley of the Cumberland river, where there are over thirty miles of battlefields, there are 50 to 60 monuments, one or more erected by each State, in memory of those who served the North and South in those great battles. I have written the Government of Canada a letter about this particular matter, and I hope something will be done on the subject.

I should like to see a conference between the Dominion, the provinces and the municipalities on the subject of taxation alone. As the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said yesterday, one province has Dominion, provincial and municipal income taxes. Taxation should be co-ordinated and consolidated and an effort should be made by all governments, Dominion, provincial and municipal, to reduce the taxes. I have looked into the British North America Act, and I may say that there is a complaint throughout Canada in regard to this question. The Parliament of Canada, by the British North America Act, granted the provinces a cash subsidy along certain lines for definite purposes and to defray the expenses along certain lines of civil government but the provinces are not spending the money for these purposes. They are using it for roads, education and other matters which are not contemplated in the act. To raise money for civil government they assess the municipalities, the cities, the towns, the townships and the villages, in many ways that I hold to be illegal. For example, in Ontario there was imposed by the legislature a war tax of one mill on the assessment of each municipality which had to be paid in every municipality, although, the British North America Act, the question of "Militia and Defence" are matters by sec. 91, which comes exclusively within the purview of the Dominion. There are various forms of assessment in the provinces and different innovations and devices for levying taxation. I trust that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will give this matter his consideration, because, as things stand at present, taxes are being raised in a way that is not legal nor proper. I have had an account prepared as between the city of Toronto—I mention Toronto merely by way of illustration and not for any specific purpose—and the Dominion Government, and another account between the city and the province, and I find that in Ontario there is a large subsidy for certain works within the province; but the money is taken and spent on other objects. Throughout the West, in the city of Winnipeg, for example, and in Montreal, court houses are built by the provinces. Then there are registry offices and land titles offices, which in Ontario are paid for by the municipalities, the cities, the towns and the county councils. In the West, it is different, according to the returns I have from the city clerks of many places. For good roads, gaols, gaol farms, teachers' salaries and hospitals the provinces are continually assessing the municipalities, though these are purely provincial undertakings towards the upkeep of which the federal government grants the provinces a subsidy. This is a very interesting brief, and a careful perusal of it would be of considerable profit; but I cannot go further into it at the present time. I will give a copy of it to the Minister of Finance, because I think that something should be done to prevent the provinces from usurping the taxes of the municipalities.

In looking over the statutes I was very much surprised to discover that police court fines, under the Criminal Code, belong to

the provincial governments, instead of to the municipalities. This is something that should be remedied, and General Mewburn, representing the municipalities, waited, I understand, upon the Prime Minister. When you consider that the municipalities have to maintain police forces for public safety, you can realize how unfair it is that the fines from police courts should go to the government of the province. Take the city I have the honour to represent. Our city spends some two million dollars in maintaining a police force, and police court, and yet the fines go to the province. We have built a court house, a gaol and a gaol farm, and maintain judicial offices, registry offices and land title offices, but we do not get the police court fines, they go to the province.

Fees that belong to the municipalities have been given to the province. We have to supply a police force to guard the Parliament Buildings in Queen's Park, build a morgue, erect police stations, and other judicial public buildings, yet the city does not get the police fines. I contend that the police court fines should belong to the municipalities, and I trust that the Government will so amend the Criminal Code as to make this possible.

I confess I was surprised to see the meagre bill of fare given in the Speech from the Throne. Of course, I appreciate the fact that the Government has been in office only a few weeks, but I hope it will introduce some constructive programme. So far, I fail to see anything constructive revealed in the Speech. For instance, no mention is made of the St. Lawrence canal, which I consider the most important question that has come before the people of Canada since Confederation. I regret, too, the absence of any reference to the housing problem. In Montreal, Winnipeg, Toronto and many other centres of population the housing situation is extremely acute, and in the city I represent some 16,000 houses short are badly needed. In Montreal conditions are just as bad. Now, this is anything but creditable to the country. I do not attribute the blame to any one, but I do urge the great necessity for action in this matter. In Toronto last year there was doled out $750,000 here and there to the unemployed to buy food and help pay rents. Toronto contributed $400,000 of that sum and the Government of Canada was kind enough to come to its help as well as to the help of other municipalities including Montreal, contributing about $250,000, the province giving a like sum. Before all the bills are in, well on to a million dollars will have been spent. With so many soldiers out of work, I do not know what the unemployed would have done but for the help from the city and the Dominion and the Provincial Governments. But this million dollars was doled out to people who did not want charity, but work. Many of them were soldiers who had fought for their country overseas. I would suggest a housing policy for the Dominion, such as exists in Australia and in England; I believe there is also one in the United States. Some years ago about twenty million dollars was devoted to roads, and legislation was passed through this Parliament. Now, if you capitalized twenty million dollars on a housing proposition, building houses in the larger centres, that would be an act of religion besides being excellent legislation, and I would commend this proposal to the wisdom and good judgment of the Government. The houses might not be up to the standard of those required by the building by-laws, but there should be some houses constructed at any rate. The money might be loaned to the provinces and the larger municipalities or the latter's bonds could be guaranteed. This would largely solve the housing problem that confronts the larger cities and towns to-day, and would automatically solve the unemployment difficulty, which is so serious at the present time.

Talk about the high cost of living! I do not see the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in his seat, to know what he proposes to do, but I may say that nobody knows better than I do what the working classes in our larger centres of population are suffering to-day. To see the misery in the congested districts is heartrending. I hope the Government will still consider the advisability of introducing a housing bill, for undoubtedly it would do a great deal not only to relieve the misery and discomfort of the slums in our large centres of population but would also help solve the unemployment question. Dr. Hastings, the very capable medical officer of health of the city of Toronto, says that if we had a proper housing policy as suggested, it would do away with half the ill-health now so prevalent in our larger cities. I hope that this very serious problem will be taken up by the Government in the interests of good health and good living, so that we may have a rising generation that is sound in both mind and body.

I was glad to hear yesterday the speeches of some hon. gentlemen of the Progressives regarding economy, because this is a time for the exercise of economy by all governments not only by the Dominion but by the provinces and by the municipalities. I might describe the Parliament as the housekeeper of this young nation. Well, she is a poor housekeeper who will not exercise economy, and when the Estimates are brought down I hope they will show that the Government is following the policy of retrenchment and economy along business lines. The definition of economy, it seems to me, is the art of spending wisely, not frittering away our means. We all know that a Government can spend a large amount of money with little to show for it; and it can also spend a considerable amount of money without being at all extravagant, because the money is expended wisely.

I regret very much not to see any declaration of policy in regard to good roads. Away back in 1911 the Government of the day brought down a bill dealing with this subject. I desire to quote a paragraph from the preamble of that bill, but as it is now six o'clock I will, if the hon. leader of the Government has no objection, move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 16, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, March 15.

Mr. CHURCH (resuming):

Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last evening I was referring to the Good Roads question. In the session of 1913 legislation was introduced in the Dominion Parliament providing for an appropriation of $20,000,000 for good roads. Canada has been away behind the times in the matter of a Good Roads policy, although in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario rapid strides have been made in dealing with this important matter. In the interest of the solution of the transportation question, and many other problems which vitally concern the country, the Good Roads question is one of tremendous importance and one which especially concerns a country of vast distances such as Canada. The subject is one in which there should be co-ordination and co-operation between the federal government and the several provincial and municipal authorities. I was somewhat impressed with the legislation in the Senate and Congress at Washington some years ago making provision for good roads, under which the federal authorities were empowered to loan money by a guarantee of bonds to the state governments for this purpose. This plan in the carrying out of which there has been cordial co-operation between the federal, state and municipal authorities has been productive of the happiest results. The Good Roads question is still but in its infancy in Canada, but I hope that the present Government will, sooner or later, take it up and deal with it in a broad and comprehensive manner.

I wish for a few minutes to deal with the transportation question which was referred to the other day by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). In my opinion there is room in Canada for the activities of both private ownership and public ownership. There is no use in those who support public ownership being unfair or unjust to private ownership. Private ownership has done a great deal for Canada; let us not forget that fact when we are discussing this question. The pioneers in electrical development in Toronto were a privately-owned company, and they bore the heat and burden of the day for many years, and gave a good service as beginners. But another era came, a new day dawned. The era of public ownership set in; and now for years in the province of Ontario many of the municipalities have been operating their own water-powers and light, heat, power and gas plants and telephone systems. Public ownership has for a long time been in operation in other countries but Canada was a slow beginner and was away behind the times in this respect. When we refer to Switzerland, and many other countries in Europe we find evidences of the fact that this country has been somewhat lacking. I repeat that I

do not wish to be unfair to private ownership; I should be the last one to say anything unjust with respect to its activities. We owe to private ownership a great debt of gratitude for the way in which it has developed the country in many respects. In my own city of Toronto, when the question of electric light installation was before us, we had a pretty capable city corporation counsel who was a great assistance to us in many ways. That gentleman was afterwards appointed to the Board of Railway Commissioners and made the best chairman that board ever had; I refer to the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). This capable gentleman was acting for the city of Toronto when we took this matter up and tried to avoid the evils of duplication. The Toronto Electric Light Company, the pioneer company in that city, had done a great deal of good in the early stages of its operation. We tried to buy the concern out in order to avoid duplication. We offered the company 125 for their common stock, but they could not see their way clear to accept. We were advised by our experts in Montreal and other cities that the stock was only worth 105, but the city of Toronto was willing to pay them 125 to buy them out. While the city was anxious to avoid duplication we did not want to interfere with the company's bonds or other securities; we wanted to be absolutely fair to private ownership. However the Board of Directors did not see fit to accept the city's offer with the result that we immediately began the construction of the Hydro Electric—the people's own system—and there was duplication.

For the installation of that system at heavy cost the taxpayers of Toronto deserve the credit. I may say that duplication after all did not prove a bad thing, because we have got a better service. Both companies had to keep faith with the public. There was a race to see who would give the best service, with the result that the public got the benefit of cut rates for commercial and domestic lighting. I have the report here of the commissioners for this year and it shows that $22,000,000 has been saved in commercial and domestic lighting to the consumers in the city of Toronto. Toronto's venture in public ownership power plant has already cost $12,000,000. We have to-day taken over the street railways, but an arbitration is pending as a result of which we will probably have to pay several millions. Since the first of September we have spent $12,000,000 on betterments. The roadbed of the street railway has been rebuilt, the road has had many other improvements and we had built 200 new cars. Other right of way improvements of various kinds have been carried out. Having been in existence for so many years the system was badly run down, but as soon as we are able to carry out our plans Toronto will be given a better service and cheaper fares than ever it enjoyed under private ownership. I mention these facts to show that the city from which I come has not been unfair to private ownership.

In my opinion Canada has the most insane railway policy of any country in the civilized world. Where a railway company like the Canadian Pacific proves a success it immediately adds to its services ocean, oil land, land, and lake services and hotels, with the result that it achieves greater success than ever, but it is retained by private ownership. We are all proud of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its success. I would be the last man in the world to say anything unfair about the men who compose that company and who have done so much for Canada and for the Empire. While I may have something to offer by way of criticism, nevertheless I wish to pay a tribute to them for what they have done for this country, and for the Empire as well, in the operation of their most efficient railway and ocean services, especially during the war. Where a road is a success in Canada it is retained by private ownership; where a road has been a failure and its managers cannot even raise sufficient revenue to meet the fixed charges the enterprise is handed back to the people of Canada. I wish to be absolutely fair to the pioneers of the Canadian Northern Railway also. Both Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann are good men, and had it not been for the war they would probably have succeeded to a far greater degree in their railway enterprises. I do not wish to say anything unfair against the Grand Trunk Company either. Some of the English shareholders in the three companies I have named are also shareholders in loan companies in Western Canada. How do they deal with their debtors? If a man is behind in the payment of his instalment do they renew his mortgage and give him time to make good the arrears? I think not, even if he is a returned soldier they foreclose and force him from his farm. But Canada does not measure out this treatment to railways that are bankrupt, but gives them more

money and longer time to pay. I give the Conservative party the credit for the introduction of public ownership in the province of Ontario. It was the late Sir James Whitney and Sir Adam Beck who started the Hydro Electric Light and Power movement in that province which has saved $22,000,000 to the people of Toronto since 1911. There has been no politics in the Hydro-Electric movement. They have good Conservatives and good Liberals in that enterprise, but it was the Conservative party that deserved the credit for creating that great people's enterprise of cheap light and power. The Conservative party, whom the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) characterizes as not a respectable party, deserves the credit for the nationalization of railways in Canada. I want to say, in reference to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that future generations will owe a debt of gratitude to that brilliant statesman for all he has done for public ownership of railways and all he has done to redeem Canada from the deplorable state of railway affairs which has existed in this country.

But we must not worry about the past, as far as the transportation question goes. There is no use crying over spilt milk. They have spent eight or nine hundred million dollars on direct and indirect aid to railways, and the country does not own anything except a lot of bankrupt railways. I think if you went out on the streets of Ottawa, or Winnipeg, or any western city, and put your hands on the first five men you met and said: "Come to Ottawa and we will make you director of the old privately-owned Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific," any of those five men you might select could not have made a worse mess of things than the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern made in the administration of those privately-owned roads. I say that with all due respect to the old directors of those systems. If it had been public-ownership that had fallen down in the transportation sense in the way the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific roads have, which were fed on all kinds of hand-outs, we would have heard severe criticism of them. Not satisfied with federal grants they come also to the doors of the provinces and ask for provincial aid and grants and bonuses. The people's own hydro-radials have never asked for a subsidy or hand-out from any government, but the publicly-owned roads lived on it. If these bankrupt roads had been owned and operated by public ownership instead of by private corporations, oh, my, what a row they would have raised about the evils and the failure of public ownership in this country! I may say that in the session of 1917 matters had reached such an acute state that in Ontario the Hydro-Electric organization composed of over 300 municipalities, came to Ottawa, headed by Sir Adam Beck, the head of the delegation, that great statesman and patriot who has done so much for the people of Ontario.

I venture to say that Sir John Macdonald was the greatest constructive statesman this country ever had. He did wonders in the negotiations for Confederation, in the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, and the farming of the national policy. He was a Conservative, and I may say that constructive work of his has lasted, and will last for all time. The next greatest constructive statesman, I think, is Sir Adam Beck. Some of my friends opposite will also say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did a great deal for Canada, but I wish to remind hon. members that all the good is not in one party. Sir Adam Beck was sufficiently in advance of public opinion not only in regard to public ownership, but in regard to cheap light, power and transportation, as to have been the standard-bearer on these questions and has accomplished a great deal. The United States will run out of coal a hundred years from now. That fact is shown by the report made to Congress by the Conservation Commission of the United States. The result will be that that country, as well as Canada, will have to depend on cheap water-powers more than in the past. Just consider what Sir Adam Beck has done in the Niagara district and what he proposes to do in the St. Lawrence. Future generations will bear tribute to him as one of Canada's greatest statesmen, and he will rank with Sir John Macdonald in the years that are to come as a constructive statesman. He is working for the building up of the Dominion. A deputation from 375 cities, towns and incorporated villages came down from the province of Ontario to oppose any further land grants or subsidies to the bankrupt railways, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. That deputation was received by Sir Robert

Borden and his cabinet, who announced that they proposed to deal in the House with that question later on in the session. And they did deal with it by appointing a royal commission to make a survey of all the railway systems of this country. There was a great deal of difficulty in getting men to serve on the commission, but they chose three very excellent men. The then chairman of the Railway Commission, Sir Henry Drayton, now the member for West York, was one of the commission. Mr. A. H. Smith, President of the New York Central, which is one of the largest, best-equipped and most modern roads in the world to-day, with large affiliations, was the second commissioner. Then they chose a British expert, who did not act, and subsequently they selected Mr. Acworth, an engineer of the Old Country. These gentlemen set to work. The war was on and the country was spending money and the commission started to make an inquiry along certain lines. A survey was made from a public standpoint and the report, which I have before me, is one of the most valuable reports we have ever received in Canada. It is quoted constantly before the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States. I have the records and proceedings of that commission at home. I was reading the reports of the meetings of the Federal Commission appointed by the United States' Government investigating all the electric railways of the United States. They were bankrupt and wanted a different arrangement. I was struck in reading the reports of that commission to see some references to this Drayton-Acworth report. This report recommended the various things defined in the Speech from the Throne, which the Globe says is the most advanced programme of legislation we have had in this country for many years passed. What do I find in the summing up? The report says:

> To summarize our conclusion, we find in Canada 40,000 miles of single track in a country with a population of seven and a half million the year before last. We have as much railway mileage as Germany with a population of 67,000,000 or as much as France with a population of 46,000,000 the United Kingdom with a population of 47,000,000 people.

Canada with a population of seven and a half million people has 40,000 miles of single track, with useless duplication and waste, three transcontinental railways running across Canada where one with a double track would have done for many years with lateral branch lines built off the main line.

Between Toronto and Belleville we have the Grand Trunk double track main line. Then they come along and build the Canadian Pacific, another high-priced track. Then the Canadian Northern is built. So we have the Grand Trunk station at Cobourg, a Canadian Pacific Station, and a Canadian Northern station, all at that and other towns, when there was not more than enough business for one road—useless duplication, useless waste of public funds and capital. This government report found a similar duplication of waste in the Western provinces, and I do not wonder at the movement which has been started amongst the farmers of the West owing to such a railway policy. I am not a supporter of the official U.F.O. Drury-Raney administration. I do not believe they are representative of the farmers of the province of Ontario. They have had two years to make good but have not made good. I see a lot of young men from the West in this House and I hope they will not make the mistakes of the U.F.O. in Ontario, as we all want to endeavour to do something to make this a better country to live in for the farmer and for the toiler in the city. And to this end I think the farmer, the farm labourer and the city toiler should work hand in hand. As they have a common interest in this country let them work to make it a better country, a more contented and happier country to live in. Now what does this official government report recommend about the co-ordination and consolidation of these publicly owned railways?

For one thing, they say:

> 11. We recommend that the control both of the Grand Trunk and of the Grand Trunk Pacific be assumed by the people of Canada on terms hereafter set out.

They also say:

> 25. We have discussed and rejected the following suggestions:—Transfer of all three railways to the Canadian Pacific. Transfer of the Canadian Northern or a portion of it to the Canadian Pacific.

I asked the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day why it took so long for Parliament to consolidate the roads as recommended by this report. He said he could consolidate them in a day. This is what the report says:

> 30. We recommend that the whole of the Dominion Railways be operated by the trustees as one united system on a commercial basis, under their own politically undisturbed management, on account of, and for the benefit of, the people of Canada.

That is the recommendation of this commission which brought the most eminent railway engineers the world over to investigate this matter. They came from England; they came from all over the United States and New York. Mr. A. H. Smith, President of the New York Central Lines, brought all his traffic experts, commercial experts, tariff experts, right-of-way experts, car accountants, engineers, and all that kind of prominent experts to Canada to give recommendations to the commission. Why have those recommendations not been carried out? This Government have not been in power very long and I do not wish to hurry them on this question; I believe in being fair to the Government, and I think the Government will find that I shall be fair to them. I have known the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) practically all my life—he is an old Toronto boy and moved to Windsor, where he did very well. I congratulate him on being sworn in as Minister of Railways. I would give him all the time he likes, to see what he can do with Canada's railway problem. The recommendations, however, which the minister requires, are to be found right in the aforesaid government report; he does not need to travel throughout Canada to find out what should be done. The train on which the commission used to travel throughout this country was like a caravan or a circus, but the moneys spent by the commission were well spent. The then chairman of the Railway Board (Sir Henry Drayton) loaded down as he was by problems created by the war, gave up his time without stint, and he worked practically twenty-four hours a day for nearly eighteen months on this survey to assist in reaching a solution of the problem. The Minister of Railways—I do not wish to criticise him—has been travelling throughout Canada over our railway system, and he came into the Union Station at Toronto. I think Sir Joseph Flavelle had a private car attached to that train too, representing the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not know how many private cars there were; but the more the better, if the railway problem is solved as a result of these trips. If, however, the Minister of Railways will sit down in this House and study this report and the report of the experts, he will have all the advice and knowledge he requires to enable him to decide what to do with the state railway system so as to effect a remedy for the disease into which the railway business has fallen in this country.

[Mr. Church.]

In looking over the transportation question, I find that Mr. Beatty, president of the Canadian Pacific railway, agrees with this report. One night after his appointment as president of the Canadian Pacific railway, a banquet was held in the town of Thorold in which he was born, in his honour by the Board of Trade of that place. I was invited to attend, and I spoke at that banquet. People of both political parties were present; there were private ownership men and public ownership men there. This is what Mr. Beatty says about this question. He is in favour of co-ordinating and consolidating; he welcomes and favours competition; he says that competition is going to be a good thing for the Canadian Pacific railway. He claims that the time has gone by in business in the history of the world when two men quarrel as competitors. Two men, each running a retail store or a hotel, need not quarrel because, as a result of competition, there will be business for both of them. I will read, without any comment, his very words on the railway situation; and it is amazing to me to see the different position taken by the president of the Canadian Pacific railway now from that taken formerly by him and also the remarkable stand taken by the former president, Lord Shaughnessy. The Drayton-Acworth report was a Conservative Government report; it was made before the Union Government was formed. I was never a believer in the Union Government; I am a Tory of the old school and I intend to continue to be one even though the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) says that it may not be a respectable party. The Conservative party was in office at that time. As the hon. member for South York pointed out the other day, the railways have always been in politics. True it is that the president of the Canadian Pacific railway in the late election said that the Canadian Pacific was not in politics; but the Canadian Pacific has been in politics as long as it has been a road, since away back in the early seventies. The greatest politicians that this country has ever produced have never sat in the legislatures at all; they have been general managers and presidents of railways, and they have been managing legislatures and things pretty well for themselves. As some one has said, Ottawa never knows what the rest of the country is thinking, but these railway presidents manage things pretty well as they want to. My understanding is that the Canadian Pacific

have always changed their politics with the party in power; they are friendly to every administration. If the Farmers' party came into power, they would now support the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Had it not been for the unpopularity of the Drury Government, they did not carry out their pledges to the Progressives; if they had done what their U.F.O. officers said they would do for the hon. member for Marquette, he would to-day be occupying the Treasury benches. That should be a lesson to the Progressive party from the West to stand by their principles and not join the Government here. Had the hon. member for Marquette succeeded in forming a government, the Canadian Pacific would have wished themselves on him whether he liked it or not. When a man becomes a railway man, he knows no politics; the railway business is his politics. Some of the railway magnates in the past have been very successful in managing various legislatures of the country; they have been most successful in their management of the United Farmers government at Queen's Park. Mr. Beatty goes on to say, speaking at the Thorold banquet:

> On the occasion of our last banquet, the railway sitaution was somewhat different than it is to-day. It has now advanced another step in what some regard as being the logical consequence of the first step, and we are met with the rather unique situation of the existence of two strong railway systems in Canada, both backed by adequate credit and both desirous of fulfilling to the best of their ability their share in supplying the transportation requirements of the country.
>
> Some people have regarded the railway situation as highly controversial, and it was to the extent that the adherents of the two systems of administration, privately and publicly owned, have been insistent on the correctness of their respective views, and expressly apprehensive of the results of any other system than that which they advocated. To my mind, to regard it as controversial is now unnecessary and unwise, and the chief consideration of all of us is as to what will be the result to the country as a whole in the matter of railway service, and to ourselves in particular as one of those engaged in supplying a large part of that service.
>
> The Canadian Pacific has been built up over a long period of years into an organization of which we may all be conceivably and properly proud, and an organization, the usefulness of which in public service is probably now more important than at any other period of its history. It is a company which can only continue to succeed by being administered with strict integrity and in accordance with the highest business ethics. Upon its success in service depends its rewards.
>
> There has always been competition and there always will be competition and the character of business competition does not alter in any of its essential details as the years pass on. Our competitor is and will be a very extensive system, which will probably increase in magnitude. We all hope it will be a success, and we do not need to be altruists in order to harbor that hope. I think I can say to you with perfect candor that no man in Canada has more reason to hope for its success than I have, for two reasons, first, because its success as a railway undertaking means a gradual release of the burden on the taxpayer, and the Canadian Pacific is a fairly heavy taxpayer, and secondly because the factors which contribute to its success will ensure the further and continued success of the Canadian Pacific. If the traffic development of the country is such as to support the National system, it will undoubtedly be sufficient to add to the support of the Canadian Pacific. You will, therefore, appreciate that on national and selfish grounds the success of the National railways is something that every Canadian Pacific official should desire.
>
> It involves competition of course—keen competition. Competition which is both keen and honest cannot help but redound to the advantage of the competitors, to the improvement in the character of the service they render, and to the resultant advantage of the people and communities served. Personally I would have no fear of the competition adversely affecting this company or its interests, and the reason why I think I have a right to that confidence is to be found in the organization itself and the character of the officers and men who comprise it—officers and men who, I think, can be relied on to play the game of transportation competition as it was meant to be played—adroitly, persistently, aggressively and fairly.
>
> Depreciation of Roads
>
> In years gone by it was considered an act of proper aggressiveness for one competitor to decry the methods and wares of his rival. This is not the case to-day. It is foolish to depreciate your competitors outwardly or otherwise—foolish for two reasons: first, because they probably do not deserve your depreciation of them, and secondly, because it is bad business.

Now that is what Mr. Beatty says in regard to the question of duplication and competition and in support of his theory of a public-owned system. The officials of the Canadian Pacific railway are very fond of talking about what that railway has done in the interests of the country. What, on the other hand, has Canada done for the Canadian Pacific Railway? I think they should consider that question on the other side of the account. Lord Shaughnessy declares for co-ordination too, and government ownership with Canadian Pacific railway operation and I think he has expressed the belief that his policy is approved by some gentlemen in the House. He says that co-ordination is both logical and economical. Well, of course, it is—for the Canadian Pacific railway. If Lord Shaugnessy could have his way he would have everything in Canada, and the heavens above, and the earth beneath and the waters under

the earth, all placed under the control of the Canadian Pacific railway, and would lord it over all the inhabitants of the earth. His predecessor, Abraham Lincoln, said with regard to public-ownership, "This country and all that is within it belongs to the people who inhabit it." Lord Shaughnessy would go him one better and declare that this country and all who inhabit it belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Others have expressed themselves on public ownership. Let me quote what some have said:

> Every measure must be tested by this question only: Is it just? Is it for the benefit of the average man, without influence or privilege? Does it embody the highest conception of social justice, without respect to person or class or particular interest?—Woodrow Wilson.
>
> Real public ownership is the essence of democracy. Instead of dividing men into masters and mastered, it brings men together in a union of interest, and affords the conditions necessary for the highest traits of conscience and character.—Prof. Frank Parsons of the Boston Law School in "The City for the People."
>
> In its search for truth the commission had to overcome many obstacles, such as the burning of books, letters, and documents and the obstinacy of witnesses who declined to testify until criminal proceedings were begun for their refusal to answer questions. The New Haven Railroad system has more than 300 subsidiary corporations in a web of entangling alliances with each other, many of which are seemingly planned, created, and manipulated by lawyers expressly retained for the purpose of concealment of deception.—From the Inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission, July 11, 1914, into the New Haven and other Railroads.

If public ownership had been in such a condition as was revealed by the Interstate Commerce Commission as aforesaid, I wonder what private ownership advocates would have had to say? What would Lord Shaughnessy and Mr. Beatty say? I asked the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day why it should take so much time to co-ordinate and consolidate these roads, in view of the recommendation made by the commission appointed by this Parliament four years ago. Take the New York Central lines in the United States as an example of the expedition with which consolidation can be achieved when an effort is made toward this end. That system co-ordinated many branch lines in Ohio, the Lake Shore passing through Geneva, Cleveland and other centres down to Toledo. How long do you imagine it took the New York Central to co-ordinate that system? About forty-eight hours. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) the other day referred to the subject of arbitration of the Grand Trunk. It is true that a delay was experienced in connection with that arbitration, but it was entirely unavoidable. The right hon. gentleman was compelled to visit the Old Country on an important mission, in regard to which, as we all know, he acquitted himself so admirably, reflecting the greatest credit on this country. When he returned last fall he announced an election, and as head of the government of that time he felt he could not deal with the important question of co-ordination of the publicly owned roads until the country had expressed its opinion on his policy of linking up the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The election came, and nothing has been done since. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) has been taking a trip, and now that he is back in the House I trust it will not be long before he can make up his mind as to what it is best to do. What they have done in the United States in connection with their railways should spur the Government of this country to activity. Mr. McAdoo, the Director-General of Railways, under Mr. Woodrow Wilson, soon after he was appointed to the position, took over, on the 28th of December, 1917, all the railways in the United States in twenty-four hours and co-ordinated and consolidated them. True, it was not strictly government ownership but government operation. This taking over of the railways was a war measure that had to be carried out. Many of the roads were bankrupt and could not carry on; they could not, in the state in which they were without certain betterments and improvements which had to be made by the director-general, carry munitions and troops to the seaboard. The Director-General of Railways, however, was able in twenty-four hours to co-ordinate something like, I think, 200 or 300 companies. These roads were taken over for the duration of the war and a period of eighten months thereafter, when, it was agreed, the government would hand them back to private ownership. During the time that they were under the control of the government they were put into a state of repair. The government had undertaken to pay to private ownership 5½ per cent. or the average dividends secured each year for the 5 years prior to 1917—during government operation. That, of course, I do not call public ownership. There are several ways of operating a railway. There is, for instance, private ownership practically without any government regulation, such as we see in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is also private ownership with some degree

of government regulation. Then there is private ownership and management with strict government regulation, and private ownership with exclusive government operation. There is also government ownership with private operation, such as Lord Shaughnessy wants. And there is what I want—government ownership and government operation. I mean such proper and adequate government ownership and operation as will make the publicly owned roads a success. A few days ago the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) referred to the deplorable condition of the steam roads in the United States, due to over capitalization and lack of rolling stock and equipment, which, coupled with a long period of depression in business and post-war stagnation, had reduced most of the railway companies to financial trouble. A shortage of rolling stock and equipment has rendered it impossible for the railways to efficiently handle even the limited amount of freight that has been tendered to them, and as a result the automobile manufacturers in the Central States have been forced to drive over 80,000 of their cars to New York city under their own power rather than trust to the very unsatisfactory transportation services of the railways. To illustrate the condition of affairs I will quote some of the evidence given before the Inter-State Commerce Commission regarding the difficulties which confronted the Railroad Administrator of the United States in the winter 1917-18, when he assumed control of the American railway systems.

It was the worst winter in the history of railroading.

I happened to be in the Southern States at the time and had personal experience of the severe winter weather then prevailing.

They were up against:—

War demands—army of millions of men to be transported to the cantonments, seaboard, and back.

Plague of influenza, playing havoc with workmen, 18,000 employees sick at one time in New England alone.

Greatest burden of both freight and passenger traffic in railroad history.

Alarming coal shortage (248 mines idle because of lack of cars).

Terrible freight congestion (180,000 loaded freight cars on the eastern lines alone; many freight embargoes).

Putting in and training inexperienced men.

Drafting of thousands of employees.

Chaos in railroad management, poor handling of cars, locomotives etc.

Great amount of overtime pay necessary to get repair work done. Had also but six months of increased rates to meet 12 months of increased pay.

Inability to get new cars and locomotives because of need of them for war purposes and our shortage of men owing to the draft.

No serviceable locomotives in reserve (at beginning of this winter, however, 1,000 in reserve.)

More or less opposition on the part of railway executives to successful government control for fear it would become permanent.

Necessity of handling freight and making repairs at any cost.

No complete valuation of the railroads on which to compute freight rate, and make a budget.

As the hon. member for South York pointed out, if you look over the history of the privately owned railroads of the United States, you must admit that private ownership has not been a success. I shall not labour that point to-day.

The press has devoted considerable attention to our railway affairs, and I wish to direct your attention to an article which recently apeared in one of our leading Ontario papers, written by its Ottawa representative. It reads:

While no sound comes from the hermetically sealed room in which the Gouin Government holds secret counsel as to its railway policy, the stock ticker—the same prophet that for a whole year foretold the coming of the Great War—keeps chattering. "Something doing in C.P.R.: something doing in C.P.R."

Something doing in Canadian Pacific! We have the declaration of the hon. leader of the Government that he intends to give public ownership a chance, and we have the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Crerar) declaring themselves in favor of public ownership and operation of our railways. But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been most active regarding the transportation situation, and when you see the stock ticker chattering you know there is going to be something doing in respect to our railway problem. Continuing the article says:

Last week C.P.R. stock advanced in price about eight points. In the same time U.P. stock, which pays the same 10 per cent dividend, advanced only three points. And everybody started looking for the reason. Some Yankee financial papers hinted at "Government ownership," and there is something more than a possibility that they have scored a bull's-eye.

That the railroads were the issue in the recent elections is now common knowledge; that the railroad interests won that election is beyond a peradventure. That the latter are about to take action of some kind is evidenced by the stock market. But what is the action to be taken? That is the question for which politicians and financiers alike are trying to find the answer.

Again, the article proceeds:

On more than one occasion the C.P.R. made proposals to the late government. They were always along the same line. They always provided for government-ownership of all railroads, with the exception of the old G.T.R., which was to be handed back to its shareholders, but included the C.P.R. And they always provided that the C.P.R. should have the management of the whole government system.

But, naturally, every care was to be taken of the C.P.R. shareholders. They are paid, as said before, 10 per cent on this stock.

And again the article says:

Sacred Cause is Safe

One hundred per cent of the Liberals are for private-ownership. Ninety-five per cent of the Conservatives are in the same frame of mind. Eighty per cent of the Ontario U.F.O. members are as pro-C.P.R. as the Drury Government, and the western Progressives would be, too, if they were not afraid of their constituents.

This gives the sacred cause of vested rights an overwhelming majority in the House. It gives the Gouin ring their long-looked for opportunity to put over any kind of a deal that is even slightly camouflaged.

To put it briefly, the stage is all set for the final division of those accumulated C.P.R. profits. The right kind of Parliament is there. The Cabinet has been especially selected for the purpose. The C.P.R. has prepared its deal.. And the stock-ticker fairly shrieks that it is on the way.

The Conservative party has been a believer in public ownership and favourable to the hydro-electric and hydro-radial movements in the province of Ontario, and the Conservative party gave the province the benefits of public ownership of our hydro-electric development. Eighty per cent of the Progressive party in Ontario, or of the U.F.O. are said to be as pro-Canadian Pacific Railway as the Drury Government. It is said that the western Progressives would be pro-Canadian Pacific too if they were not afraid of their constituents. I should think that some of my Progressive friends are too young in their parliamentary experience to be afraid of their constituents so early in their public career.

The hon. Prime Minister said in the course of his speech on Monday, " Give the railways a chance." I hope he will give them a chance, but what does he mean by that word? The Drayton-Acworth Commission recommended that a free hand be given to a board of directors to consolidate all the government-owned roads. When we appointed a transportation commission to take over the Toronto Street railway, on which they spent $11,000,000 on betterments in the last four months of 1921, and will spend another $11,000,000 in betterments this year, the citizens carried by a large majority the proposal to take over the light, power and transportation systems within the city, with a commission to administer them. When we were considering the powers and scope of the transportation commission, I took a very strong stand to give the commission an absolutely free hand and full control over the entire system and also rates and fares, and insisted that the commission should be free of any and all interference from the city council and should have full power to fix rates and operate the street railway system to the best of their ability, and make it pay and administer it solely from the commercial aspect.

That principle was adopted by the city council and the legislature and was embodied in our act. It would prove a success in its application to our publicly-owned federal railway systems. That is the only kind of management that can be successfully applied to our national railway system; without it we might as well have no public ownership at all. What has been the secret of the success of the Hydro-Electric in Ontario? First, the absence of politics in its administration; second, efficient management and operation,—and without these things public ownership cannot succeed. I hope that if the railways are handed over to a commission, there will be a stop to the passing of legislation as to receipts and expenditures and the financing of the road, or affecting hours and conditions of labour; matters of that kind should be left to the commission. Labour has everything to hope for from public ownership; it has very little to expect from private ownership. Public ownership will always deal justly and fairly with the workingman so far as working conditions and hours of labour are concerned. Under public ownership the same rates of wages and hours of labour apply as in the case of private ownership because they are established on a similar basis or on a higher and better plane than under private ownership.

I hope that the state-owned railways will be given a proper chance, but when the Minister of Railways addresses the House with regard to this matter I would like him to tell us what he means when he says that state-owned roads will be given a "chance." The Drayton-Acworth report indicates how they can be made a success. Let the Government carry out the recommendations of that report and thus follow

the basic principle which has brought such splendid success to the Hydro-Electric movement in Ontario. If Progressive members from the western part of Ontario—and I know eight or ten of them from that district—want to see at first hand an exemplification of the success of public ownership as applied to railways in our province, let them go over Adam Beck's railway, the London and Port Stanley, owned by the city of London, which was formerly owned by the Pere Marquette and subsequently the Grand Trunk, and finally taken over by the city of London and electrified. Passenger rates have been reduced enormously; freight rates have been brought down to a minimum, and improved facilities afforded in the way of lake services—London and St. Thomas have been placed thus on lake Erie—with lake services to Cleveland, Erie, Pa., and other points on lake Erie. I repeat that that road has been made a splendid success, because it has been administered by Sir Adam Beck on the basis of no politics and entirely from the business point of view. Operate a road in that way; secure an efficient operation equipment and management, and you will have what the Drayton-Acworth report recommends. But if you are to have the doctors of the Canadian Pacific giving advice, then good-bye to public ownership of railways in this country. If that condition is to prevail it would be far better if the railways had not been taken over.

I was somewhat surprised yesterday upon hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan)—and I am glad to see him back in the House, because he is a good friend of mine. He made a very good speech so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned; he knows a great deal about the transportation question. But he did not tell the House all he knows. I say I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the stand he took; I do not think his attitude is altogether just and fair in some respects. British Columbia has an equal right to take that stand, and so have the other western provinces. I do not know whether or not it is correct, but some years ago I saw a return which stated that Ontario had contributed about 52 per cent of all taxes of Canada since Confederation. At any rate, Ontario is a very heavily taxed province, and 58 or 60 per cent of all taxes in Ontario are paid by Toronto and the district of Toronto. I saw a return the other day in this connection, relating to the British North America Act and the bringing of British Columbia, the Western provinces and the Maritime provinces into Confederation. Having regard to the British North America Act there may be something in what the member for Cumberland says, but when the Maritime provinces set up the contention which he makes, it should be remembered that the West, British Columbia in particular, can reasonably do the same. But I hope that they will never make that contention; I hope they will not ask the old provinces of Canada, Ontario and Quebec, to pay for what they are asking in regard to reduced freight and passenger rates, because the old provinces have borne the heat of the day for quite a long time and are already loaded up with a heavy burden of freight rates.

You cannot have faithful and efficient administration of the railways of this country unless solely administered from the commercial aspect, along the line of the Hydro-Electric movement and the Drayton-Acworth report. The railways must be run for the benefit of the whole of Canada; they must be operated on a purely business basis or not at all. The sentiment of the East and of the West, or of the East as against the West, cannot be considered. And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the Western provinces have a good deal to complain of from the standpoint of government regulation. Government regulation in this country is not what it should be. It is not here what it is in the United States. I am free to say that good work was done by the Railway Commission through Mr. Blair and Mr. Justice Mabee and Sir Henry Drayton. They were strong administrators of the railways so far as their jurisdiction went and they had the confidence of the people of Canada. But in later days the Railway Commission has not been fulfilling the functions for which it was appointed. There have been four increases in rates—freight, passenger, telephone and express. The municipality of Toronto had to fight practically alone against these increases. We spent nearly $30,000 in the services of experts to fight the freight increase and the passenger increase; we spent $30,000 on two fights over telephone and express rate increases. The Railway Commission heard these corporations, and notwithstanding the fact that the war had long been over, and prices were beginning to recede, in the summer of 1920 they allowed these companies an increase of

4 p.m.

40 per cent in freight and passenger rates. I have figured that the total of these increases —I speak subject to correction; I have seen the figures as given by the head of the Hydro-Electric Radial Asociation, Mr. J. W. Lyon, of Guelph, who is an expert in these matters—the total freight increases granted by Hon. Mr. Carvell and his colleagues in the Railway Board have amounted to $300,000,000 a year in the last few years. Fancy all these taxes put on the farmers and working classes without the consent of Parliament! A railway commission which does not represent the people is appointed to impose taxes amounting to a million dollars a day for every working day in the year, without the consent of the people's representatives in Parliament. I say it is not fair; it is not just; legislation of that kind is not equitable; it is not responsible government. I hope I shall have the support of the Progressives in seeing that something is done to amend such legislation —I know I shall have the support of the Opposition — to bring about a change in this state of affairs. There is something in the Speech from the Throne about freight rates, and I think the hon. Prime Minister says that if there is dissatisfaction with what the commission does, he is willing to let Parliament take some stand in the matter. But if I had my way I would go back to the old method of doing things; I would not have any of these rate handouts by the Railway Commission without the authority of Parliament. It was a particularly retrogressive step for Canada when we placed the telephone and express rates under the control of the Railway Commission, and it is fortunate indeed that Parliament did not place under their jurisdiction also the matter of tolls and rates for water-borne traffic and the control of lake rates. These increases to which I have referred were granted without proper or adequate inquiry, research or investigation; the chairman of the board took the figures submitted by the experts of the Canadian Pacific as to receipts re the freight and passenger increase, etc. The result was he granted a forty per cent increase, notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Pacific had a surplus of nearly $492,000,000, I think it was, as active and inactive assets.

Then the people of Canada taught the railways and the Railway Commission a lesson, because with a forty per cent increase in the passenger rates they would not travel on the railways; accordingly the companies had to go back to some of the old rates. The people taught the railway people a lesson with respect to freight rates also. In the district from which I come the largest retail stores, when dealing with customers located on the Toronto and Hamilton highway, transported their goods in motor cars. So the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk railways lost heavily in some localities by reason of that increase in rates.

Then the Telephone Company came along. It wanted an increase and nothing would do but they should come to Ottawa and ask the Board of Railway Commissioners for an increase. They preferred their request and they got the desired increase. And this, although the Bell Telephone Company is a rich corporation, with a large surplus, and it was so hard up that it paid eight per cent in dividends for thirty-two years. That company came down to Ottawa, applied to the Railway Commissioners and got a raise in their rates for the asking. This telephone rate increase took a million dollars out of the taxpayers of Toronto and was unjust, unfair, inequitable and not according to the provisions of the Company or the Railway Act. I am satisfied that the latest increase asked for by the Bell Company would have been granted had an election not been pending. Some of the commissioners probably thought they had better look out for their positions on the board, and not grant the increase, for if a new government came in they might be relieved of their judicial duties. So the board divided itself 3 to 2 on this second telephone application and it was refused. I hope the present Government will bring in legislation in the interest of the public, and not allow any further increase without the consent of Parliament, and so take some of the taxes from the shoulders of the working classes as well as of the farmers in this country. Perhaps it would be a good thing for this country if provision were made also for a reorganization, root and branch, of the whole board and let us have a living regulation of these powerful public service corporations.

I will tell you what the increase of freight rates has done for the farmers. It has added $5 to the price of every ton of coal which the farmers in the county of York buy. I was one of the directors of the Consumers' Gas Company in Toronto representing the city on the board, and that company pays out a million and

a half in freight rates alone. It took all the money coming in over the counter to meet the added charges of freight rates, labour, exchange, and increased cost of coal. The price of gas in the city of Toronto was very low at the time, but you can see what was involved when the price of coal went up from $3.20 to $10, $12, $13, $14 a ton. The exchange rate represented an additional charge of $250,000, and the freight rates a million and a half dollars. The price of gas had to be twice raised and it was hard on the working classes.

I would like to consider how these freight rates affect the farmer in another way. I have here a statement issued by a bank that loans the federal Government of Canada, as well as the provincial governments and municipalities, a lot of money —I refer to the National City Bank of New York. It is one of the largest financial corporations not only in America but in the world. This corporation isues a sketch every month describing the economic conditions in Canada and in the United States. In the statement referred to they discuss the high prices of building materials and how the excessive freight rates are keeping building operations back. Reference is made to the iron industry, and it is stated that the difficulty of getting steel for building purposes is very largely due to the present high freight rates and high prices of coal. The coal question, as any coal dealer can tell you, is very largely a transportation question; solve the transportation question and you can overcome the high price of coal. Many of the mines in the coal mining regions closed down during the war and after it because of the scarcity of cars and the difficulty of getting coal transported to the consuming centres. Now, this is what this bank statement has to say as to how the freight rates affect the building trades and the farmers:

> As the liquidation process throughout the industry was extended, the wholly disproportionate margin of cost assumed by the freight factor under prevailing rates was thrown in bolder relief. A typical study has shown that whereas on January 1, 1913, the assembling cost for a ton of basic pig iron in the Mahoning Valley was approximately 27 per cent of the selling price, it is now approximately 58 per cent. The estimated assembling charges in the two periods are $4.80 and $10.55 and the prices $16.45 and $18.25 respectively. With labour costs cut down 40 to 50 per cent from the peak, operating efficiency largely restored and other economics forced, the factor of freight cost obviously occupies a commanding position in its bearing upon future prices.

The statement goes on to say:

> Nothing will save the farming industry but a deep cut in freight rates. We are all merely producing tonnage for the railroads, who merely collect from the unorganized workers and turn it over to the organized workers. The latter punish when the politicians fail to do their bidding; we farmers don't.

The farmers did, in Canada. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) referred to what has been done in the United States in the matter of electrifying railways. In this connection the New York Central railway has effected great economies in the saving of coal; also the London and Port Stanley railway in Ontario and the Milwaukee, Chicago and St. Paul operating in the Western states. I do not agree with my hon. friend from York that in Ontario we have a million horse power at present available. The power available from the development of the Chippewa has been contracted for, but with half our industries closed down and the other half only running part time difficulty has been experienced already in getting sufficient power.

If the St. Lawrence power scheme were carried out sufficient energy would be available to electrify our railways from Quebec to Fort William. President Harding of the United States has come out very strongly in favour of the St. Lawrence waterway and the electrification of railways in the United States. Addressing the national agricultural conference at Washington on February 20 last, he spoke as follows:

> To this time railroad construction, financing and operation have been unscientific and devoid of proper consideration for the wider concerns of the community. To say this is simply to admit a fact which applies to practically every railroad system in the world. It is as true regarding the railroads of Canada and Great Britain as it is in reference to those of the United States.
>
> In America we have too long neglected our waterways. We need a practical development of water resources for both transportation and power. A large share of railway tonnage is coal for railroad fuel. The experience of railway electrification demonstrates the possibilty of reducing this waste and increasing efficiency.
>
> We may well begin very soon to consider plans to electrify our railroads. If such a suggestion seems to involve inordinate demands upon our financial and industrial power, it may be replied that three generations ago the suggestion of building 260,000 miles of railways in this country would have been scouted as a financial and industrial impossibility."
>
> The waterway improvement represents not only the possibility of expanding our transportation system, but also of producing hydro-electric power for its operation and for the activities of widely diffused industry.

I have spoken of the advantage which Europe enjoys because of its easy access to the sea, the cheapest and surest transportation facilities. In our own country is presented one of the world's most attractive opportunities for extension of the seaways many hundred miles inland. The heart of the continent with its vast resources in both agriculture and industry would be brought in communication with all the ocean routes by the execution of the St. Lawrence waterway project. The feasibility of the project is unquestioned and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small.

There you have the declaration of the President of the United States regarding the electrification of railways and the need of stimulating and developing water-borne traffic, on inland rivers and waterways of United States and Canada, in order to properly, adequately, efficiently and economically solve the transportation problems of his and our country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South York (Mr. MacLean) referred to motor trucks as a factor in transportation. I cannot go as far as the hon. member in that connection, because, taking the other side of the case, I have the finding of the electrical commission in the United States, who investigated all the electric systems in that country and they found that the motor truck would not be a factor in transportation for two or three reasons: first, on account of the high price of gasoline, second, on account of the high price of tires, and third owing to difficulties of loading and unloading and trans-shipment. As I see it they will only be a factor to act as a feeder to the electric railways, and the electric railways and radials will be feeders for the steam roads. That was proven in the railway administration of the United States, and that is what happened on the New York and Pennsylvania lines and the Michigan Central lines. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman from South York when he said they would be a factor, although at the time of the 40 per cent increase in rates they were a factor, but between inter-urban municipalities I do not believe they will ever be a factor in Canada, especially on account of the climate that we have here for five months in the year. But there is another matter which enters into it. I believe the greatest factor in transportation in Canada in the future is the electrification of railways and hydro-radials and radials as a whole. I regret to see the stand taken by the Drury U.F.O. government in the Ontario Legislature in this regard. I think the radials in Ontario are not a luxury, they are a social, economic and commercial necessity.

I desire to pay tribute to the pioneer work done by Sir Adam Beck in Ontario. It is a revelation to visitors from all over the world.

I refer to the development in the Niagara river, and to-morrow it will be in the St. Lawrence, and in the West also. Sooner or later we will have a network of electrical lines between rural municipalities and urban centres. We have to look to United States to see what a factor electrical railways and radials and interurban lines of communication are. Take the state of Michigan. A few years ago the city of Detroit only had a population of 425,000. To-day, owing to the network of radials in that great city, the population of Detroit is over a million people. The Ford industry also helped in that development. I was at the Deep Waterways convention at Detroit at which sixteen states were represented and nine state governors were present to discuss the St. Lawrence canal. These states were linked up together as far as they could be on the waterways problem, and one of the main things discussed at that convention was the effect the radials had in the solution of the transportation problem in that great land, and especially the Western states. Look at what radials have done for Ohio—they solved there the unemployment and transportation question—and were feeders to the steam roads. They have radials from Cleveland all the way to Buffalo. Every mile and a half or so, all the way down you see spread out little villages, built up by interurban lines of communications between the cities and towns of that great state and the lake Erie ports. This is the state of Ohio, whence came the present President as well as the defeated candidate for president—Governor Cox. The population of Ohio is as large as that of Canada, namely, 9,000,000. I pay tribute to what President Harding has said as to the electrification of railways and the development of waterways and interurban traffic. That is borne out in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, and in that state of Woodrow Wilson's, New Jersey. In Ontario 200 municipalities have carried Hydro Radial by-laws. It was not Sir Adam Beck nor the commission that first asked for a survey for these lines of railways, but the 200 municipalities themselves—the Hydro Radial policy is not to duplicate the steam roads. The policy is to

take over some of the unused sections of the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk and electrify them. I believe the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) in this House, will be a faithful friend of Sir Adam Beck and of the Hydro municipalities, and will do what he can for the Hydro Radials.

I believe he will bring down a policy in this connection to give the Hydro an option on what federal sections of our publicly-owned railways the Hydro wants—unlike the Canadian Northern Railway the Hydro Radials ask no subsidies. When they are operating through the country they will give a service to the farmers, so that the farmer of Ontario will have a fair chance to market his crop to his home market at cost. Sir Adam Beck's report when presented recommended a radial system for Ontario. The farmers are very strong for it, and the reason is this; that the steam roads have absolutely fallen down in the province of Ontario. In the Hamilton district, the Toronto district and the London district we have no steam suburban service. Montreal has a steam suburban service; on the national lines they have about six trains a day out and back. The Canadian Pacific has, I think, about 12 trains running out and back the same day; from the Island of Montreal the Grand Trunk has far more than that. In all they have some 30 or 40 suburban trains a day out of Montreal—the Toronto district has not a single suburban train on the steam road, except one to Oakville on the Canadian Pacific. There is an absence of any semblance of any steam suburban service.

In the territory back of Toronto, for a distance of thirty miles, there is a population of 800,000, over a third of the population of the entire province. That great district is without a steam suburban service. What is the result to the farmer? He cannot get his crops to market. If you go to the Niagara district in August or September, you will find they have a difficulty in getting out the fruit crop. If you go to Hamilton you will see the same. Go to Mr. Drury's own constituency of Halton and see the same and you will also see that the farmers in Halton are very much dissatisfied on account of the stand the government has taken on the hydro radials. They are a unit in Halton in that respect. The absence of this service is the cause of the high cost of living in the cities and towns and of underproduction. The municipalities were forced to ask the Hydro Electric Power Commission to investigate the radials because—of the way the steam roads fell down—these radials have done so much for the farmers and the towns and cities across the border. Sir Adam's report, was prepared and then the municipalities voted on and carried the various Hydro Radial by-laws.

It is not an Ontario government radial scheme, it is the municipalities' own scheme. The government of Ontario never lost a dollar in it or on the Hydro Light and Power scheme. Every municipality has a surplus from Hydro, except one or two not yet beyond construction. I may say that is the reason the radials were brought into existence. Now, because of the lack of transportation in Ontario we have rural depopulation in this province. In the period from 1904 to 1914, 500,000 people left the farms of Ontario and went to cities and towns in the West and to cities and towns in Ontario and the United States. Why? Some of my hon. friends opposite and some hon. members on the Progressive side of the House claim that that was due to the trade policy of the country. I say: No, it is not due to any question of protection or free trade. Some of it may be due to free trade in other countries, because rural depopulation is a world wide problem; but rural depopulation in Ontario was not due to protection, it is not a local, but a world problem; it has been brought about largely by the war. What is the reason and cause of this rural depopulation in Ontario from 1904 to 1914 of, I think, half a million people? It is because of lack of transportation facilities on the farms, because of lack of the very joy of living on the farms, without conveniences such as good roads, hydro-telephones, hydro-telegraphs and hydro-radials. Prior to a few years ago, there was no rural mail delivery, no goods delivery and only a flag station railway service from the steam roads throughout the province. I believe, however, that the hydro-radials will bring about a remedy of those conditions.

Before I conclude, I desire to say a few words about the St. Lawrence waterway. The people of Ontario and, I believe, also the people of the Western provinces are vitally interested in this waterway. In the first place, there is no coal in Ontario; we have to depend on the Maritime provinces or the United States for our coal supply. In about a hundred years the United States' coal supply will be exhausted; we are thus at the mercy of a foreign country. The province contains an abundant supply of water-power, in all

6,000,000 h.p., of which approximately over 800,000 h.p. has been developed. I have in my hand some notes of the evidence which I gave before the International Waterways Commission in October, 1920. As I am placing on the Order Paper a resolution in regard to the St. Lawrence river, I will not go into this matter at any length to-day except to say that the Western provinces especially, Ontario, and indeed, Canada as a whole, should be vitally interested in this proposition.

Nature provided the St. Lawrence for two reasons: (1) For a great waterway to the sea; (2) for a great power plant to develop trade, commerce and agriculture. The development of this river will bring untold relief to Canadians and Americans. Power will be developed; industry and agriculture made more secure; freight rates cheapened; several million tons of coal will be saved annually. Fourteen western states have come out in favour of this project, and I think all Canada, with the exception of some conscientious objectors in the city of Montreal, are in favour of it.

I was speaking to a member of the Montreal Harbour Commission yesterday and they are not opposing this proposition. In the United States they are having a little family spat between the cautious conservative big interests in the East and the more progressive interests in the West over this project; but the West is going to win. The younger generation in Canada will live to see the day when ocean-going ships will come from the Old Country, go up the St. Lawrence and up the Upper lakes with their cargo. The fact that this scheme is feasible from a commercial and business standpoint is strengthened by what happened in 1911 when the big interests were willing to canalize the St. Lawrence in return for the power privileges. They made a sharp fight before the Rivers and Harbours Committee at Washington. They said they would build a canal if they were given the power to build it. Every year 4,000,000 h.p. of electrical energy, the equivalent of $800,000,000 worth of coal, is going to waste in the St. Lawrence, and the finest system of inland waterways in the world has been lying idle all these years because of lack of development, as deep draught vessels cannot sail up the St. Lawrence 46 miles on their way to the Upper lakes. The St. Lawrence ranks with the Suez and Panama canals in its magnitude and importance. The cost of this project may reach $250,000,000 or more, no one yet knows the cost, but there will be no great difficulty in financing the work. Private capital stands ready to develop the deep waterway in exchange for the power privileges. The great bulk of the developed power will belong to Canada. Some say that Canada wants to take it all, but that is not so; they can dispose of the power in other ways and sell some abroad. A large part of the power will belong to the province of Quebec. Abundant evidence will be found in the report of the International Joint Commission that this project will be a success. Sir Adam Beck, of the Hydro-Electric Commission, who investigated this project on behalf of the Ontario Government, has made his report.

1. The report sets out clearly the position of the province in relation to the improvements. It pointed out that in all discussion and consideration of the work the important facts of navigation and power could not be separated; that in all consideration and in all determination as to the future of the river, the fact that navigation and power were so intimately connected that one could not be sacrificed to the advantage of the other.

2. This report stated that there could be developed at conservative estimate power equivalent to 20,000,000 tons of coal per year —more than the total importation of Canada now. It advocated the construction of the proposed improvements to the St. Lawrence, which it said was the most important economic question before the people of Canada.

3. The final aim of the policy of the Hydro-Electric Commission is, first the complete development of the available power at Niagara, and following that the joint development with the aid of the federal governments of Canada and the United States of the great international water powers on the St. Lawrence River.

The Hydro served 344 municipalities, every one of whom had a big surplus. If the St. Lawrence scheme materializes, as it must, large industries will inevitably move into Canada and the United States to take advantage of the cheap and abundant power thus made available, and no more ideal location for the exploitation of these enormous industrial activities can be imagined than that portion of Ontario and New York lying adjacent to the shores of the St. Lawrence River. With nearly two million horse power available and with deep draft navigation to tide water the industrial future of this territory would be assured. The canalization of the St. Lawrence is the most important matter to come before the people of Canada since Confederation and the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. I propose to discuss this further when my motion comes up on the Order Paper.

The Hydro from the Niagara district exported from Canada 90,000 horse power. Each horse power represents from six to twenty tons of coal according to the character of the industrial plant which is supplied. I have attended as a Toronto Harbour Commissioner the convention of the Port Authorities and heard the arguments for the St. Lawrence scheme. Those against it were all founded on a fallacy. To sum up in a few words the advantages of the St. Lawrence route:

1. It is one of the great natural waterways of the world.

2. The cost of improvement is less than that of other routes. Moreover, it would be divided between the two nations sharing its benefits.

3. It is a high-speed highway avoiding long passages by canals.

4. It would accommodate the large vessels of commerce, opening the Great Lakes to ocean freighters and avoiding the cost of rehandling goods.

5. The improvement would develop vast water power, more than any other project—develop it where wanted.

6. It would be jointly owned and used by Canada and the United States, and such joint ownership and use would cement the friendship of these two great peoples.

7. If, failing to join with the States, we insist on an all-Canadian route, then we may expect an American route as well; we should then have two costly waterways paralleling the way to the sea, where one less costly and more efficient than either would suffice. It is a practical and sensible plan.

We believe there is a distinct advantage in joining hands with our sister nation to the south, the United States.

Millions of horse power are available, that, while incidental would more than repay the entire cost of the improvement.

This development would represent a saving of coal running into tens of millions of tons annually. Coal miners may strike, but the St. Lawrence never goes on strike. Yet this great development is but a by-product incidental to the greater object to be achieved.

Nature has done so much to afford the Great Lakes a flowing road to the sea that it seems to me utter folly that we should neglect to improve the short stretches that bar the modern freighter from the Canadian lake ports.

Without a deeper St. Lawrence our whole harbour expenditure rebuilding the Port of Toronto of over twenty-six millions will be in jeopardy and founded on a wrong foundation.

The St. Lawrence is Nature's highway to the sea. Give us a great water highway, a flowing road down which the products of the west may float from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

In seeking a better water route to the Atlantic, we must have the best highway that can be obtained.

It is a national duty—a Canadian duty—an International duty—to develop water power wherever possible. Give us this mighty co-laborer with coal in keeping the wheels of industry revolving and you will put the country beyond the power of any man or group of men to cripple and imperil as the country is crippled and imperiled to-day.—Pamphlet T. L. Church on St. Lawrence.

We have engineering and commercial assurance of these three facts:

1. It can be done; it's practical.

2. The cost will be less than other routes proposed.

3. There would be developed water power running into millions of tons of coal per annum and millions of horse power available for trade and commerce and industrial development.

The people of Ontario believe that one joint route for Canada and the United States is better than two rival routes. We believe that such a route can be accomplished more cheaply, that it provides a more direct way to the markets of Europe, that it is more practicable, more serviceable, better than any other plan yet offered.

We believe that this improved St. Lawrence will bring great commercial development to our own country and corresponding benefit to the peoples of the world with whom we shall trade.

The St. Lawrence route has long appealed to my interest. I am hopeful that we are going to get a report which will give us in concrete form the cost and the possibilities that will grow out of this great international waterway.

The water has been running to waste through all the ages, and at a time when this country is suffering for want of fuel for producing and short of power for our industries and our railways.—T. L. Church Pamphlet.

Water-borne traffic is going to be a very important factor in solving the transportation question in Canada, and I hope the Minister of Railways will bring down some scheme in that connection, especially as we have the findings of President Harding of the United States and the findings of the International Joint Comission. I understand some interests in Montreal are opposed to this scheme. The Premier of Quebec, Hon. Mr. Taschereau, is opposed to the St. Lawrence canal for some reasons; but I think his objections can be met by agreement with the United States, for his arguments are based principally on anti-American prejudice. He claims that the navigation feature of the project is but a cloak for an attempt by our neighbours to grab the power; that the Americans expect to get international control of about 2,700,000 h.p. of energy. But there will be the same amount or a little more belonging to Canada, and Quebec will have its share. He goes on to refer to the position of the high-level dam which, he says, will be located in the United States. That location has not yet been fixed; it is a matter for agreement with the United States Government. The broad fact for Mr. Taschereau to answer is that 4,000,000 h.p. of electrical energy is going to waste every year, and he has no suggestion

to give for making it available. This is the equivalent of 48,000,000 tons of coal having a value of $240,000,000, and it is allowed to slip away every year without being used.

I wish to say a few words regarding trade with Germany. In many centres of our population there are complaints that certain localities are being flooded with German goods. I have had many complaints in this connection from constituents of mine and from other people in the Toronto district. They point out to me that as a result of the war, many industries had been started up by Canadians to supply minor goods which Germany had formerly supplied to Canada. In this way, plants had been established for making such things as toys and small-wares of all kinds. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), no doubt has not yet had time to look into this problem, but I hope he will do so, and that he will be able to lay down a policy for the House and the country. So far as I am concerned I am in favour of protection to these small local manufacturers. I do not believe we should have any trade relations with Germany at all.

Something has been said about Senate reform. In 1896, the Liberal party's platform declared strongly for Senate reform, but, as has been well said, platforms are generally made to get in on and not to stand on, and it was so in this case. Workingmen can sit in the British Parliament, but no workingman can sit in the United States or the Canadian Senate. So far as I can see when the Liberal party attempted to implement their platform of 1896 and reform the Senate, they simply made the Senate "ten times more reform" by appointing Liberals. I would suggest that the British North America Act be amended, after a vote of the people at the next election, on a Senate reform referendum, with a view to abolishing the Senate altogether, because I feel that its usefulness has gone. I do not know how the Progressive party feel on this subject, but in their platform they advocate strict economy and the saving of taxes, and this would an excellent way of economizing, besides ensuring better legislation and to some extent abolishing privilege in this country. The moment a man is appointed to the Senate he thinks that he is absolutely independent. It is all very well when men are trying to get into the Senate: they are then in favour of the policy of the existing government. But in a recent debate in the other House an hon. gentleman in that Chamber assumed an attitude of independence and disregard of the government of the day. They say some of them: We are judicial officers as senators and can oppose bills as we please.

Mention has also been made of Civil Service reform. I am in favour of the patronage system. I believe that you can get better results under the patronage system than under the Civil Service Commission. I am a Conservative, but let me say that I have been sent to Parliament to express a liberty of speech on what is good for the people and to exercise an independence of thought and action for the people; and while I am glad to call myself a Conservative, at the same time I am an independent Conservative. I noticed that the Liberal newspapers at one time condemned the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) for suggesting that all vacant judgeships, at the time he spoke, "should be filled with good Tories." Well, it is a credit to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he did not so commit himself. But he has raised no objection to this principle applied the other way, for I see that he has been himself doing the same thing, as can be seen in the appointment of such good Grit lawyers as Judge Fisher, of London, and Mr. Duncan Ross, the ex-member for West Middlesex as judge for Elgin, Judge Mulligan of Carleton, Senators Pardee and Boyer, and others. The Civil Service Act, it seems to me, applies only to the spade and shovel men and not to those higher up on the civil pay rolls, like senators, judges, lieutenant-governors and others of that class for whom there is no sort of examination, a la Civil Service Commission.

With regard to Canada's wonderful banking system, I have been looking over the Bank Act from cover to cover, and I may have something to say in this connection later on.

The Prime Minister the other day, referring to the Conservative party, seemed to rejoice in the fact that it had been wiped off the map in six provinces. Well, I can sympathize with him, for he also was wiped off the map in about three provinces —in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba —in which he obtained two seats out of forty-one. So he is in the same boat as those on this side in three provinces as to being wiped out. It is true he carried Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Quebec, but in some other provinces he did

not do so well, and I think he knows what it is to be wiped off the map. He ran second to the Tories in Ontario and British Columbia, and we divided fifty-fifty with him in New Brunswick.

I do not see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in the House, but during the campaign in the Toronto district he evinced a keen interest in the cost of living, the question of trusts and combines, and other allied subjects. This question of combines has been made a football of by the Government of Canada and those of the provinces for many years, and I trust we shall hear the end of it and that the Government of Canada will take a leaf out of the book of the Attorney General of the United States, who prosecuted 285 combines in one year and broke them up. As a start the Government might take action against the tobacco trust. I have had several letters from soldiers and others, strongly urging that something should be done to break up this combine. The prices of a good many of the tobacco commodities of life are on the down grade and it seems an outrage that the working classes should be obliged to pay 15 cents for a plug of tobacco, while tobacco is lying in the fields not cut. Steps should be taken at once to regulate all trusts of this nature.

Before I conclude I want to protest against any action or any speech calculated to loosen the ties that bind this country to the Motherland. I think that this declaration is timely, because there is an agitation on foot in certain localities—and among certain classes that would tend to loosen that connection. I do not think that anyone did more than our King during the war to forward our interests, or was more concerned in the welfare of the Empire. Our Governor General, too, a brilliant soldier, was an inspiration to all fighting Canadians, and, I say, long may that office continue. Another office that is of use in the affairs of the country is that of Lieutenant-Governor. I do not agree with those who advocate the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council; this, I think, would be one way of loosening the ties that bind the Mother Country and Canada together. In regard to the question of Canada's representation abroad, it is my opinion that there is no necessity for an ambassador at Washington; nor do I believe that we need a High Commissioner in London. If we can do without an ambassador in Washington, why cannot we dispense, without great inconvenience, with a representative in London? I wish it distinctly understood, of course, that I have absolutely nothing to say against the appointment that has been recently made by the Government to fill this office. The appointee is a good business man, a gentleman who is admirable in more senses than one. I sat with him on the Toronto General Hospital Board in Toronto for a number of years, and from my knowledge of and association with him I have formed a high estimate of his ability and his character. Nevertheless, I do not think that the office to which he has been appointed is very necessary. I may say, in passing, that as a friend of Mr. Larkin, I wish him good luck. I think he should answer those papers that criticise his income tax payments. In Toronto some time ago he paid taxes on an income of $50,000. But the next year—1921—when he was assessed on a similar income, he appealed to the Court of Revision and made a declaration to the effect that his income was only $25,000. The Court of Revision, without taking any evidence on the subject, reduced the assessment to that amount. Sir John Willison, the Canadian representative of the London Times, wrote an article which appeared in the London papers stating that Mr. Larkin's income was $500,000, and some of the London papers are commenting on it and on his assessments. Now, while undoubtedly Mr. Larkin will make an excellent High Commissioner, I think it would have been better, both for him and the country, had he followed in the footsteps of the First Commoner, yourself, Mr. Speaker, when you announced in such modest terms that from the moment of your election to your high office you ceased to be a party man. It would be better for all concerned if Mr. Larkin refrained from attending party dinners. I say it would be in his own interests, and I am speaking as a friend of his; for, I repeat, I found him an honourable business man, having sat with him on the Board in the building of the Toronto General Hospital, a $5,000,000 hospital. I can say that he has done a wonderful service as a citizen. As his friend, I say that he should make it clear just what his income is on which he has to pay local and federal taxes and answer his critics. I have every confidence in his integrity.

In conclusion, I desire to thank you, Sir, and the members of this House, for the way they have listened to me, and on my own behalf I thank you for your patience.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, and I would not now rise to address the House were it not that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), in the course of his speech, thought it proper to refer in the manner in which he did to my attitude during the last electoral campaign. I crave the attention of hon. members for a short time, and I also crave their indulgence, for though I may count myself as one of the veterans in our public life, yet as a newcomer to this House I must confess in all candour and sincerity that I feel exactly as does the young member who rises for the first time to address his fellow members.

Listening to the oft repeated references of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to the declarations that I made during the last general election, and also to the declarations which he says I may have made, I could not help thinking that my right hon. friend should be exceedingly grateful to me for having sought and won the confidence of the electors of Laurier-Outremont. Had I not been elected for that constituency much of the best effect of his great speech would have been lost.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I do not intend to detain the House for any length of time, by attempting to answer all the statements which have been made about myself by my right hon. friend.

For many years I sat in another legislature and I have always avoided what might be construed as an attempt to impose my personal views on my colleagues in respect to any subject; I have never made a long speech to defend myself against personal attacks, and I do not intend to depart from that rule on this occasion.

I gladly accept this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to add my most sincere congratulations to those which have already been so happily and so justly extended to you by those hon. members who have preceded me. I am glad also on this occasion to most heartily congratulate the hon. proposer and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne on their remarkably eloquent addresses.

My right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition has endeavoured to put me in a contradictory position by quoting a paragraph from the Speech from the Throne in which it is stated:

> Our Dominion has not escaped the world-wide economic disturbance and industrial depression, but has suffered less from it than other countries. Keen observers of the business barometer feel that the worst is about over and that at an early date we may look for a substantial revival of activity.

My right hon. friend has contrasted with that paragraph certain opinions which I expressed during the late general election to the effect that our country was passing through a most serious crisis. The picture I then drew of her economic, commercial and industrial condition, was no darker than that drawn by the right hon. gentleman himself at that time. Indeed, were I to trespass on the time of hon. gentlemen by quoting newspaper clippings to the extent that he did, I could very easily convince the House that on this point I hardly exceeded any of the statements of the right hon. leader of the Opposition himself.

With regard to the statement quoted by him, that I told the electors of Montreal, or Three Rivers—I do not remember which exactly—that the population of Canada was declining, he should at least, it seems to me, have given me credit for sufficient knowledge to believe that I could never make such a declaration, I did say more than once that our customs revenues were decreasing, and that is borne out by the official returns. I stated also, and rightly, that our foreign trade was falling off and I do not suppose that any hon. member will pretend that I misled the people of my province when I stated that our national debt was increasing to an alarming extent. No, Mr. Speaker, none of my declarations during that campaign were exaggerated; all and each of them were strictly in accord with our economic condition and the state of mind of the people at that time. In a word, there is no contradiction between any of my modest speeches and this Speech from the Throne. I would remind the right hon. leader of the Opposition that circumstances have changed in this country since the dissolution of the last Parliament. Great and important changes have happened in the interim, and I make bold to say that this feeling of security which already is so noticeable in our people, as well as the general revival in business, are due to a large extent to the confidence which the citizens of Canada repose in the new Government which they chose last December.

My right hon friend has referred to my standing on the tariff question, and if I understood him aright he even insinuated that that stand was inspired by certain interests which he holds responsible for his defeat and for the triumph of the Liberal party. My views on the tariff

question have never changed during the last twenty-five years. For fifteen years I have followed, approved and endorsed, the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy. During the last election I advocated that policy; I told the electors of Laurier-Outremont and I told the electors of the province of Quebec that if the Liberal party secured their confidence and was returned to power it would remain true to that policy and would carry it into effect through a revision of the tariff to meet the necessities which have arisen since the last revision, taking into account the interests of the consumer, of the farmer—whose industry we have always regarded as the basic industry of this country—and of the manufacturers in general. That policy I advocated before the general election, Mr. Speaker, at a dinner given in the city of Quebec, and at which the right hon. leader of the Opposition himself was a speaker. On that occasion, Sir, he applauded my declaration and made no such insinuations as those he made the other day.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in his speech, quoted from the Montreal Gazette certain remarks that I made at a dinner held in connection with a convention of the shoe manufacturers of Canada. The hon. member seems to have found in my remarks a declaration tending toward an increase of duties on shoes imported into Canada. I am surprised that he made such a discovery, and if he has the patience to read that speech,—or re-read it, if he has not already done so—he will find that all I said may be summed up in the affirmation that it was the revision of the tariff of 1907 which brought to the shoe manufacturers of Canada that era of prosperity which they enjoyed until the recent crisis occurred which has affected their industries as it has affected all others in Canada. I reminded the Shoe Manufacturers' Association—and here I may say that these gentlemen have invested in their industry a capital of over $32,000,000 and that they afford subsistence to some 70,000 of our people—I reminded them that what they had of prosperity they owed to the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking of the railway question, endeavoured to convey the impression that some mysterious power had inspired those hon. members who expressed themselves as not believing in state ownership or state operation of railways. My right hon. friend has come out categorically in favour of the nationalization of our railways. He is sincere in his views, I know; but why should he cast suspicion on those hon. members who are not of the same opinion in the matter? As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) declared in his speech, there are on this side of the House, as there are on the other side, members who do not look upon state ownership or state operation of railways as practicable and profitable for the country. But we now own our railways and the Government has decided to give the system a fair trial under the best possible conditions. I cannot understand why my right hon. friend should doubt the good faith of the Government or of any of its members in that matter. The question is not one which concerns Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver or any city in particular; it is a question which concerns Canada as a whole, and the solution which we seek is a solution which shall be satisfactory to the interests of our country generally.

5 p.m.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has stated—and he has repeated the assertion several times—that his government was defeated by the big interests of Montreal. The interests that defeated my right hon. friend's government are the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, who voted to a man against the late administration and its followers, joined, as they were, by the majority of the Conservative electors of this country who by their vote and through their newspapers declared that they did not believe in the National Liberal-Conservative government. The power which defeated the late administration was the will of the Canadian people.

Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), who declared that the time had come when we should have responsible government in Canada and should cease administering the public affairs by Order in Council, the right hon. leader of the Opposition said: Every one of the Orders in Council that we passed was necessary for the good government of this country. He went on to say: You have a new Administration; you have already passed an Order in Council by which you deprive the Canadian Parliament of certain of its rights. Mr. Speaker, there were many Orders in Council passed by the government presided over by my right hon. friend and by the government which preceded it and of which he was a member. But although he declared that all these Orders

in Council were necessary for the proper administration of our public affairs, in every case where such Orders in Council were submitted to the courts they were declared illegal and ultra vires, and as a result the government was condemned.

It is not an Order in Council of that kind that the Government of Canada has passed with regard to the administration of fisheries in the province of Quebec. We have passed that Order in Council, Mr. Speaker, only to conform with a judgment of the Privy Council; and I wish to state here that in passing such an Order in Council the Federal Government has not abandoned an inch of its territory or renounced the shadow of a right in favour of the province of Quebec. My right hon. friend allows himself to be blinded—to be blinded by his bitterness against the city of Montreal and against the province of Quebec; and he is wrong in leading other provinces of the Confederation to believe, that by that Order in Council the Government has granted a favour to the province of Quebec, because that province never asked for, and never received any favour, from this Government.

My right hon. friend ended his speech by asking my colleagues what had been the verdict of the last general election. I will be very frank and I will tell him that I could not altogether analyze the vote which was cast at that election. It would be very, very difficult to find the determining factor; but there is one thing certain and that is that the people of Canada, by an immense majority, voted against the continuance in office of the Meighen Government, who suffered in that election such a defeat as no other government has experienced since Confederation. As to my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, I wish to be allowed to say that I admire his high attainments. He is a very eloquent speaker; he is a good fighter; but I regret to have to say that he is not a good loser. But he is now in the right place to learn. In his present seat he will have an opportunity to learn, and I hope that some day we will be in a position to say that he is as good a loser as he is a fighter.

Another word, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat. My right hon. friend has taken pleasure—particular pleasure—in designating me as "The Master of the Administration." This is an old game which has been played before in this House by some of my right hon. friend's predecessors. Still there is one thing I regret: it is that it is resorted to to-day not so much to annoy me as to accentuate the unfortunate differences which have existed far too long between certain provinces of our Confederation and the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party has one chief and one chief only: that chief is the Prime Minister of Canada, the leader of this House. He has, and he can depend upon, the loyal support of all his colleagues, of everyone of the Liberal members of this House, and of every Liberal in Canada. As for myself, Mr. Speaker, I am nothing but a man of good will. I hope that I will be long enough in this House to convince all my fellow members, Conservatives and Progressives as well as Liberals, that I have only one ambition in coming here: It is simply to be permitted to serve my country in my own modest way and to try and help bring about that spirit towards which I have directed all the efforts of my life for twenty-five years in another field, the spirit of unity, Mr. Speaker, which is so necessary for the prosperity of our country and for the happiness of our citizens.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to address this House I hope that I shall not find myself out of order too often. Public speaking has not been my business; I have been engaged in the far Northwest for the last number of years trying to subdue this earth or a part of it. The life of a farmer is not the kind of life that tends to make one a finished public speaker. It is a life that serves to give one a practical view of things; and I hope that if my remarks are not quite so polished in form as those of some other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, the House will nevertheless hear me with patience.

I represent in this Chamber the constituency of West Edmonton—the largest, possibly, in Canada. It reaches from the Saskatchewan river to the northern boundary of the province of Alberta; a distance of 450 miles north and south, and about 250 miles east and west. It has a population of something like 70,000 people, an increase of 99 per cent since 1911. I consider, as an ordinary citizen of this Dominion, that it is a great honour that I should be chosen to represent this constituency, and I also realize that I should do my best to live up to the great responsibility that has been imposed upon me. West Edmonton has a population that is composed of farmers, miners, lumbermen, fishermen, and town and city dwellers.

During the late campaign the people were told throughout that constituency that we Progressives were out for class legislation, class domination; but whether one is nominated and supported by a Liberal party or a Conservative party, or a Farmers group, after he is elected I consider that he is not doing his duty unless he is willing to try and represent and be fair to all the people regardless of their attitude during the election. Whether the majority or minority be small or large, we have no right to seek for anything less than absolute justice for minorities whether in a particular constituency or in the country at large.

For some time after the election there was an effort made in the province of Alberta, with some of the Progressives, to provide a seat for a minister of the Crown. I was not able, though I had been invited through the press, to accept the invitation to resign. I think a gallant spirit has been shown in the province of Quebec, especially in the county of Argenteuil, where they have selected as their representative in this Parliament a worthy citizen of northern Alberta, thus providing northern Alberta with a representative in the Cabinet. They have shown that they were willing to try and undo the injustice that was inflicted on Alberta on account of the Redistribution Bill not having been passed by the late administration.

I wish to speak on the Speech from the Throne, and to take issue with some of the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). I do not believe that anything we can do at this time, or anything we are likely to do, will bring in the millennium, and anything I can or will advocate is simply done as a means of helping to alleviate the conditions, especially, existing in Western Canada to-day. I do not believe the average member of this House—and I refer especially to the members from the East—has any idea of the conditions existing in Western Canada, particularly in the pioneer districts of the country. It may be that in this part of the country, and particularly in the cities, there is a feeling of confidence. It may be that those engaged in industries that are built up through special legislation enacted by Parliament, and are able to pay dividends of 10 per cent and sometimes more, are beginning to feel that there is reason again for optimism and confidence. But the people of the West, the people on the farms of this country, and the working people who have been contributing out of their earnings to this 10 per cent dividend, and sometimes larger dividends on watered stock, have not the same feeling of confidence or the same assurance with regard to the future.

In common with some of those who have preceded me, I am a little disappointed with the paragraph in the Speech dealing with the tariff. It has been stated by the hon. Minister of Justice that we are going to have a tariff along the lines of the Laurier-Fielding tariff. I will be satisfied—that is if the information that I have received from this book is reliable with regard to what that means. If I may quote from this volume entitled "Sixty years of Protection in Canada" I would like to show what has been stated by some hon. gentlemen in days gone by, worthy men in their day, with regard to the Laurier-Fielding tariff. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has declared—

> I leave it to the working men in the cities if protection is anything less than slavery*** The moment the government takes one cent from your pocket, and that cent does not go into the treasury of the country, that is robbery to your prejudice. * * * We stand for freedom. I denounce the policy of protection as bondage,—yea bondage—and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which American slavery was bondage.

The late Sir Richard Cartwright, who was also an eminent authority in his day, has stated that if you add together the sum which has been put into the treasury and the larger sum which has been extracted from the pockets of the people for the benefit of a few privileged and favoured individuals, you will find the total for the last fourteen years is hardly less than a thousand million dollars.

I have been doing a little studying with regard to this tariff question during the last few years, even though my duties on the farm have been such that I have had to work twelve and fourteen hours a day, and perhaps my study has not been just as thorough as the study of some other gentleman, but I fail to find that after 1896 there was any substantial reduction in the tariff from that which existed previous to that time. I fail to see that there is anything to justify any one to-day in stating that that policy, followed during the fifteen years of Liberal administration in this country, was anything different from that which had been in existence previous to that time, and I hope that when we are face to face with the actual proposals with regard to the tariff, they will show some-

thing more substantial in the way of reductions on farm machinery and the necessities of life than we have ever seen before in the history of this country. We have been told that we ought to contribute in this way to the manufacturing interests through the tariff, to the railway interests through guaranteed rates, and to other interests through large grants of money, to give them protection, in order that we may build up a well united and well developed Dominion. We have large reserves in farm lands that are very rich, and we have been told, as a people, that by simply giving protection to certain manufacturers and certain other interests we would build up a self-contained Dominion, and would have prosperity under any and all circumstances.

We have been dealing with this problem, as near as I can see, for about forty years, and after forty years of that policy I believe we have harder times, in the West at least, than we have ever known before. I believe that we have more unemployment, even throughout Eastern Canada, than we have had at almost any other time. I would like to ask those who have been telling us that this tariff was going to give us security and prosperity, how much longer we will have to follow along this line before we arrive at the place where we are going to have steady general prosperity for all the people? I maintain that the whole tendency with regard to this protective tariff —and that is what we have had—is to segregate the wealth of this country in the hands of a few individuals. We pile up wealth on one hand, and we have a corresponding poverty on the other hand. The result is that we have wealth in one case, but without any corresponding need, and on the other hand we have need, where there is not the purchasing power to supply that need.

Unless at last we can find some method, some system of administration that will give to our citizens something like an equal chance and an equal share of the good things of this country, we can never have a good, sound, reliable, happy country. If we take the past forty years, in the fourteen years prior to 1896, something like $500,000,000 was taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country, and we have been following the same policy for the last twenty-six years. I understand there is a little dispute going on between the two parties as to which of them reduced the tariff most during the time that they were in power. But studying the matter as an observer from the outside, I would say that the two parties are very much alike, and if we take into account the increase in Canada's population, I think we would be justified in saying that the same policy has been continued from 1896 onward, and that at least $1,000,000,000 have been taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country. If even one-half of that sum were spread around in a general way amongst the people of this country, that would do far more to bring prosperity, and it would solve our unemployment problem; it would give us a general all-round prosperity in this Dominion of Canada. We have on the one hand great wealth—the mountains—and we have on the other the valleys of poverty; there is only one way by which to fill up the valleys, and that is to take down the mountains.

We have, of course, been told that the manufacturers cannot compete; that we ought to protect those great industries because they are vital to the country. I believe our Canadian manufacturers can compete with the manufacturers of other countries, just as our farmers compete with farmers in all parts of the world. We have been speaking about our soldiers, how they crossed the Atlantic and went up against the trained armies of Europe, with practically no training as compared with the training those European armies had, and we are proud that, with this unequal opportunity, so to speak, they were able to more than hold their own. Are we to conclude that there is in our country a class that is not ready to face the world and the conditions and difficulties that all the rest of us must face? Are we to conclude that we must ask the large producing class in this country, working men and farmers, to carry an extra burden on their backs, in order that we may pass on some special privilege to another class? I believe, in advocating this Laurier-Fielding tariff by which not one cent will be taken out of the pockets of the people that does not go into the treasury, we are advocating not class legislation, but the doing away with class legislation; for a protective tariff is one of the best examples of class legislation that we have and have had in the Dominion of Canada.

With the handicap that we have carried of increased prices of the tools of production, increased prices of farm machinery

and, indeed, of practically all the materials that one needs to develop our farms, we have been able to compete with the world, and to build up, as farmers, the greatest industry in this Dominion. The farming industry is by far the greatest of any of the industries. Our people have had to test out the climate, to test out the soil in new districts; they have been up against the difficulties of long freight hauls, of climate, hail, drought and sometimes too much moisture; but in spite of all these difficulties and with the handicap of increased cost of the tools of production, they have been able to compete successfully with the well established farmers to the south and with the well established farmers of other parts of the world. Nevertheless, they have been asked to share the results of their labours with speculators and others who are not contributing in any specific way to the general wealth of the country.

I wish to pass on to deal with the question of immigration. I should like to have seen, with regard to the reduction of the tariff, something as definite in the Speech from the Throne as we had with regard to immigration. During the war the stream of immigration was much interrupted and restricted. Now that the business of peace is with us, the renewal of efforts to bring in new settlers must apparently be made. It requires some courage to make a statement of this kind during the present condition of unemployment. Are we to conclude that our Government is going to be very considerate of financial interests and manufacturing concerns, with its guarded expression with regard to the reduction of the tariff; but that as regards the people who are unemployed and the general common people of the country, the Government is ready to launch out with an immigration policy. It seems that there is just a little tendency to assume an attitude of caution with regard to doing anything at all that would imperil in any way the returns of capital; but as regards the interests of the common people, it would seem that the Government is ready to launch out with an immigration policy, and take chances. While we are not quite able to provide employment for a large number of people in this country, we are ready to bring in others.

Of course, a reasonable endeavour is going to be made to attract to our country people of the most desirable class. I think I know something of conditions in Western Canada, and I suppose that most of the immigrants would go to our western country to settle on the land. I know something of the people that we desire to get, but the people who can make good on the western lands to-day are not the kind of people who are easy to move. People who, under present conditions, can make good on farms in Western Canada, are people who can make good in almost any country in the world. They are not the kind of people who can be swayed by pamphlets; they demand facts; they cannot be easily influenced to move by pamphlets with a picture of a tar-paper shack on the front page and a picture of a splendid farm on the second page, with the caption, "After a few years." They are people who are making good generally where they are.

If a campaign is launched to get new settlers we shall get some who, in spite of our best efforts, will prove unfit for the land, and who will therefore tend to drift to the ranks of the unemployed. It seems to me that it would be better to try to improve conditions by a reduction of the tariff, so that the people who are already on the land may be able to make good. They certainly will not do so under present circumstances, no matter how industrious and thrifty they may be. When we can reduce the tariff and can have prosperous and industrious people in Canada we shall have the best and the cheapest immigration policy that this country could possibly have. The only way we can get the class of settlers we need to develop Western Canada is through the efforts of their friends, who are satisfied with their lot here. Those who really know conditions in the West will bear me out when I say that it would require, on the part of any of those living under general conditions in the West to-day, a great faith in the heroism of their friends to advise them to come here, if they are at all satisfied where they are at present. We should all like to see the country filled up and the population increased three or four times, but we desire to see the population increase under such conditions as will assure general prosperity. I do not think that the creation of millionaires and the piling up of huge fortunes is in the interests of any country in the world. What is good for the ordinary individual, for the artisan, and for the ordinary farmer, will give us general prosperity, which we can never have under existing circumstances.

Some hon. members who have spoken from this section of the House have mentioned the Wheat Board, and I want to

emphasize the fact that Western Canada does need that Wheat Board and is demanding the old board under the old conditions. We want to see it in operation for the 1922 crop. It is the general wish in the West to see the Wheat Board ready to take over that crop, and we want to see it established as soon as possible.

Another matter that appeals to the people of the West is the question of freight rates. In the Speech from the Throne we have a reference to the fact that conferences have been arranged between the railway authorities respecting the revision of rates upon basic commodities. So far as the West is concerned, we understand that certain legislation with respect to the Crow's Nest Pass agreement will expire this year, and I have been wondering whether these conferences contemplate dealing in any way with the possibility of reducing the rates in the West below the standard set by the Crow's Nest Pass agreement. With the permission of the House I shall read part of an article appearing in a Western paper known as The U. F. A., with reference to this matter:

> In order to understand the situation which wil arise at the coming session of our Dominion Parliament it is necessary to make a brief reference to the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement and the present Railway Act. The Crow's Nest Pass Agreement was entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Dominion Government and was confirmed by the Dominion Parliament. Under terms of this Agreement the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook, in return for certain subsidies and concessions, to build certain lines and also agreed to a schedule of maximum rates from Western points. The Railway Act in Sec. 3, Sub-Sec. B, provided that the Board of Railway Commissioners should not have power to authorize rates in excess of those provided for in any special agreement between the Dominion Parliament and the railway company. This means that the Railway Commission could not authorize rates in excess of those provided for under the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement. At the session of the Dominion Parliament in the summer of 1919 the Railway Act was amended in Sec. 325, Sub-Sec. 5, so as to remove the above mentioned limitation on the power of the Railway Commissioners over freight rates, the result being to give them power to approve any increases in freight rates, irrespective of any agreements existing between the railway companies and the Dominion Parliament. This amendment passed in 1919, however, had a saving clause providing that it was only to be in effect for three years, and the situation now is that it will expire during the coming summer, and unless legislation is passed at the coming session of the House at Ottawa, this amendment will expire by limitation and rates will automatically revert to the 1917 basis.

Now I hope it is the intention of the Government not to renew this special legislation setting aside the Crow's Nest Pass agreement, for the present rates are strangling business in Western Canada. To-day they are 50 to 70 per cent higher than in 1917. I quote further from the article in question:

> The comparative rates on grain from representative points in the West as they existed in 1917, in September 1920, the highest point which rates reached, and as they exist now after two reductions have been made, are shown in the following table:

	Comparative rates in cents per 100 lbs.		
	1917	Sept. 1920	Now
Winnipeg	10	19	17
Calgary.	24	40½	36

I hope the Government is ready to take some more vigorous action than merely inviting the railway authorities to hold conferences to agree among themselves as to what reductions in rates there should be. I represent a pioneer constituency, a constituency of almost 100,000 square miles, and the people, who are engaged in agriculture, feel extremely the long freight haul from Edmonton and northwest of Edmonton to the ports. I believe that if you go to the northern extremity of the railway development in that constituency and take the freight rates from that point to Fort William, you will find, taking the average price for the year of all grain raised in that locality, that after paying the threshing bill and the freight bill there is nothing left. On some of the higher grades of wheat the farmers are able to realize something, but practically nothing on the lower grades. I left Spirit River on the 10th of January, and I found the farmers hauling grain a distance of twenty-seven miles to that point and selling it for 40 cents, their threshing bill being 14 cents. Oats at that time were worth about a cent less than nothing on the farms.

Yet in view of the fact that they have been producing at a loss for the past two years, it is rather strange to understand the attitude taken by some of our railway authorities with regard to freight rates. Some of them take the stand that the great Canadian Pacific Railway—which we are told has done so much for this country, and which, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) has suggested, the country has done so much for—is under any and all circumstances entitled to 10 per cent and something over. Can you wonder that some bitter expressions have come from western farmers, in view of the fact that the value of their

land has been cut 65 per cent during the last two years, that farms that a few years ago were worth $3,000 are on the market to-day at $800, and that practically nothing produced on the farm is yielding a profit? Some people tell us that we are not patriotic because we complain of these conditions. But I think the work that we have done in the West during the last two years in carrying on at a loss in order to facilitate the readjustment of business conditions is an example in loyalty to national needs that has not been surpassed by any other business or industry in this Dominion. Needless to say, agriculture cannot be continued in the West under these conditions—conditions which I am not exaggerating in the least. Last year a number of our farmers in the Grand Prairie district and in the Peace River district of my constituency shipped oats to Fort William at a loss. I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) yesterday said something about freight rates taking, in certain cases, half the price of the grain; we have numerous instances in that country where after our farmers have hauled their grain for twenty to twenty-five miles to the railway, loaded it, and shipped it to Fort William for sale, they have had a bill come back for part of the freight. Such instances have happened not only in the northern but in the southern part of my constituency as well.

I think we have been too long taking the position that certain interests must be protected and guaranteed profits while others must be allowed to take the losses. The sooner we get to the position where all the various interests of the country are willing to take profits and losses in something like their equal and just share, the sooner we will get back to prosperity and to happy conditions.

I do not wish hon. members to think that we are antagonistic to these favoured interests; but that does not imply that we are not antagonistic to those things that we believe are inflicting an unnecessary hardship on our people. We have very large settlements of returned soldiers in my constituency. What is their condition? They bought stock a few years ago, which to-day is worth about a third of what they paid for it; the grain they produce will hardly pay freight expenses; and they have been appealing to the provincial Government of Alberta for assistance. We have come to a strange pass when the men who went overseas to fight for us have now to endure those conditions and pay tribute to large financial interests through the operation of tariffs, guaranteed railway rates and so on. Of course, it may be argued that our national railways have been losing money and require those increased freight rates. But after all, I do not know that rates would need to be so high if we had only to provide interest on the money that actually went into the building of our railways. It is hardly fair that we should be asked to pay freight rates to provide interest on money that was never invested in those railways but which, I fear, was looted during their construction.

Our soldier settlers in the Northwest are pretty much in the same, or in a worse, condition than the soldier settlers that you heard about the other day from my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), and I sincerely hope that the Government is prepared to do something substantial to enable those men to make good, because unless they are helped they are doomed to failure. Of course, if their goods are revalued it will mean that they have received a gift from the Government. In days gone by some returned soldiers refused to accept loans from the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and those men to-day are better off than their fellows who accepted loans. Possibly they will think they have some claim too if you make a gift through revaluation to some of those who did accept loans, but I believe, in view of the fact that they were wise in not accepting soldiers' settlement loans at the time, we ought to treat them the same as those who accepted loans.

I said a little while ago that we in my constituency were not antagonistic to the railways. I think my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, will bear me out when I say that we are very anxious to have railways, and more railways, in that constituency. But the people demand an outlet to the Pacific coast, to the ports of Prince Rupert and Vancouver, and I hope we will be able to get that outlet and thus, reduce the present long rail haul eastward of two or three thousand miles to a short haul of only six or seven hundred miles to the Pacific coast.

I am glad to see a reference in the Speech from the Throne to the matter of the return to the three Western provinces of their natural resources. I do not think that this question should be mixed

up in any way with any claims that other provinces have upon the Dominion. I do not think the Western provinces ought to be asked to assume the status of colonies toward the other provinces. A study of this question will show that it is a mistaken idea that the Hudson's Bay Company ever owned as large an area of that great Northwest as they have claimed. In fact, I think there is substantial evidence to show that when the Hudson's Bay Company received their charter in 1670 from King Charles II, most of this Northwest belonged to the King of France. In view of that condition; having regard to the fact that all the other provinces have control of their natural resources and that in all other cases the various sections of the countries making up the British Empire exercise a similar control, it is only fair and just that the Government hand over to those Western provinces their natural resources as soon as possible.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was talking on the question of the return of their natural resources to the Western provinces. I said that this question ought to be dealt with on its merits, and that it should not be entangled with the question of the rights of any other province. I believe there is evidence to show that the Hudson's Bay Company, when it ceded its charter, upon receiving payment of millions of acres of fertile lands in Western Canada in consideration of the surrender of that charter, received the first real title that it ever had to any part of what we know to-day as Western Canada.

I now wish to occupy the attention of the House for a short time in order to draw attention to another matter. This question is one that concerns a certain number of people in northern Alberta and probably in other parts of the country—I refer to the question of half-breed scrip. I think it is a matter in respect to which the late government is deserving of criticism. With the permission of the House I shall read a letter addressed to "All Canadians who believe that our national honour, our national integrity and our national good name should at all times be kept sweet and clean to all the world and to ourselves," and which is worded as follows:

On May 27th, 1921, the Honourable Sir James Lougheed introduced in the Senate of Canada Bill No. 138, being a Bill for the amendment of the Criminal Code. It had its first reading on that date as appears by Hansard reports No. 50, page 676. The second reading was had on May 30th. See Hansard reports No. 51, page 699. On June 1st, according to the Hansard reports of the Senate Debates, No. 53, first page, on motion of Sir James Lougheed the Senate went into Committee on Bill No. 138:

"The Honourable the Chairman:

It is moved that the following be inserted after Section 24 as 24a, paragraph 'a' of Section 1140 of the Act is amended by adding thereto the following sub-paragraph:

"(iv) any offence relating to or arising out of the location of land which was paid for in whole or in part by scrip, or was granted upon certificates issued to half-breeds in connection with the extinguishment of Indian titles.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON: What does all that mean?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The intention is that if a prosecution for an offence is not brought within three years of the date of its commission, then it is proscribed. There is no provision for that in the Code at present.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: From the reading of the clause I did not grasp what the offence really is.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: This brings it into Section 1140 in the Code, which deals with the limitation of actions. There have been one or two cases brought, going back twenty years, claiming that fraud was committed. Of course, the evidence in connection with them would have disappeared long ago.

Section 24a was agreed to.

The enclosed correspondence will show that I first wrote to the Hon. Arthur Meighen, Prime Minister of Canada, on August 2, 1921. The Premier apparently was in ignorance of the amendment and the latter was forwarded to Sir James Lougheed. On August 22nd, I again wrote the Premier enclosing a copy of my former letter. In answer to a telegram from me of September 13th the Premier writes that he cannot do more than refer the matter to the Department of Justice, the Minister of which handled the legislation.

The fact of the matter is that while the Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, did handle the Bill in the House of Commons, it originated in the Senate and was fathered by Sir James Lougheed. Notwithstanding this we find the Prime Minister letting out Mr. Doherty and making Sir James Lougheed Minister of the Interior and appointed as Minister of Justice Sir James Lougheed's law partner, Mr. R. B. Bennett. The Prime Minister being, as he says, ignorant of the Bill in its effect, must have been deceived by his present Minister of the Interior.

The enactment of this particular piece of iniquitous legislation has the effect of protecting a number of reputed millionaires, the foundation of whose present wealth was built upon scandalous frauds committed against the half-breeds to whom land scrip had been issued

by a Government whose duty it was to guard and protect them.

As one particular Edmonton millionaire had already been committed for trial on a charge of uttering a forged document in procuring title to land under half-breed scrip, and as the amendment prohibits the proceeding with the trial to ascertain his guilt or innocence upon a charge which has a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, one need not seek far for the motive behind the amendment.

A Government has deliberately stepped in and stayed the hand of justice for the protection of wealthy friends of that Government, who, if they be innocent, would have nothing to fear from our judges whose sense of personal and public honour is apparently infinitely higher than that of the Government which appoints them.

I believe it is the duty of the Government to bring in legislation wiping out this amendment and the effects of it while it remains on the statute books of this country.

Mr. ARTHUR JOHN LEWIS (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of associating myself with former speakers who have congratulated you upon your elevation to the highest place in the House of Commons. I wish also to extend to you, Sir, my sincere sympathy in the difficult task that you have been called upon to discharge in this Parliament. Your administration has so far been marked with patience, kindness and firmness, and I trust that you will not during this session suffer in the discharge of your onerous duties.

It is unnecessary for me, Sir, to compliment preceding speakers, more particularly those who moved or seconded the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. They have already been complimented upon the excellent speeches they have made and I think they thoroughly deserved the encomiums bestowed upon them. Let me say that at this time I feel it a very great honour to be a member of the House of Commons; it is one of the highest gifts the Canadian people can bestow upon any man or any woman. But with election to the House of Commons comes a great responsibility; and although it is a pleasure for me to sit in this Chamber, listen to the excellent debates and watch the legislation as it passes through, I can scarcely say that it is an equal pleasure for me to rise to my feet and address this assembly. But it is in the discharge of this great responsibility that I rise to continue the debate in regard to the Speech from the Throne. Reference, Sir, has already been made to the electioneering campaign which took place prior to December 6th. Insinuations have been made that certain people did not conduct the campaign along lines that were fair. I wish to state, in regard to myself, that I did not attempt any mud-slinging. I endeavoured to place the principles of the Progressives before the electors, and I endeavoured to show, Sir, with all the power at my command, that the Progressive platform was not only superior to the Conservative platform, but also superior to the platform of the Liberal party. Although I was able to persuade my electors in that respect, judging from the number who voted for me and considered I was right, I may have just a little more difficulty in convincing the members of the Government and our friends to the right. At the same time I am firmly convinced, after hearing the different speeches that have been made, and what has been said in regard to both parties, that what the Canadian people require at this time is that elections shall be fought on certain principles, and not on personalities. I believe that the time has come when the Canadian people, the most highly educated people of our time, shall declare that only the best men and the men of principle shall stand in these halls to legislate for the masses. I believe there are good men on both sides. We are not all professional politicians, but I believe, Sir, that all parties have the country's welfare at heart and that they will legislate as they think proper. In regard to the Liberal party, I believe that if they stand on their platform, and legislate in accordance with what the people expect, they will not go very far wrong. For that reason I am willing, individually, to support them in all sound legislation that will be for the well-being of our people. In a country as large as Canada, geographically speaking, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and almost from the North Pole to the border of the United States, you will readily understand that there are problems that are peculiar to each province, and that members coming from one province cannot expect that those coming from other provinces will see eye to eye with them. If we waited until that time the millenium would be at hand. I believe it is possible, Sir, that men and women who are wise and sane can stand upon a common platform where they can unite and legislate for the good of the whole of Canada and for its unity.

Certain things were said this afternoon in the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir. Lomer Gouin) that I did not altogether agree with, but there was one statement with which I was heartily in accord. I think the end of his speech was ideal. It reached a high plane. He said that, as far as he was concerned, he was going to support the Liberal party in the interests of, not one province, but the whole of Canada. I believe that is the plane we ought to endeavour to reach, in order to solve the great problems that confront us. I share with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr.McMurray) the splendid optimism that he manifested in his speech. He expressed the belief that the Liberal party was going to put into effect the policy which they have proclaimed. I believe and I intend to believe it until I find it otherwise.

Before dealing with the Speech from the Throne, I wish to say a few words in regard to my own constituency and the western part of Canada. I have noticed that hon. gentlemen from the Maritime provinces have spoken of justice and what is demanded by those provinces. We have heard similar statements in regard to Ontario, its wonderful powers, its electrical forces, and its ability to pay such a large amount in federal taxes. I want to say a few words in regard to Saskatchewan, although I know that what I am about to say will not meet with the approval of all the people in that province. I heard of a certain person who spoke in Ontario some time ago, and some of the western papers said that her statements make excellent anti-immigration literature. Be that as it may, I believe that the truth will make you free, and for that reason if I can impress upon these eastern people the real conditions of the West, I feel that my speech will not be in vain. It was stated by the hon. gentleman from North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) that to-day farming is not a paying occupation. The same sentiment has been expressed by a great many members in this House. I can only corroborate what has already been made. As far as my personal experience is concerned, I am intimately associated with at least 500 families of farmers, and I want to say without any exaggeration, that not 5 per cent of those people during the last two years have been running their farms on a paying basis. Just before I came to Ottawa a gentleman got on the train with me, and we were talking about conditions. He said to me "I actually paid out last year, or the year before, $11,000 more than I received. This year I have done almost the same thing, having paid out nearly $10,000." Then when you take into consideration the fact that he has an equipment valued in the neighbourhood of $140,000, on which no interest has been paid, and that he did not receive a cent in wages for managing that great business, you can begin to realize the appalling conditions that exist in Western Canada. With regard to a great majority of those 500 families, almost without exception the half-section farmers have each lost in the neighbourhood of $800 to $2,000. I am not going to say, Sir, that these men are failures. We have the finest people that can be found in the country. They are intellectual, industrious and persevering. Their patriotism has been manifested without any reserve, and for that reason we cannot say anything against them. As regards the land there, I believe it will make good; but it will make good only when conditions surrounding agriculture and those elements that enter into the production of agricultural commodities are made satisfactory to the western people. I might go on along those lines and point out some of the appalling conditions. I do not wish to dwell very long on this matter; but, in my experience, I have been in homes where there are families of five and seven living in two rooms eking out a bare existence, having merely a little flour and a little coal to keep body and soul together. I can say honestly, without fear of contradiction, that within a radius of eight miles of my home, at least twelve to twenty families would have absolutely perished had it not been for the charitable associations around them. That is not good literature to induce immigrants to come to this country, and it is up to us, as a Parliament, to legislate as far as possible to remove those conditions and to make the basic industry of Canada profitable to the masses. That is all we are asking at the present time.

I notice further, Sir, in the Speech from the Throne, that it was mentioned that we had not escaped suffering as a result of the Great War. We did not expect to escape that suffering. We know our Canadian people were willing to bear the burden and to enter into that Great War, and they have sacrificed manfully with the end in view of bringing victory to the world. At the same time, it is also said that the keen observers of this land have spoken with

optimism and that, in the near future, we may expect to have a return to prosperity, I wonder whether the Government has placed its hand upon the pulse of the nation, and whether, in diagnosing the case, it is going to legislate for the return of this vitality and prosperity that is so desirable. That is a question, of course, that we have to consider; but prosperity, happiness, contentment, is not some will-o-the-wisp that can be caught in times of enthusiasm; it is due to sound fudamental economic laws, and when those economic laws are put into force, prosperity will return to us in exactly the same measure as when you put two and two together and it makes four, and not otherwise. I was wondering whether the Government, when they were preparing this paragraph, had taken into consideration, not only the great industries and great manufacturing centres in the East, but the farming interests of Canada as a whole.

I wish to continue the debate, Sir, in regard also to the unemployed. The unemployed question is a very serious one, and I did not altogether agree with the paragraph upon that subject in the Speech from the Throne. I believe the federal government is equally responsible with the provincial governments and also with the municipalities in which those unemployed are found, and I have reason to believe that, because I find that the immigration policy of this Dominion is a Dominion one and does not rest alone on the provinces. We, as a nation, as a whole, are responsible for bringing these people into our midst; and although I would not for one moment say that these men who are unemployed to-day are all to be found in the ranks of the immigrants to this country, at the same time, a large percentage of immigrants is to be found amongst the unemployed, and the responsibility rests with the Canadian people. I hope that some measure will be forthcoming that will not savour too much of charity, but that we shall be able to evolve a measure that will enable the individual to retain his dignity and citizenship.

I pass now to another paragraph, that which deals with agriculture. It is the largest paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and believing it to be the most important one, I am going to deal a little more fully with this question. It is said that certain conditions are maintained to-day and that, as a result of those conditions, agriculture is not on a proper basis. People have spoken of various things; they have told us that we must have wider markets. I believe this is a desirable thing; it will encourage greater productivity on the part of the people, but the difficulty to-day is to get these larger markets. All the great nations of the world are endeavouring to do the same thing; and the only solution that I can see to this larger market problem is that the time must come when the people can continue to produce things that are natural to the country in which they live, and must cease to produce things which are artificial. For that reason, if it can be found that we in Western Canada are able to produce grain of all kinds, cattle, hogs and other agricultural commodities, we have a right to take these to the markets of the world and, in return, to receive from them the things that are manufactured in other countries, things which are not artificial but natural to the countries from which they come.

Boundary lines must not present artificial barriers to restrain free trade amongst the peoples of the world.

Something has been said about the cost of production. I am one of those who believe when economic conditions are righted, the cost of production will automatically right itself. We can readily see that, if there are lower freight rates, if there is a lowering of the cost of tariff, if other things are equal, the cost of production will naturally at once come down, and that is our only salvation. It has been said that the question of marketing the wheat has been designedly left out of the Speech. This, to us, is one of the most important matters. It has already been spoken of by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson), and I want to say just a few words in regard to it. As regards the need, we have already been told that seven-tenths of the wheat grown in Canada by the western farmer immediately finds its way to the market. As a result, the market is flooded, and then the European buyer, taking advantage of the situation, will immediately buy the grain at the lowest ebb. The reason why the Canadian farmer is forced to sell seven-tenths of his grain during three months of the year is because of his financial position. He is rightly called upon to pay the store bills, to pay the wages of the hired men, to pay the threshing expenses and so on, and I do not think the Canadian farmer would be justified in speculating with that wheat while he owed money to other people. So in an honest effort to pay his debts, he places his wheat on the market, and the

buyers of the world take advantage of the situation.

We believe, Sir, that a voluntary pool is not sufficient to overcome these conditions, and it is a very strong man who would attempt to attack the old conditions as they have existed during the past three or four hundred years. But when these conditions, under the stress and strain following a great war, have broken down, then it is time for us to come forward with a scheme that has proved itself satisfactory to the men who grow grain; I have reference to the re-constitution of the Canada Wheat Board. I can only emphasize this fact, that so far as the western farmer is concerned he desires it. The western farmers are almost unanimous upon that question. We believe that the board is a vital necessity and that the Government, doubting nothing and without any procrastination, should act immediately, because the prosperity of the Dominion depends upon the farmers as a whole. We need to inspire the farmer with confidence and give him fresh courage to go forward once again into that great country, to delve in the soil and bring out the wealth that lies there so that he may get for himself that return that will enable him to live in the state of life which he desires.

Do you know, Sir, that in Western Canada to-day, as a result of the drop in the prices of the commodities which the farmer produces, we are expecting in a great many sections to close the schools?—a thing that would be a national calamity. When we have to economize in such a way that even the children, owing to the lack of money, are not able to secure an education, things have certainly come to a pitiable pass. And yet we pride ourselves in being a democracy, although education is the salvation of democracy to-day. If the eastern people are wise, if the great manufacturing interests are wise, they will realize that it is to their advantage and to the advantage of the whole of Canada that the Wheat Board be immediately reinstated, prior to the farmer putting any seed into the ground, so that he may feel that he has the support of the Canadian people in his demand to get what is coming to him. In the past the Canadian farmer has been the butt of profiteers and other people who have made money, not from the soil but because they have—shall I say?—taxed the farmer, or taken his commodities and speculated with them on the world's markets. Any one who has observed the conditions of the market during the last four or five months will see that the demand for the Canada Wheat Board is based upon an economic fact. There was no reason in the wide world why the farmer should get $1.64 at Fort William as soon as the grain was threshed, and then, immediately following Christmas, $1.06. To-day, the price has gone up to $1.40. We do not believe that the Wheat Board is a panacea for all the ills that afflict the Canadian farmer, but we are convinced that it is a step in the right direction towards restoring prosperity to that western land.

I desire, of course, to deal with the tariff. This is a subject upon which I could speak for a long time to-night, but I do not wish to tire the House with my address. I remember hearing the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) giving expression to feelings which almost depressed the hon. gentlemen in this assembly, when he said that my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) was too optimistic, and that before this session was over he would possibly share the feelings of the right hon. gentleman himself. My right hon. friend then went on to accuse the Liberal party of enunciating almost the same doctrine as he had propounded himself. If that were true, then, instead of being depressed, he should have rejoiced, because that was the very thing he advocated as the harbinger of prosperity in Canada. But I was wondering in my own mind whether he believed that the Liberal party were going to enact legislation founded upon the manifesto in their platform of 1919, and show to the world that by lowering the tariff they would once more usher in prosperity and demonstrate the fallacy of the right hon. gentleman's arguments regarding protection.

I do not wish to go very deeply into the question of protection to-night, but I heard one hon. member—I think my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Baxter)—twitting the Government in a certain respect. He read an extract from the Prime Minister's speech and went on in a humorous vein. He said that if there were a tariff for revenue, shoes that cost $5.50 would be reduced to $5.20, and he treated this reduction as a light matter, declaring that it was only a difference of 30 cents. Well, it may seem a light matter when you buy only one pair of shoes, but if you have a family like mine and have to buy shoes for a family of nine, 30 cents of a difference on

each pair of shoes does not strike me as being a matter that can be easily dismissed. And when you have to reckon on four pairs of shoes per person per year it becomes quite a serious problem in the domestic budget. And, then, in the matter of underclothing and other articles of apparel, when you have to pay an aggregate of $300 as a result of protection, I do not think that a difference of 30 cents on a pair of shoes is one that can be pooh-poohed. It is a consideration for every family-loving man in Canada.

It has been stated that we must have protection to safeguard our infant industries. Now, I can readily understand that protection was justifiable in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald, in the seventies, if ever it could be justified in the history of Canada. The industrial arts of the United States were in an advanced state, and there was a danger of flooding from Europe. It was, therefore, possibly necessary in that early period of our existence to protect these manufacturers. But as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Motherwell) said in a speech in Swift Current, and as I also said, these infants have now become fathers with whiskers and they are amongst the dominant powers in Canadian life. I therefore do not believe that the argument in favour of protecting infant industries holds good to-day. Even in Great Britain, where they have had free trade, some of the greatest industries have been built up, yea, even in competition with the whole world.

Another argument that has been advanced by our friends in support of protection is the necessity for a home market. Of course, the home market is a splendid thing. We have no fault to find with Eastern Canada and the men that work in the factories; nor have we anything to say against the manufacturers. We do believe, however, that the home market is only a drop in the bucket so far as the great agricultural interests are concerned, especially in regard to wheat. For the next fifty years the Canadian farmer will have to grow wheat and other grains of all kinds, and raise cattle for the markets of the world. For that reason, therefore, the home market does not enter into the price that we are receiving at the present time.

We as Canadian farmers can grow wheat at 80 cents a bushel and place it on the world's market in competition with the farmers of all other countries. But in return, Sir, we claim the privilege in regard to the commodities that enter into the production of our wheat, that we shall have the same opportunities of buying them in the world's market.

Of course, the argument is still being advanced: Where are you going to get revenue to run this great country? We need revenue and it is very difficult to get. The only question I should like to ask hon. members is: Who pays that revenue? Why, we are told by the greatest economic authorities in the world that 90 per cent at least of this tariff revenue is paid by the domestic consumers. So, Sir, we pay the revenue any way; but not only do we pay the revenue—we also make handsome gifts to those manufacturers who are protected as a result of that revenue being collected. Now, in regard to the economic factors that enter into world production, taking into consideration the demoralized exchange of most of the countries of Europe, and bearing in mind our domestic conditions, I can readily understand that it would not be advisable to have free trade at the present time; but I believe that it would be sound policy to have an all round reduction of the tariff for the good of our people generally.

I should like to deal for a moment or two with the tariff platform of the Liberal party. I believe that the Liberal party is more nearly in accord with us than is any other party—and yet I have my doubts. I have debated before this subject of tariff for revenue purposes only, and after carefully looking into the matter I find it very difficult to have such a tariff as will not in some measure protect the Canadian manufacturers. Yet we do not wish to revolutionize our trade practices, we do not wish to put our manufacturers out of business, as some people tell us is our intention. I do not believe that that is either possible or feasible. I believe that our manufacturers have just as much business acumen and ability as any of their competitors in Europe or the United States. Indeed it has been proved that the same men that enjoy this protection here can compete in the markets of the world. Therefore it seems to me fallacious to argue that it is absolutely essential to the prosperity of this country that we have high protection, and I hope that the historic Liberal party will live up to its ideals—ideals that have been manifested in the life of men of the stamp of Gladstone and Laurier, and that that party will give to our people legislation for the good of the people of Canada as a whole rather than for the advantage of the few.

That is where we stand as Progressives to-day—equal rights to every man, special privileges to none.

The question of returning their natural resources to our Prairie provinces is of vital importance to those provinces. We heard yesterday something about the justice that should be accorded the Maritime provinces in dealing with those natural resources, and we also heard the views of hon. members on this side. I want to say, Sir, that in regard to the return of our natural resources, we of the Prairie provinces only ask for our rights. We believe that those natural resources belong to us, and that the Dominion in 1870 did a great wrong to the province of Manitoba in retaining its resources. We further believe that this wrong was accentuated when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were created. A study of the constitutional practice of the British Empire will disclose that in every instance where the people have developed to the extent of being able to rule themselves and receive a measure of self-government the control of their natural resources has accompanied autonomy. The four provinces that entered into Confederation in 1867 had strenuously demanded from the British Government the right to control their natural resources. While replying to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. leader of the Government stated that Canada had equal rights with the other members of the great British Commonwealth and he did not believe in taking second place or asking for privileges from the British Government. I concur in his judgment that we are one of the great self-governing nations of the British Commonwealth. But, Sir, what he advocates in respect to the Dominion, I claim, applies in equal measure to the three Prairie provinces. We are members of Confederation, we have been granted autonomy, but we are the one glaring exception throughout the British Commonwealth to-day in that we are denied control of our natural resources. In 1871, when British Columbia entered Confederation, her lands were immediately given to her. But some of those lands had already been exploited by the Canadian government as one of the conditions of building the Canadian Pacific railway. What was the result? The Canadian government immediately compensated the government of British Columbia for all lands which were retained specifically for Dominion purposes. When, however, Manitoba came into Confederation her natural resources were denied her. But in 1873, before Prince Edward Island became a member of Confederation, her natural resources had already been dissipated, and as an inducement she was invited to enter into Confederation on the same basis of equality as Ontario, Quebec, and the other provinces, and was immediately granted a sum of money in lieu of her natural resources.

Therefore, Sir, I see no reason why we need enter into a long discussion on this matter. It is our right to control our natural resources. The subject has been a political football for both parties in the past, and it is time that the Government of the day, with the aid of the Progressives, take that political football and kick it into the net so that we may get our rights and be members of Confederation on the same basis as our sister provinces. An hon. member this afternoon said that we were in the position of a colony. I do not think he over-stated the fact, but it is time that we enjoyed equality with all the other provinces. Of course, the argument is raised that Canada as a whole paid for these natural resources. But how? The £300,000 so paid was borrowed in Great Britain, and the Canadian people as a whole became responsible for the loan. But, Sir, we find on examination that the rights granted to the Hudson's Bay Company were granted by the British Crown, and when this £300,000 was paid over the Hudson's Bay Company surrendered those rights to the British Crown and in turn they were transferred to Canada. When the Northwest became settled and the Prairie provinces were created, those provinces were to enjoy the same privileges as if they had entered into Confederation in 1867. But they amended the British North America Act and I think, Sir, that if it went to the highest court of the land that amendment would be found to be ultra vires. Be that as it may, we in Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba believe that we have a right to these lands; that we should be enabled to enjoy the privileges accorded to others under similar conditions. When Ontario's boundary was extended, no great cry went up among the Canadian people that we had an interest in these lands. When the boundary of Quebec was extended to James Bay, no great cry went over the Dominion that we had an interest in those lands. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as a result of their isolated position and in-

ability to acquire additional lands, may need to come to this Parliament for a new financial arrangement, but we claim, Sir, that that is a question which should not enter into the matter of the return to the Western provinces of their natural resources. The question is a constitutional one; we claim that we have a constitutional right to enjoy these things. The matter of a larger subsidy to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia is an entirely different question. I wish to say also, on behalf of Saskatchewan at least, that we shall not be satisfied merely with the return of these natural resources; we want something more than that. Millions and millions of our acres have been exploited and put into the hands of speculators; we demand, therefore, that there shall be an acounting of these lands that have been used purely for Dominion purposes, and that, after deducting administration charges, the 9 p.m. money received shall be handed over to its rightful owners. That is where we stand in the matter.

In conclusion, Sir, I wish to say just a few words with regard to the railways. I believe that the national railways should be owned and controlled by the Canadian people and should be kept entirely out of politics. I see no reason in the world why they should not pay a large revenue to the federal exchequer if they are put under an efficient and businesslike administration. There is one thing I want to say about the railways which some may look upon as a little radical, and it is this: the railways were bought at an inflated price, and you cannot, on the basis of that abnormally large capital investment, expect them to pay a profit. I think the time has come when, as a wise business principle, these railways should be revalued on a business basis. If necessary, we should take the money which has been paid over and above the reasonable market value and charge it to our national debt. Do not burden the railways with it; do not put it on the western farmer, with his long hauls and high freight rates. Revalue these great national railways; consolidate them; put them under one business head and do not allow any urban centre like Montreal—or Toronto, for that matter—to enter into the negotiation at all. Look upon it from a purely business standpoint and let it be administered in the interests of the whole Canadian people. The time will come when, under a fair and wise administration, freight rates may be lowered, the road with its rolling stock and equipment kept in proper condition; then we shall receive handsome interest upon the investment made.

I shall take advantage of a later opportunity to enter more fully into a discussion of matters affecting the Tariff, the Wheat Board, and other things. In the meantime I thank you, Sir, and hon. members of the House, for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

Mr. ARCHIBALD M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I, too, crave your indulgence for a short time as well as the indulgence of hon. members of this House. I am aware that you have heard a good many speeches from this corner of the Chamber, but I assure you Sir, that you have not heard all we have to say; we have much more back here yet. We are just putting forth a small sample of what we have.

I rise with a certain amount of fear and trembling because, like some previous speakers, this is my first appearance in this assembly. But I am satisfied that a certain amount of generosity will be extended to me by the Speaker, because he assured hon. members that for a quarter of a century he himself honoured the rules of the House more in the breach than in the observance, and I am quite sure that when we who are new members transgress the rules we shall have his indulgence.

Being a new member in this Chamber there are some things that I particularly notice. One is that we have with us, in addition to English, a language to which I have not been accustomed. It does not, however, strike me harshly—not quite as harshly, at any rate, as it did some few years ago when I was compelled, under a very strict teacher, to learn its rules and idioms. They struck me then as being very peculiar and very hard to master. I am quite convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this great race which we have represented here, and which has produced a Cartier, a Champlain, a Frontenac, a Joliet, a Marquette, —yea, a Laurier and a Marshal Foch,—I am quite convinced that this great race has still representatives worthy of seats in the councils of this nation. While I do not fully understand the language, I may add that I am somewhat acquainted with the peculiarities of the race, because my life companion claims descent from those who bore the fleur de lis. I am quite convinced of her capabilities, and if ever called upon to choose another companion I believe I would choose one whose characteristics in

that direction were even more pronounced. I am particularly pleased to be in this corner of the Chamber—this Progessive corner. We are the second largest group in the House. It is true that we have, so to speak, sat back and let the smallest group sit nearer to you, Mr. Speaker,—we have done that for their mutual encouragement. They were pretty badly dilapidated on December 6th last, and if their opponents in other constituencies had done as much to bring them to a state of dilapidation as I did in mine, there would be none of them here to tell the tale. The electors of my constituency gave me over 82 per cent of the votes cast. My opponent was a Conservative; he got the rest of the votes.

I am particularly pleased, too, that we, the Progressive group, have the first lady commoner sitting amongst us. I am well aware that some of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House have not fully learned that it is not well that man should live alone, and I think that the Progressives will have to pay particular heed to the hon. member of the gentler sex and see that she is not induced to cross the floor to form a stronger Liberal Government.

As you are possibly aware, Mr. Speaker, I am from the West, that country with the reputation of being wild and woolly; but I assure you that the wildness has fairly well all vanished and the woolliness as well. Even the wild buffalo that used to roam the prairies are now behind fences, and the former wild Indians are pretty well pacified and living on the reserves. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we who are here representing the West are fair specimens of that country, and just as tame and as docile as the average human being. Of course in the recent election we were classified as Bolshevists, Seditionists, Annexationists and several other kinds of "ists." Well, we do not merit all these designations, but I must say that I am an annexationist myself, a very strong annexationist—I believe that we should annex the United States right away.

I was pleased to hear our Premier remark in his speech that he wished to hear the western opinion—wished to have it expressed in the councils of the nation. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is being expressed in no uncertain tones and I think it is right that it should be.

There is one part of the Speech from the Throne that appeals to me, and I wish to consider it, perhaps, from an angle of vision somewhat different from what has been emphasized before. A paragraph in the Speech states that it has been decided to hold in Genoa a conference with the object of securing a concerted effort to repair the grave dislocations in the economic and financial field that have everywhere followed the war. That is the point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress in the few remarks that I shall make to-night. As the hon. member (Mr. Lewis) who preceded me intimated, it perhaps is not good policy for a westerner to say anything derogatory about the province in which he resides. I felt somewhat loath to do so, but picking up a copy of Saturday Night, published in the city of Toronto, dated March 11, 1922, I found in the first column on the first page an editorial the reading of which caused me to throw aside my reluctance to speak about conditions in the province of Saskatchewan. Here is what the editorial says:

> A situation has arisen in Saskatchewan that will bear close watching. As is well known, quite a number of western towns have, owing to the absurd land boom of years ago, been obliged to default on their bond interest. Among these places are Swift Current, Prince Albert, Sutherland, Watrous, Battleford, Scott, Canora, Melville and Humbolt.

That looks pretty bad, Mr. Speaker, for Saskatchewan. I think if I bring to your attention, and to the attention of the House, some of the conditions as they actually are in that province I shall not be publishing much more than has already been given out to the public. I also have before me a letter from the secretary-treasurer of a rural municipality in the constituency which I represent. As you are aware the rural municipality is our small, local sub-division out there for governmental purposes. In part here is what the official referred to says:

> Last Fall those who were indebted to the banks for advances—which was practically everybody—were induced to repay wherever possible their notes before the end of the year and assurance was given verbally that those who did so would be financed during 1922. Now the banks are closing down on credits altogether. The municipality is in the same boat as the individuals.

Mr. Speaker, that gives us an idea of the conditions that the municipality I refer to is up against. Here is another extract from a letter written by the reeve of another municipality in the constituency I represent:

I wonder do those men at Ottawa fully realize what we are struggling against in here? Is it possible for you to make it plain to them that horses and cattle are dying in here by the dozens, simply starving, and we have nothing to put in the crop with.

Those are very dark conditions to have to lay before you. Here is a further suggestion, a rather novel one; I wish you would pay attention to what it says:

We are completely out of funds and require money for actual necessities and to alleviate our temporary pecuniary embarrassment.

We would ask you to take up the matter on the floor of the House if necessary.

Our request is, that we be given a cash grant sufficient to give each signer from fifty to one hundred dollars apiece.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any department in connection with the Dominion Government that would be very willing to carry out the suggestion made by this indivdual, and even if there should be there would be plenty of hon. members here ready to overrun that department without very much delay. I have simply read these extracts from letters to give you an idea of financial conditions in the part of the province that I have the honour to represent, and knowing these conditions I will make a few deductions therefrom. One is the need for absolute economy. I was pleased to hear that note struck by several hon. members in this House—the need for absolute economy. Some hon. members have made suggestions as to how we should economize, and possibly there is some virtue in them. We have a tremendous public debt, running as it does to some two billion three hundred and forty odd million dollars. That is a tremendous debt to rest upon Canada, and it is necessary that it should be met and that the money should come from somewhere to meet our obligations when they fall due.

Now some doubtless will think, especially hon. members sitting to my right who compose what is called the official Opposition, that is very good and sufficient reason why we should continue to have a tariff in Canada. Very well; let us look at that point for a moment. If we have a tariff in the country for raising money and that money is raised in a good and economical way all well and good; if not, it is not so well nor so good. I would like to give an illustration to show that the method of raising money for paying off our public debt by a customs tariff is not an economical method. If hon. members are good at arithmetic let them please follow these figures. I used to follow the school teaching profession and I only wish I had a blackboard here and a piece of chalk to more effectively demonstrate my point. We will suppose that a suit is bought from Great Britain costing over there the sum of $10. The tariff duty on fabrics entering Canada is 30 per cent, which means that when that suit enters Canada its cost is $13. It goes into the wholesaler's hands and he adds one-fourth to the cost of $13 to him, which is an addition of $3.25 to the $13, making the charge to him for selling $16.25. That suit goes into the retailer's hands. He adds 50 per cent to the cost price to him, which is $8.15 added to $16.25 making $24.40. Now if a person went into the store and bought this suit of clothes he would have to pay $24.40 at the present time.

Let us suppose there was no tariff. The original cost would be $10. It would go into the wholesaler's hands, and he would add one-quarter, $2.50, making $12.50. It would then go to the retailer, and he would add 50 percent or $6.25, bringing the cost up to $18.75. Notice the difference. In the one case, it is $24.40 and in the other case $18.75. That means that the consumer pays out $5.65 for a tariff of $3. But does that $3 tariff all go into the Dominion coffer? I think not. It is estimated, on very good authority, that to keep up all the expenses in connection with the collection of the customs tariff, it takes fully one-half, so that out of the $3 not more than $1.50 in cash actually goes into the Dominion coffers for the payment of the public indebtedness. That means, Mr. Speaker, that it takes $5.65 to put $1.50 into the Dominion treasury. It costs almost $4 to collect $1. Is that economy? I think not. Several hon. members have dealt with the tariff, and much can be said in regard to it. I do not know as it would be advisable to prolong the discussion. As intimated before, we have plenty of arguments to put forth, to show that the old, antiquated method of collecting revenue by tariff is too costly for this country at the present time to tolerate.

Besides the need for absolute economy there is the need for remedial farm legislation. This applies particuluarly to our western country. It is absolutely necessary, owing to the difficult conditions of the western country, that we should have this remedial legislation to enable the farmer to continue. Of course we know that the great need out there is rain, and it is beyond the pale of this honourable body to produce rain. Some of our western citizens last year endeavoured to have

rain manufactured, or drawn down in some mysterious manner, but I believe it was more or less a failure; at any rate the gentleman who was responsible for bringing the rain has not been re-engaged this year, as I understand.

There are several other problems that have been touched on that are necessary for the prosperity of Western Canada, such as lowering of freight rates, the decrease in, or the complete elimination of, the tariff on farm implements, as well as the elimination of the speculation in grain, which is perhaps the most vital question with the western farmer to-day. I am well acquainted with a gentleman in our western country, who was a citizen until recently of the town in which I live, but who took a liking for southern California. He was immensely rich, and has gone to southern California to live at ease, having made large profits out of speculation in buying Canadian wheat. I was advised some few years ago that he had cleaned up $70,000 in one transaction, and that he had several such transactions. The western farmer looks for remedial legislation to overcome that speculative tendency in regard to Canadian wheat, and not only to overcome that speculation, but to extend the period of our wheat entering the world's market from a two months' period to a twelve months' period. This we believe can best be attained by the re-establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board. I am quite convinced that the Wheat Board will not solve all the ills of Western Canada, but it will solve a great many of them, and we who represent western farming communities are decided in our opinion that it will go a long way towards remedying the evils in that western country.

In addition to this, there is, the question of the financial condition of the country with particular reference to banking. We have in Canada 18 chartered banks, with approximately 5,000 branches. Now, I am venturing on a subject upon which possibly there is no unanimity of opinion, but I have read to this House a statement of some of the financial conditions as they are actually encountered in Western Canada. We find that rural municipalities, with assets of between three and four million dollars, are unable to borrow money to carry on current expenditures. There are individuals out there who keep good faith with the bank and pay what they owe them, and yet are refused credit to finance their operations during 1922. The Government of Saskatchewan, some couple of years ago, started a system of taking in money from people who had a surplus, paying them, I believe 5½ per cent, and reloaning that money to farmers who need it at 6½ per cent. Some few million dollars have been borrowed and loaned in this way. We find that quite recently the Ontario Government started a system of taking in money from those who had a surplus, paying them 4 per cent, and reloaning the money at 6 per cent. A resolution was passed recently by the United Farmers of Alberta, calling upon the Dominion Government to enter into some system of extended credit to assist those who needed money. A few months ago there was a bank scandal in Eastern Canada. The Merchants Bank on December 17th, 1921, was absorbed by the Bank of Montreal. Previous to the absorption that bank loaned money recklessly, and the outcome was that some $8,000,000 of the people's money was squandered. Under these conditions, I am not prepared to venture an opinion as to what the remedy should be, but I wish to bring these facts to the attention of the Committee on Banking and Commerce and ask that they inquire very carefully into our present banking system, and especially into the Merchants Bank scandal. In addition to that the committee might take up the matter of the nationalization of the banks and report as to the merits and demerits of our present system, and a system of bank nationalization. I am not expressing any opinion on the matter but would like to have a report from our banking committee on the subject.

I am grateful to you, Sir, for your indulgence in permitting me to say a few words on this, my first appearance on the floor of this House. I assure you that I share the feelings that have already been expressed by my fellow-members from the West. We are not here particularly in the interests of party. I fear that we have already seen too much of the spirit of trying to put party before country, and even since the opening of this Parliament, we have listened to many wordy arguments, many denunciations and declarations, but we have not listened to as much discussion of the real, vital matters before the country as we should. I think you will agree with me, Sir, that the attitude of the Progressive party is not so much to advance party or to try to gain the ascendency over some other party, as it is to tackle the real problems that are confronting Canada at the present time. I am with the other

members of this Progressive group in going up against the real problems, tackling them like men—and women, by the way—and endeavouring to bring about the solution of our real problems.

Mr. JOHN A. MacKELVIE (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I would have intruded in this debate, had it not been that I rather consider it of importance that a representative of a large agricultural section of the West—of the westernmost province of the Dominion, indeed—should lay before this House his views of the fiscal policy of the country, more especially as related to the tariff question, in order that our Progressive friends to my left may have some indication that all the agriculturists of Canada do not hold the same opinions regarding the tariff as those which have been so freely expressed since the opening of this House.

Before I proceed with my remarks along those lines, I desire, very heartily and sincerely, to unite myself with those who have expressed congratulations to you, Sir, on your elevation to your most important position. Those of us who have been privileged to sit with you in this House before, need no assurance that you will bring to that high position both grace and dignity, and that you will always conduct affairs under your control with absolute impartiality.

I should like also to add my measure of congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the Address, and, in this instance, perhaps, I can speak with more feeling than the ordinary member, as only a year or so ago it fell to my lot to second the Address and to make my maiden speech in this House. I can well recall the feeling of trepidation and diffidence with which I approached that task. I only wish that I could flatter myself that I succeeded in accomplishing the duty laid upon me on that occasion half so well as the hon. gentlemen who undertook the same performance a few days ago.

I also, perhaps, may be permitted to express very hearty congratulations to the new Prime Minister of this country upon having attained, at such an early period of his life, to the highest position in the gift of the Canadian people. I may, however, frankly add that I do not suppose that I, or some of my associates in this section of the House, would be in danger of collapsing from heart trouble or dying of grief, did the exigencies of the occasion require that, at a sooner or later period—and we all here trust it may be sooner—he might be required to cross the floor again and take up a position, Sir, at your left.

Along with other members who have very heartily and, I know, very sincerely, congratulated this House upon the addition to it of a lady member, I desire to add my voice in giving expression to the very great pleasure it affords me to see the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) occupying a seat in this Chamber. I would not say that any individual member around me would be so self-sacrificing as to wish that, in the next approaching contest, his seat might be filled by a lady representative; but I think I might venture to say that many of us would probably not be very sorry if our near neighbours should suffer from a fate such as that.

I am aware that a speaker in this debate on the Address is afforded a good deal of latitude and can, if it so suits him, discuss a great variety of subjects without being held too closely to the Speech from the Throne; but I suppose, in order to maintain some semblance of debate, it would be wise, at least, and advisable that a little attention be given to the remarks of those who have immediately preceded me to-day. I have been impressed—and I think the impression has been conveyed very strongly to other members of this House—that among our new associates to our left, is numbered a very considerable proportion of speakers who would grace any large assembly in the land. I have listened with marked satisfaction to some speeches which have come from that quarter of this assembly and which, for clearness, gracefulness of diction and comprehensive grasp, from their point of view, of the subjects to which they have given consideration, have reached a very high level.

I cannot, however, with an equal degree of sincerity, congratulate them upon some of the principles which they have set so vigorously before this House. I am tempted to draw attention to an illustration used by the hon. and very eloquent member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) who dwelt rather humourously on a remark made by the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) yesterday regarding a pamphlet issued as campaign literature by the party on the other side of the House, in which pamphlet attention was drawn to a promise that, if they came into power, a reduction would be effected in

the duty on boots and shoes. I was rather surprised, I must confess, to find that the hon. member for Swift Current, who had such a large family, was able to supply their wants so lavishly. I think, indeed, that his income tax must have formed a very considerable accretion to the funds of this country last year, if he carried into effect the scheme of provision he there outlined, for I find that reduction in the cost of boots and shoes contemplated in that pamphlet and mentioned by the hon. member for St. John and Albert amounted to about 5 per cent. The hon. member for Swift Current informed the House that the saving which would be effected in buying for his household under those conditions would amount to something in the neighbourhood of $300 per annum. That would mean that he was buying, for the use of his family, imported goods in the way of clothing alone to the extent of about $6,000 per annum, which, I imagine, from a country where, according to his own dictum, conditions financially and otherwise are so stringent, does not very forcibly bear out his argument.

I wish also to make a very brief reference to the remarks which fell this afternoon from the lips of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). I wish to say, at the outset, that I am approaching the consideration of this debate absolutely devoid of any feeling of resentment on account of the overturn which has taken place as a result of the election that was held on December 6. I am absolutely devoid of any feeling of bitterness in the criticism which I shall be compelled, I think, to make regarding some of the hon. gentleman's statements. I do not believe that it would be of any possible utility for me to attempt to re-thresh old straw. The country has spoken in a very decisive way and given expression to a verdict which we cannot gainsay, and which we on this side of the House are prepared to accept, I think, with very good grace indeed. But I do say that in the remarks of the Minister of Justice this afternoon there was an indication that he was not endeavouring to approch the subject, which he had under discussion, in an entirely disingenuous manner, and I am putting it as mildly as I feel it is possible for me to do.

He made a complaint that my leader (Mr. Meighen), in his opening remarks, had endeavoured to force upon the attention of this House certain theories of his own regarding, in the first place, the manner in which the Government of the day might be expected to handle the revision of the tariff, and, in the second place, the manner in which they might be expected to approach the very great task of handling the railway situation in this Dominion. Now, what the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said in both of these connections is a matter of record and is fresh in the memory of every person who heard him only two or three nights ago, and I desire to call to your memory, Sir, this fact, that any assertion he made regarding the statements in Montreal or elsewhere of the Minister of Justice was repeated word for word from the printed page. There was no conjecture on his part; he was not seeking to make any insinuation or innuendo. If that statement had not been correct, if the press had been guilty of misreporting the Minister of Justice on that occasion, we should certainly have heard of it before now.

But in another and, I think, even more reprehensible manner, the hon. gentleman, in the first speech which he has delivered in this Parliament, took occasion to twist a statement given by the leader of the Opposition in such a manner as to give him ground, as he thought, to enter the accusation against him that he had been guilty of utterances calculated to inflame the passions of the people of Quebec against other sections of this country, and to widen the breach, if any such existed, between the two great races of Canada. Now, I venture this assertion, from a perfect knowledge of the sentiments, the convictions, and the utterances of my leader, that no man in this House, or elsewhere in this country, is more thoroughly convinced that it is a duty of the public men of the country to give as much sympathetic consideration to the people of the province of Quebec as, so far from antagonizing them in any way, will draw the two races, if possible, into closer harmony; and I do not know upon what ground the allegation of the Minister of Justice could rest. I do not know that there could be traced to any public utterance of the right hon. leader of the Opposition any single sentence that would indicate that in his mind there rankled any suspicion of a sentiment of that kind. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that certain public journals of the country have so distorted and twisted the utterances of my leader that they have spread abroad that impression, and I speak of this matter with a certain degree of feeling and of

shame. For over thirty years I have been engaged in newspaper work in this country, and I have the honour of the craft very deeply at heart; and if any vestige of reason has been given to the hon. Minister for the attack he made upon the leader of the Opposition this afternoon it must rest solely with such distorted utterances as have gone forth from a section of the press of this country.

The hon. gentleman also gave expression to the opinion—and I assure him that it is an opinion not very deeply shared in either by hon. members surrounding me here or by the people of the country as a whole—that while the right hon. the leader of the Opposition might rightly be termed a good fighter he was a bad loser. Now, I should like to appeal to the members of the House, more particularly those who are new, whether they found anything in the utterance of the right hon. gentleman the other day to substantiate the assertion that he was a bad loser. Did they notice anything in the nature of a whine that fell from his lips as he detailed—and he had a perfect right to detail—some of the difficulties which met him during his recent campaign? Surely he was justified, and amply justified, in placing before the House and the country, on the first opportunity that arose, some of those difficulties and some of the tortuous paths which the then Opposition on certain occasions pursued in their endeavour to discredit him in the eyes of a certain class of people. In his speech there was nothing in the nature of a whine; it was a manly, straightforward statement of facts, and did not in any sense indicate that he was a bad loser. I will tell the hon. minister one thing that my right hon. friend has not lost, and is not in danger of losing: he has not lost one particle of the respect, and admiration, and enthusiastic devotion, and I think I am right in saying, the affection of the members who stand behind him in this part of the Chamber.

Mr. VIEN: They are only a few at that,—the remnant.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Well, there have been some saving remnants. There has been such a thing as the little leaven that leavened the whole; and in time, I predict,—and in my opinion that time is not very far distant—that remnant will have grown to such proportions that those who are inclined to jeer and taunt us regarding our size at the present time may be very fortunate indeed if they can escape the same fate. The hon. gentleman who leads the House (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his remarks the other night, was good enough to refer to our party. He congratulated us, if I remember rightly, upon the slight change that has been recently effected in our designation. He commented, at any rate, upon the fact that the Opposition in this end of the Chamber was now to be known as the Liberal-Conservative party. He went a little further, if I recall the circumstances correctly, and said that we were, in fact, Tories. Well, I for one did not feel any cold shiver running down my back at being so designated.

I know of course that the name "Tory", if applied in the sense in which it was at one time applied in Great Britain and in this country, is now nothing more than a joke. The crusted old Tory, the upholder, rightly or wrongly, of class privilege, is to-day as extinct as the dodo. But there has been a good deal of loose talking, loose thinking and loose press comment during the last few months since the election regarding that historic name Liberal-Conservative, which I for one shall never, I suppose, be able to express how proud I am to bear. It has been said that the name originated in 1867 when the unification of the various provinces was brought about and a government composed of Liberals and Conservatives, headed by Sir John A. Macdonald, consummated Confederation. That is only true in a measure. Considerably further back than that is to be found the genesis of the name. I think it was in 1854 that in this section of Canada, when the forces of the Liberals and Conservatives, known as the Baldwin-Lafontaine party were united in a government headed by MacNab, the name Liberal-Conservative was first used. Since that day I need not draw the attention of even the newest member of this House to the fact that a great deal of Canadian history has been made by that party.

Now, I said a moment ago that the honoured leader of our party had not lost the affection, esteem and respect of those who follow him here or of those who were ranged under his banner in the country, and the principal reason in my opinion why that devotion to him as a leader still exists is the fact that nobody ever has been in doubt, more particularly during the recent campaign, as to his being entirely worthy to bear the name Liberal-Conservative, for he has upheld through thick and thin in every section of this great

country where he appeared before the public the outstanding principles which have characterized that party from the time of its birth, namely, adequate protection of our industries.

After what I said in introduction I suppose it is not necessary for me to inform my Progressive friends that I am a protectionist. It indeed is the fundamental principle of my political belief. If I were asked to define that fundamental principal, I would say that first and foremost I believe in a measure of adequate protection to the industrial interests of this country; to the farming interests; and, following out that system of adequate protection to those two great industries, I believe the labouring classes of this country have their conditions infinitely bettered and are afforded far greater opportunities of obtaining remunerative pay for their toil than they would be under any other system that could be introduced. If that means to be a Liberal-Conservative, if that even means to be a Tory, I confess that so far from being ashamed of the designation I feel rather proud that it should be applied to myself or to any other member in this section of the House.

I do not propose to take up in detail consideration of all the clauses of this somewhat remarkable speech which has been put into the mouth of His Excellency. The only thing that I can really congratulate those responsible for its introduction upon is that it is couched in remarkably graceful, if at the same time remarkably ambiguous, language. The practiced hand of its originator is apparent in every line, and with finely rounded periods and very graceful sentences indeed he endeavours to lay before the country a pronouncement of policy which is entirely innocuous, which leaves scarcely anything tangible to grasp in the way of criticism, and which after all means precious little. I join here in the view expressed by my leader on Monday night. I feel quite certain that before this session closes my friends of the Progressive party, who are so thoroughly and absolutely wedded to the principle of free trade in foodstuffs—of reciprocity in natural products—will not take home with them any very great consolation when the final meaning of this paragraph relative to the revision of the tariff is disclosed to their view by such legislation as may be brought down during the course of this session. I, of course, am not complaining about that. The more my friends on the other side of the House refrain from tinkering with the tariff the more pleased I shall be, but I am quite well aware that it will bring disappointment of a very bitter kind indeed to many an hon. member, more especially to hon. members from the Prairie provinces, who had anchored their faith upon the fact that at a representative convention assembled in Ottawa only two years ago a great party had given to the public a pronouncement of policy which led to the belief that a very considerable revision in the tariff would be effected when that party attained power—that many articles would be placed on the free list, and that a very determined effort would be made to bring about reciprocity in natural products with the United States. I venture to predict that very, very little indeed along those lines will be accomplished this session.

I promised my Progressive friends to give them some reasons for my political belief that protection afforded the best possible system under which a large section of our farmers could pursue their avocations. I suppose that had I been brought up under other circumstances, say, in an industrial centre, where the benefits of protection as related to industries are very apparent, I might have become a firm believer in protection from that point of view. But for the last thirty years my life has been spent in one of the agricultural sections of British Columbia where we have no manufactures, and the same conclusion has been indelibly impressed upon my mind as would be the case if my associations had been entirely with a manufacturing centre. I have not on this occasion to discuss the subject in any academic manner. I am in a position to place before you a concrete example where demonstration is made up to the hilt of the benefits of protection to a great agricultural section of British Columbia. I represent the county of Yale in that province. That is one of the largest constituencies in Canada; its area is about as extensive as that comprised in the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island combined. Certain sections of that constituency are devoted almost exclusively to fruit growing—a large section surrounding Okanagan lake, a body of water 75 miles in extent, the shores of which are dotted with orchards; Grand Forks and Similkameen, provincial ridings are also orchard sections. In British Columbia there is now invested upwards of $40,000,000 in the orchard business. The Minister of Justice, who spoke

this afternoon, referred to the fact that in his province the amount invested in the boot and shoe business was no less a sum than $32,000,000, and that protection was necessary to keep that business alive. I want to impress upon you members of the Progressive party that in his address this afternoon, which was delivered in a very impressive manner indeed, the Minister of Justice, while he did not mention the word "protection," so far as I can recall it, from start to finish, did say frankly and freely that for twenty-five years or more he had been firmly convinced that the tariff policy pursued by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government, with the present Minister of Finance in charge of the exchequer, was the correct one for Canada to hold to to-day. None of you who have given any consideration to this subject can fail to be aware of the fact that the customs tariff from 1896 to 1911 was absolutely a protective tariff; just such a protective tariff—for it was almost unchanged during that period—as that which prevailed while the predecessors of the Laurier government were in office. It is true that at the very end of that period they made an appeal to the country on a policy of reciprocity in natural products with the United States, and the verdict of the people was so overwhelmingly against the proposal that they went down to almost complete collapse. In no part of Canada was reciprocity a more vital issue than it was in the constituency that I represent. In no part of Canada was the danger so freely seen to the great industries, which, indeed, are our basic industries there, and the result was that the then Conservative candidate, Hon. Martin Burrell, was returned by one of the largest majorities ever received by a candidate in the West. The people of that constituency, whose bread and butter were at stake on that occasion, were fully seized of the gravity of the situation as it affected them.

Now, let us look for a few moments at this fruit-growing industry. We have heard to-day a very distressful tale indeed from several speakers in the group to my left, and I am only too fully aware that what they said was true. The conditions which have confronted the farmer of the western plains during the last two or three years are all quite as depicted by my hon. friends. But I venture to suggest that some of those difficulties and distresses were due to conditions relating to climate and soil; not all of them, surely, were directly or indirectly traceable to the tariff policy of the country. However that may be, here is the condition of affairs in my constituency.

We have, as I say, invested in the orchard business about $40,000,000, and our natural market is the prairie country of the West. In 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, when the orchard business was just beginning to get upon its feet, we were met by this condition of affairs: we were trying to ship apples across the mountains for sale to you people on the plains. Our cost of production in those days was between ninety cents and one dollar per box; to-day it has risen to $1.50 per box. We found that the great apple-producing sections of the two states lying to our south—Washington and Oregon, and, to some extent Idaho and Montana—were producing one hundred boxes of apples to our one; had established trade in a large chain of populous cities stretching at least to the Mississippi river and in a great many instances further east, where they could sell their "Fancy" and "Extra Fancy" brands of fruit at a profitable figure. They were anxious to dispose of what they call their "C" variety at almost any price they could get for it; accordingly they began sending this fruit into the Prairie provinces in such quantities and at such prices that stark ruin—no other word can properly designate it—stark ruin stared the orchardists of Okanagan and other sections of Yale in the face. Apples were sent on consignment from Washington and Oregon to the prairie markets and sold at forty cents a box when the cost of production in those states was about ninety cents. Was there any possibility under those circumstances for our orchardists to compete? Could they, indeed, continue in existence in the face of that condition? Well, we speedily saw that we had either to give up the business or get some measure of protection that would save us from disaster and ruin. Mind you, the orchard business is not like any other. When a man starts an orchard he has to buy expensive land in the first place; he has to make a large annual outlay for water to irrigate it, and he has to wait anywhere from five to eight years for the trees to attain maturity before he can look for any return. And if he has an unprofitable season he cannot go into some other line of agriculture; he cannot change his crop; he has to depend upon the product of his apple or plum or peach or cherry trees.

10 p.m.

We found, as I said, that in those years we were facing absolute ruin, and the only thing that could save us was relief from this Parliament. We came here with deputations; we presented the case to the government then in office, of which Sir Robert Borden was the head, and we backed up our plea by statistics of so convincing a nature that the Governemnt, in spite of a good deal of determined opposition from the other side of the House, gave us the relief that we sought in the form of an increase in the duty on apples to 30 cents a box. A box contains about forty pounds; there are about three boxes to a barrel. From that moment the industry began to flourish; people took new heart, and from British Columbia there will be exported this year some 6,000 cars of apples valued at between $8,000,000 and $9,000,000. Is that not an industry that is worth conserving? You gentlemen from the prairies are very enthusiastic supporters of the principle of co-operation, and rightly so. Now, we have built up in the Okanagan and other apple-producing valleys of British Columbia a splendid system of co-operation in the handling and marketing of our fruit. If you want to deliver it a deadly blow; if you want to bring co-operation in that country to its knees—indeed, to extinction—you cannot do it more effectively than by taking off this protection from our fruit.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. member permit me a question? What is the duty on Canadian apples entering the United States?

Mr. MacKELVIE: It is just about the same, since the Fordney Bill came into effect, as our own duty.

Mr. VIEN: But what was the duty prior to that?

Mr. MacKELVIE: Prior to that apples were free.

Mr. VIEN: Well then in so far as the argument of my hon. friend goes, what was to prevent him or the apple growers from shipping apples to the United States and competing with the American fruit growers.

Mr. MacKELVIE: The reason that prevented us from taking advantage of a situation of that kind—which by the way never existed—was just the same reason that prevents our manufacturers of goods in Canada from competing against highly specialized firms in the United States they can turn out their products in such vast quantities that their overhead expenses are very low compared to ours; they can afford to sell their products—I know your point—I will come to it in a minute—very much cheaper than we can. But the real reason was this: they produce a hundred times more apples in those two states to the south of us than we produce in British Columbia, and their market is crowded with their home products, for that reason they seek to dump their surplus product in our natural markets on the prairies.

Mr. VIEN: But their market was just as open to you.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Providing there was a market there; but there was no market; they were overstocked; they themselves had overproduced.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend allow me a further question?

Mr. MacKELVIE: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: I would ask him why the British Columbia fruit growers went into such an unprofitable business?

Mr. MacKELVIE: Oh. Well, I think I can possibly explain that too.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacKELVIE: At the time we entered largely upon the commercial production of apples in British Columbia the prospect did seem to be a pretty alluring one. We had not then perhaps, taken into consideration the fact that there were very much larger areas of land suitable for the cultivation of orchards in the states to the south of us. We had not, perhaps, been fully seized of the fact that already the existing orchards there far outnumbered our own, but the principal reason was this: at that time there was pouring into the plains, into the three provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba, immigrants from the United States at the rate of at least a couple of hundred thousand a year and it looked to us who were planting orchards there that by the time our orchards came into full production, by the time they came to maturity, the natural increase of the population of the Prairie provinces would be such—and we hoped too their prosperity would grow in the same measure as their immigration—that we would have provided for us just over the mountains that lie to our east a vast market that would absorb all that we could offer it.

Mr. VIEN: Providing it was protected by a high tariff wall.

Mr. MacKELVIE: No. We thought then that the American product would not seek entrance in the manner in which it did. We did not understand the situation; I am free to confess none of us are so well acquainted with facts before they happen as when we are able to look back upon them in retrospect.

Now, as to the measure of protection that is afforded us, we not only have a specific duty on apples but we had inserted in our Customs Act last year what is known as the dumping clause. We have had the dumping clause in connection with our Customs Act in Canada for many years, in fact, I think it goes back to probably 1903 or 1904. But that dumping clause of the Customs Act we found was lacking in teeth; it did not grip the situation; it did not give the relief to us that we thought we were entitled to because of this fact: It was based upon the selling price of the article at the point of production, and that selling price might be manipulated, might be rigged, might fluctuate so much in places a few miles apart that it was a matter of impossibility ever to determine it with any degree of exactitude, and it was a very easy clause to avoid. So, last year, finding that other countries who were alert and alive to the situation, were introducing clauses into their customs acts based upon another principle, namely, that the cost of production—not the selling price or the market price—but the cost of production at the point where the article originated—should be the basis of that clause, we had our act changed, or we had it amended, and now we have in the Customs Act a dumping clause which does give us protection in that respect. If an American firm, for instance, ships into Calgary, as they attempted to do last year, pears which they offered on the market there for a dollar a box we could invoke—as indeed we did invoke last year—this dumping clause in the Customs law. We can prove that it cost them so much to produce that box of pears in the Yakima valley, the Wenatchee valley, Hood River district, or wherever they originated; that the transportation charges from that point to the point where they were offered for sale was so much; and then the Minister of Customs is authorized to increase the duty above the normal duty to such a figure as will bring about a fair market value for those articles in the market where they are presented; and by that means, invoking that clause, I dare say the orchardists of the Okanagan valley were last year saved many thousand dollars.

Mr. SALES: Will not that dumping clause increase the tariff?

Mr. MacKELVIE: I will tell the House this fact—it may not be easy to believe it but it is nevertheless a fact—that in spite of the protection afforded us by the Customs tariff and by the dumping clause, the market price of apples—no, not the retail marketing price of apples for that may be anything according to different localities or according to how much the retailer will get—but the market price of apples as disposed of by the producer and put on the prairie market by the wholesaler, was no larger in Manitoba, Saskatchewan or in Alberta than it was on the other side of the line a corresponding distance from the Washington orchard. For instance the price in Dakota last year and the year before was practically the same for American apples produced in Washington as it was in Manitoba for apples produced in the Okanagan valley. Now under a system such as that we have some chance of maintaining the British Columbia industries in a very prosperous condition, although I want to tell you that it is by no means as rosy in the fruit growing country as some people seem to think they have reason to believe. This year our orchardists, despite the existing protection, are almost in as bad a position as some of you graingrowers from the prairies. When I left the Okanagan valley at the end of last month the fruit growers there, selling through the co-operative institutions, had not received the money for their crop, and further, a lot of that crop was not sold. You know how conditions were on the prairies this year; you know what proportion of the crop they were capable of absorbing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is very conversant with the rules of the House. I would ask him to address hon. members in the third person instead of addressing them directly.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Thank you very much for your correction, Mr. Speaker. I will endeavour to adhere to the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not a correction but a direction.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I was about to remark, Mr. Speaker, that so far from being entirely prosperous this year the condition was not altogether rosy as regards fruit

growing in my district. We were able this year, though for the first time in our history, to break into the American market; and this will probably answer the question in some degree of my hon. friend who made a query a few minutes ago. We were able this year for the first time, owing to a set of circumstances which perhaps may never occur again, to dispose of some portion of our crop in the state of New York. The reasons for that were these: In the first place New York, which the previous year had produced more than double the amount of apples that was grown in the combined states of Washington and Oregon, this last season found itself, comparatively speaking, without a crop at all. The second reason was that while Washington and Oregon had large crops they were unable, owing to lack of transportation facilities, to place their apples on the market at the proper season; and the third reason was the difference in exchange which was sufficient to offset the duty levied upon our apples when exported to the United States. But despite that fact, although we were able to dispose of some of our apples just as soon as the car shortage was overcome in Washington and Oregon, the United States market was flooded with apples from those states, and when I left I think there were two or three hundred cars of apples stored in New York, waiting for sale and the returns came in very slowly indeed. Under those circumstances, I think I am justified in directing the attention of my Progressive friends to a section of the country where the people cannot, by any stretch of imagination, give countenance to the desire which seems to animate our friends for a sweeping revision of the tariff downward. In regard to the reciprocity agreement with the United States of America, admitting foodstuffs from that country free, or in regard to the removal of the dumping clause, which gives us another measure of protection, we have rather an example of the irony of fate.

Of course during my election campaign I naturally made as strong a point as I was able, speaking to the fruit-growing section, of the advantages which they received under this protective tariff and under the provisions of the dumping clause. I endeavoured to point out how fatal it would be to their interests if any party who would sweep away these measures of protection were to come into power. My opponent, a person whom I held in high esteem, pooh-poohed such an idea, and said it was a bug-bear. He said "If our party come into office, we never will remove the dumping clause or reduce the tariff on fruit." Here is where the irony of fate comes in. As soon as the Liberal party was returned to power, and the danger became apparent to my opponent and his friends that this tariff would be reduced or the dumping clause removed, my Liberal opponent and his chief executive, the president of the association in Yale, came down to Ottawa and used all their power to keep in effect and in force the very policy introduced and maintained by the present leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister of this country. I do not intend to pursue the discussion of this portion of the tariff at any length at present. We will, no doubt, have a full-dress discussion on it later on in the session when the Budget is presented.

I desire to make reference to another section of the Speech from the Throne, and in this connection I prophesy, the members surrounding me here will find themselves very much in accord with the views expressed by my friends to my left. That is in connection with the railway situation in this country. I was particularly impressed, in fact I was rather delighted, with the very frank manner in which that question was dealt with by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) who presented the resolution for the adoption of the Address. He designated the railway situation in these terms: "It is an emaciated foundling left on the doorstep of the Government which preceded this one." And I thought that characterization was a true one. Time has developed certain changes, but not very many, with regard to the railway situation since that foundling was laid on the doorstep of the Government. It has, perhaps, not developed into a very sturdy stripling so far, but it gives signs of growth, and healthy growth. Its future development, of course, is now in other hands, and the orphan has passed under new guardianship. Its future development will depend, of course, very largely upon the treatment which it receives from this guardian during its term of adolescence. If it be given a reasonable measure of assistance and subsistence, such as it requires, I, for one, have not any great doubt or apprehension that in time it will develop into a very healthy and flourishing offspring of this country. If, on the other hand, it is denied subsistence, if it is given

ill-treatment, as some members on this side of this House and some of the Progressive members say will be its fate, it will not be very long until the undertaker is called in, and should that contingency occur, there are those who apparently believe that there are influences across the House which would rather cheerfully, and with a great deal of alacrity, furnish the hearse and the plumes.

Be that as it may, with that railway situation, as has frequently been said during this debate, is tied up another very great and important question. That is the question of immigration. As has been very truthfully said, we must have immigration; we have to fill up the vacant land and obtain people to give business to the road before there is much hope of placing it on a paying basis. I am free to confess that we are rather up against a very perplexing proposition. We are almost, I think, forced upon the horns of a dilemma. If, in order to get immigration to give business to our railways, we take down the barriers which have restricted immigration into this country, if we permit an influx of people from all portions of the globe, who are only too anxious to flood into this country of opportunity, if we permit, for instance, such countries as the Balkans, Southern Europe and other sections of that distressed land, devastated by war, to pour their population into Canada, our second condition will be worse than our first.

We have in my own constituency an example of what has occured through loose systems of immigration in the past. I am not going to attach any particular blame to any party for the immigration policy which prevailed in the early years of this century, but I know there are hundreds and thousands of people in my own constituency who wish very ardently that, at least, the colony of Doukhobors had never been allowed to come into Canada, for, without doubt, they cannot be termed anything less than a pest and a nuisance. They will not conform to the laws of the land, nor to our provincial regulations. They will not register their births nor their deaths, or send their children to school, and when any attempt is made to enforce this law, a number of them of the extreme sect, resent it to this extent: both sexes will divest themselves of all clothing, and make a parade, dressed in the suits which Adam and Eve wore before the fig leaves were introduced in the garden of Eden.

We have also in British Columbia another immigration problem which is even more serious, indeed, vastly more serious than that, and to which I would refer. I have not time to develop its consideration to any length tonight, but I will simply say that I think a great deal of education will be necessary before the people in the eastern section of the Dominion will have anything like an adequate conception of what Oriental immigration into British Columbia has meant for our province. One out of every ten or twelve adult males in British Columbia to-day is an oriental. The whole of the industries are under their control. Down the lower Fraser river there is a town called Steveston, a fishing development, where the fishing and canning of salmon is the great industry. That community is now a community almost exclusively of Japanese. I have no dislike for the Japanese nation; I am an admirer, as everybody who has considered their growth and history during the last half century must be, of the many admirable qualities which they possess; but the hon. member for North Winnipeg, in moving the Address, employed in some connection this line from Kipling: "There is no East, no West, border nor breed nor birth". There is a couplet better known which applies more closely in this connection to our land, and that is:

> For East is East and West is West,
> And never the twain shall meet.

And they cannot meet as regards the assimilation of an oriental population amongst the people of British Columbia. Our schools are to-day crowded with oriental children, and the natural increase of the Japanese already settled in that province, is such as to warrant us in the belief that, even if the bars were put up so rigidly that not a single one of their race could enter Canada for the next decade, their natural increase would be such as to give us more by far in that province than we could ever begin to absorb profitably. There is the situation connected with immigration, and I hope those of us who come from that Pacific province will have the sympathetic assistance of some of the other members who come from further East, in guarding our western portals against any further influx of a class of people who cannot be considered as anything but detrimental and dangerous to our national life. In this connection, at the outset of my remarks I gave some reasons why, behind our leader, stood a

united party, holding him in such a high measure of respect, esteem, and loyal devotion. If there was one reason more than another that served to endear that man to the people of British Columbia, and that, I think and believe, should have endeared him to the people of this whole country if they had understood the situation as we understood it, it was the spirited, energetic, courageous and patriotic course which he assumed at the conference of Prime Ministers in London last year, when, to use the vernacular, he threw a monkey-wrench into the machinery and prevented the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese treaty. I am one of those who believe that the assertion frequently made at that time or very shortly afterwards, that it was largely due to the action of Canada's representative there that the Disarmament Conference at Washington was called, was an absolutely true statement of fact. As a result of that conference, we know that the Anglo-Japanese Treaty is now a thing of the past, and we have in its stead a Four Nations' Treaty, which we are, I think, all thoroughly convinced will, for a long time to come, ensure safety on our Pacific coast.

I find that I have several other points noted on which I had intended to make some remarks, but I think I shall pass them up. We have been treated to-day to some rather lengthy orations, and I do not want to add mine to that number. I had noted something about revision of terms in connection with the Prairie provinces, but I do not think I shall dwell upon that subject. I have tried to understand as fully as possible, from the remarks which have fallen from the lips of the members of the Progressive party who have spoken, their objection to the position taken by the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) yesterday, and I have yet failed to grasp why they should have any objection to permitting a province, which feels it has a grievance, to enter upon a discussion of any matter precedent to any change in the terms in connection with the three western provinces. In British Columbia, we all expect to interject ourselves into that conference or board of arbitration or whatever it may be, if it is held, and to have our views presented there, and, I hope, very forcibly presented. We, in British Columbia, have never believed that we have received exactly just and fair treatment in the distribution of subsidies. We have physical disabilities there which make, for instance, road-building such a tremendous expense as compared with the same sort of construction in the other provinces, and we have other cases which lead us to believe that, if any reconstruction of terms is effected, we should be entitled to present our case and to make a claim for better terms before that deal is consummated.

I also had noted something regarding Soldiers' re-establishment, and I had intended to enlarge in some slight extent upon that. But I shall pass it by, contenting myself with saying only this, that, as time goes by, as one year succeeds another, we find that even the generous intention of the past Government and what was thought to be very ample provision for the needs and necessities of our returned men and their dependents gradually worked itself out in a way which shows that ever continuing and increasing assistance must be given if this country shall, in any way at all, begin to liquidate the tremendous debt which, of course, will never by any material means be liquidated, which we owe to the men who went overseas and fought on our behalf for the preservation of civilization. I hope such generous provision will be made from time to time for men and women of that class that, sooner or later, the last vestige of just complaint may vanish from amongst our returned men or their dependents in this country.

Just one word in conclusion regarding a subject which was introduced on more than one occasion during this debate, and which I have always held very close to my heart. In the early part of my remarks I had occasion to refer to it from one angle, when I had reason, I think, to criticise the language used by the Minister of Justice in an altogether unjustifiable attempt to swing the members of this House and more particularly of his own province behind the idea that, in some unexplained way, they had an enemy in the leader of the Opposition sitting on this side. I, with as strong language as I could bring to bear on the subject, expressed my opinion then. I wish now to view the matter in another way. I was born on one ocean seaboard and I have spent most of my life on another. I was brought up as a child in a county of New Brunswick which contained a large proportion of French-Canadian people, and some of the dearest friends of my boyhood days and some of my closely associated school mates were boys of that race. I grew to hold them in very high esteem, and I have always entertained the same feelings

towards them as were engendered during those youthful days. I conceive it to be the prime duty of any man, to whom the people of this country have entrusted their representation in this House, to endeavour at all times so to conduct and comport himself, so to speak on occasions of public importance which affect these two races, as to assist, if possible, in healing any hard feeling that exists and, if possible to bring about a greater measure of unity and harmony between the two races, so that the time will not be very far distant when, in Canada, speaking two languages, holding possibly largely two creeds, we shall have one united Canadianism, having, as its first and foremost purpose, the common betterment of our common country.

Mr. ALAN WEBSTER NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, we have had various expressions of compliment paid to yourself, to the leaders of the three parties in the House, to the mover and seconder of the Address, and to the lady member; and for the sake of brevity I will simply say that they have each and all my hearty concurrence. As regards the lady member, while I am heartily in sympathy with the remarks that have been made I think that, as time goes on, we shall be led to adopt a somewhat different attitude towards her. It is natural, perhaps, that coming into the House for the first time she should receive a peculiar welcome as the first member of her sex to be elected to this Parliament. As time goes on, however, the attitude which we shall assume in regard to her, and the attitude she herself will desire that we should bear towards her, will, I think, be to treat her as the member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). We shall come to respect her ability, her keenness, her common sense, her energy and the persistence with which she will no doubt work to further the ambitions and the ideals which she entertains. That we shall do rather than pay deference merely to her femininity.

In looking over the House I have been struck by the peculiar, although natural, fact that the age and the appearance of the three parties are reflected in the individual members who respectively constitute them. Here on my right we have the men of substance, both as regards mentality and physique, of the Conservative party, men of gray hairs, the grave and reverend signors, whom we may regard for the moment at least as the statesmen of the past. Opposite, directly behind the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King), we find identically the same type of men in that party they may be regarded as the statesmen of to-day. But when we come to the third party, the gentlemen who sit on my left, we find that it is composed of, and very largely dominated by, young men. That party is a new one; it is young in the political life of the country, and perhaps it is natural to find that the men who constitute it are also young. To finish the simile, I may refer to them as the statesmen of the future. I do not suggest that it is a demerit in a man or a woman to be young. I was young once myself and wish I were again in my youth. We older men must remember that if we do not give way, at least we should make room for the younger generation. The youth of to-day constitute the driving force and the energy of to-morrow; they are the history makers of the future. I do not say for a moment that we should depreciate the respect we ought to show to hon. gentlemen whose hair is gray or, as in the case of some of us, whose hair is not only gray, but getting scant. We must realize, however, that the coming generation is forging ahead into our places, and we must make way for them or they will make way for themselves. I have great faith in youth,—youth in politics, youth in business and youth in everything. This is the day of the young man. The young men have faults; they are headstrong, impetuous, hasty, perhaps, in action, and impulsive; but they have that energy and driving power that make for progress and action, and it is progress and action we need more than anything else to-day in Canada.

I therefore look with confidence upon the party to the left of me. I would rather see the ship of state manned by young men, inexperienced though they may be, starting out boldly on the sea of life. The weather may be rough, and storms may arise, but they will make headway and get somewhere. At any rate, better that by far than trust our destinies to the ship of state lying in the stagnant waters of the harbour and moldering away with the dry rot of policies of hesitation, vacillation and over-timid caution. For my part, give me men of action who will go into the middle of the stream and try to get somewhere. At all events, they will gain experience in time. I have noted with pleasure the ability shown by these young men on my left as speakers. With-

out considering the fact that they are here for the first time, we can congratulate them upon the way in which they have acquitted themselves, and in days to come we shall be able slightly to parody the words of Samson and say that out of the producers hath come forth meat and out of the strong hath come forth sweetness. Perhaps the lady member will furnish the sweetness.

Now, it better becomes me to make complimentary remarks about this party, because I am not attached to it. I do not attend its caucus, but I have received kindness from its whip in the matter of arranging my seat in the House. I desire therefore to thank the Progressive party and express my appreciation of the courtesy it has shown me, a political stranger in a political strange land. But while I am not attached to the party, I find myself heartily in accord with a great part of its policies, except, unfortunately, in regard to the tariff. It is perhaps a matter of regret that the leader of the Progressive party was not able to visit British Columbia during the election. Had he done so it is more than probable he would have received greater support than he did. When speaking on the tariff the other day he was at some pains to modify somewhat the impression we had in British Columbia, during the election, that he was an absolutely out and out devotee of free trade. He was at some pains, I say, to modify that view; but I could not help observing, as I listened to the speeches of his lieutenants, more particularly the able one made by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) and that of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), that they, on the other hand, were not at all equivocal in expressing themselves as advocates of free trade first, last and all the time. While that is a natural attitude for them to take, as coming from the prairies—if I were a representative of the prairies I would also be a free trader—but coming as I do from British Columbia, I cannot, I am afraid, follow them in that regard.

British Columbia wants protection. That remark, I notice, gets some little applause from the members from Vancouver. Well, I am glad to establish a point of contact with my Conservative fellow members from British Columbia, but in this case it will be only temporary, because the kind of protection which is wanted in the district from which I come is not the kind of protection my hon. friends want, which is that of the policy advocated and worked for by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. In that regard, if I may be allowed to digress for a moment, I might mention an incident that is typical and indicative of much. Shortly after I was nominated I received a letter from Vancouver, I may mention that Vancouver is not in the district I represent, being probably 150 miles away from it, except for one small portion of the district that runs a little in that direction. I got a letter from a gentleman who represents the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and was resident in Vancouver. The first paragraph of the letter warmly congratulated me upon my nomination. I thought that was all right, and said to myself: "Here is a man, at least, after my own heart." I very soon found, however, that it was not my heart he was after. The second paragraph expressed the hope that I would not misunderstand him when he said that he trusted I should not get in. That was somewhat of a shock. It was rather like Isaac of old, but Isaac, when he blessed Jacob, did not in the next breath revoke the blessing. But I was compelled to acept the dictum—the Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away, and I managed to swallow that. But when I went on to his next paragraph I got a further shock. He said he felt sure that I would have no trouble in signing a couple of pledges which he enclosed for me—"put your name on the dotted line" sort of business. I am sorry I have not that letter with me, but I have left it at home. I intend to have it framed, Mr. Speaker, as a concrete presentment of the sublimity of human assurance. That is expressing myself in a somewhat classic form. In the West we use more rugged language than you gentlemen in the East, and there we would describe it in two words, each of four letters, with a preposition in between. We would say, It was a something of a something. But as we must try to conform to the culture of the East, I will repeat that I regard it as a concrete presentment of the sublimity of human assurance. I think hon. members will agree with me in that description when I tell them what was in the letter. The first pledge required me entirely and absolutely to vote for high protection for the benefit of the eastern manufacturers. That was not the exact way in which it was worded, for, as you know, these things are put more discreetly. I do not know whether the word "high" was used; probably it was the

word "adequate" or something of that kind, but if the English language means anything at all it meant that I was to pledge myself —why I do not know—to vote for high protection for the benefit of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. That was bad enough and I swallowed that more or less with a choke, but when I came to the next pledge it was more exacting still. I was asked to pledge myself absolutely and entirely, then, now and forever, to have no part or lot, in thought, word, deed, or action, with a man whom they designated, and whom I have since ascertained is the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Had I signed that pledge of so absolutely comprehensive a character, I do not think it would have become me as an honourable man to be buried in the same cemetery with the hon. member, and certainly not in proximity to him. Being of a trusting disposition I naturally believed what the writer said about the hon. member for Marquette. You may have remarked the other day that he himself said—and he should know better than anyone else—that after his experience of his opponents during the campaign he came to the conclusion that he was a very bad man. Is it then any subject for remark that I, not knowing him as well as he knows himself, should have been under the conviction that he was not a man at all, but more or less what our Methodist friends would call "of the devil" —that his human form was merely camouflage and that when I came down here I would find horns growing out of his forehead! When I came down here and my desk-mate told me who the hon. member for Marqette was, I was disappointed to see no horns. I say disappointed advisedly, because when you have made up your mind to the worst it is a disappointment to find your predictions do not come true. But later I noticed two things—that he kept his hat on except on certain occasions, and that he wore his hair very long. I know that he comes from a farming community, and having been a farmer myself I know the custom of farmers to anoint the budding horns of their calves with caustic soda, the result being that a small callous is formed where the horns would otherwise grow. Consequently, the next time the hon. member for Marquette goes to the barber shop I shall keep a keen eye on him to see that there is no development on his head along that line.

Now, Sir, it is not the protection I have alluded to that we want in British Columbia; it is protection for fruit. I agree with a great deal of what the last speaker (Mr. MacKelvie) said with regard to protection of the fruit industry, and I could go further than he went in some of his remarks. We want protection for our coal industry, we want protection for our lumber industry, we want protection for our farm products, and, Sir, the greatest protection of all we want is protection against Asiatic encroachments. I can endorse every word that the hon. member for Yale said in that regard; in fact, I could go a great deal further. I will be conservative in words, if not in party, and say that half our white population have their backs against the wall to-day industrially. The Asiatics in British Columbia have got a throttle hold upon our fishing industry, they are encroaching on the lumber industry, and large sections of the country devoted to fruits and market garden produce are entirely in their grip. The situation is getting so intense that something will have to be done or there will be a development that will astonish the people in the east. Those Asiatics are also going into the store business as well as encroaching on the hotel business. I know the spirit of the East is all right on any subject upon which the people are properly informed, and I am sure they do not understand the seriousness of the Asiatic proposition in the west. Perhaps that is the fault of representatives from British Columbia in the past, and we thirteen members from that province will be sadly lacking in our duty to our constituents, if we do not keep the East, in season and out of season, fully informed on this subject.

It is not my custom to boost,—without being paid for it at any rate,—the wares of somebody else, but I have a book here that I would commend to the attention of this House. I have asked the Librarian to stock half a dozen copies for the use of hon. members. This is my own copy that I have in my hand and I intend to send it over to the leader of the Government with a request that he read it, or at least that he begin to read it, because when he once begins I know he will not stop until he finishes its perusal. I will not send it over to him until I have finished speaking because I know he would be so engrossed in it that I would not continue to have his attention. It is in fictional form, but it is a book of truth dealing with the Asiatic question, particularly with the Japanese phase of it, on our coast to-day. So true is it that the authoress thought fit, on the

advice of her lawyers, to insert a clause that the characters in the book are not drawn to life. It is called "The Handwriting on the Wall", and any one can see a very close resemblance to a lot of matters prominent in public affairs in British Columbia in the last few years. It depicts conditions in British Columbia ten years ago, it depicts conditions as they are to-day, and it depicts conditions as they will be ten years hence provided, she says, a government can be found in British Columbia venal and corrupt enough to give the Japanese the vote. That may seem like a scare line, but, Sir, I tell you Japanese voted in the last general election in British Columbia, and we do not know how soon some party seeking for campaign funds will not grant them the franchise. I earnestly commend to the leader of the Government and to the leader of the Opposition and to every other member of this House, especially the western ones, a perusal of this book.

If you will bear with me for a moment I will speak a word on my own position in the House, I trust for the first and last time. In some respects I hold a rather unique position inasmuch as I believe I am the only Independent elected to this House. Other Independents are either Progressive Independents or Liberal Independents, and they have more or less, I think, dropped into their respective parties. I do not blame them for doing so, that is their natural course, but I happened to be elected by an entirely independent convention of those opposed to the late Meighen Government. At that convention were represented Liberals, Socialists, soldiers, farmers, labour men, and, I blush not to say, Conservatives,—they were all represented at that convention and they all supported me. Therefore, while I owe no obedience to any party, yet I am much indebted to the representatives of every party individually for my election, and that puts me in a somewhat different position to that occupied by other hon. members. I think Scott, speaking of the French courtiers of his day, used the lines:

> Who walk ambition's diamond ridge,
> Where stoutest hearts have failed;

indicating that the ridge was so fine, so diamond-pointed, that they had to be exceedingly careful lest they fell to one side or the other. And that is the trouble that confronts me: lest I be led astray,—being, as I have said, of a simple and confiding disposition—into supporting one party as a party rather than as a principle. The only way I can get out of that difficulty is to confront it when any question comes up and to ask myself: Is this measure in the interests of the constituency I represent or the province I come from? If the answer is in the affirmative, then I think I can say it will also be for the benefit of Canada and that I can safely vote for it.

From my seat here I occupy a rather strategic position. I have my friends the Conservatives on one side of me and the Progressives on the other; with one ear I can listen to the counsels and obtain the benefit of the wisdom and experience of these Conservative statesmen, and with the other I can draw inspiration from the youth and virility of the Progressive party. But I must confess that I am slightly deaf in one of my ears, and it happens to be the ear next to my Conservative friends. The deafness, however, is only slight, Sir. As for my Liberal friends opposite, I shall judge them not by their speeches and not by their programme but simply and entirely by their actions. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) in his speech the other day, to which I listened with a great deal of pleasure, because it was to me an intellectual treat—the caustic humour and keen analysis which characterize his remarks interested me quite a little—spent a good deal of his time in trying to prove that hon. members on the other side, especially those in the ministry, were acting or were likely to act in a manner inconsistent with their utterances of some months or years ago. That may or may not be so, but I am prepared at this stage to let the dead past bury its dead and act upon the scriptural maxim: "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is upon what the Liberals do, not upon what they say, that I shall judge them.

Now the convention that nominated me gave me a free hand. I was to be opposed to the Meighen Government, and I knew that that first pledge would be easily fulfilled. After the Meighen Government was disposed of, I was to be given a free hand to support any government or any coalition, —it appearing to us at that time that there might be a coalition. But there is always a string, you know; I did have a string tied to me, in the shape of a platform drawn up by the convention, to which I am committed to give my support. When I came down here and began to compare notes with my fellow-members I found I was not in such a position of political isolation as I

had expected: I found that the planks of the platform I was pledged to were very much in common with those of members on the Liberal as well as on the Progressive side. I believe also that I am in absolute sympathy with every Conservative member for British Columbia as well on one point at least. Now, if you will excuse me, Sir, I will quote the platform: to do so will not be an onerous business, and not many hon. gentlemen have had the courage to produce their platforms in the House. I am so simple-minded that I carry this platform about with me and in leisure moments I take it out and gauge how much progress I have made toward its achievement. I always get hope and encouragement when I notice that the first clause is: "Opposition to the Meighen Government." The success on that point gives me courage to go on to the other planks: "Abolition of purse seine and trap licenses." This applies to the fishing industry, a very vital question in British Columbia. The next is: "Licenses"—that is, fishing licenses—"to be granted only to white British subjects." Then the platform proceeds:

3. Immigration. Absolute exclusion of Asiatics.

4. Dominion enactment of the British Columbia eight hour law.

5. The passing of an old age pension Act.

6. (a) Extension of time on payments due under the Dominion Soldier Settlement Act.

(b) More considerate treatment of disabled soldiers, their widows and dependents.

7. The elimination of overlapping of areas covered by federal and provincial police.

That last means that we want the Royal Canadian Mounted Police removed from British Columbia in order to save expense; they are no longer needed. The last plank is: "A federal inheritance tax on large estates." I commend that suggestion to the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding); it cannot now be said that no one has suggested a method by which we can get increased revenue.

Now this is a simple platform and not unreasonable, I think, in many respects. The important planks are those with reference to the restriction of Japanese control of the fishing industry, the immigration of Asiatics, the eight hour law, old age pensions. The others are more or less minor matters. If the Government can see their way clear to bring down legislation of this kind—if the Government will do it, I should say, for I know they can,—they will have my support. And when I suggest that the Government take action in these matters, I mean exactly that—the putting of legislation on the statute books. We do not want to have somebody standing up here and proposing an academic resolution or flourishing a flag and saying: We stand for a white British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, we in British Columbia are sick to death of seeing and hearing people who "stand for a white British Columbia." The time for that has passed; we want them to stop standing, pick up their feet, move ahead, make some progress toward bringing about a white British Columbia. Therefore I stress the point that if the Government will put legislation covering these points into concrete form and pass it, they can count on my hearty support; and they will get not only my vote and what small influence I possess, but the influence and the goodwill and the support in the future of eighty per cent of the people of British Columbia. There can be no question about that; the matters I have touched upon are of vital importance to the people of our province. It is eleven o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that there is an agreement between the whips that the House shall adjourn at eleven o'clock whenever possible. If the hon. member intends to make more extensive remarks, he may wish to adjourn the debate, but it is a matter entirely for him.

On the motion of Mr. Neill the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Friday, March 17, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, March 16.

Mr. NEILL (resuming): When the House rose last evening I was about to take some points in the Speech from the Throne. The first point to which I wish to draw attention is that section of the Speech which deals with unemployment. I consider the unemployment question has two phases as dealt

with in this speech. The first is in reference to the obligation to relieve the distress caused by unemployment, and the other is the necessity to take steps to prevent unemployment. The Government claim that the matter of the relief of those absolutely destitute is fundamentally a municipal and provincial responsibility. I am not in a position to dispute that statement, and, as it has not been dealt with by the leader of the Opposition, I assume the statement is correct; but I hold the Government entirely responsible for taking steps to do away with unemployment, though they do not deal with the question of relief. In that regard I wish to quote just a few words from a debate in the British House of Commons. One of the members of the cabinet said, speaking about unemployment—

> He thought the speech of the Prime Minister had denoted the fact that Parliament had concurred in the view and accepted the task of governing the people of this country by providing the masses with two conditions, employment and contentment.

Another member of the government, G. M. Barnes, said, speaking on the same subject—

> The classes who have the running of this country would be judged in proportion as they could find organized employment for the great mass of the people.

I think that is a very well-founded theory of the unemployment situation to-day, and I consider that if the Government could take such steps as would lead, so to speak, to the abolition of unemployment, it would be not only good statesmanship but good political expediency;—after all, the practical politician always keeps one eye on the ballot box. We all know that a contented voter is a Government voter. If times are good and work plentiful, the average voter will not desire a change of Government, but our experience is that when a voter becomes discontented he is ready at once to take a chance on a change of Government. Unemployment is so universal now that it has gone beyond a national question, and has become an international question. Each nation has endeavoured to solve the question for itself, generally by building up high tariff walls to keep their people employed, within the boundaries of each nation. I believe wider action will have to be taken, before world-wide unemployment will disappear. It may be that I have a fantastic idea as to the remedy, but I hold that the only way to handle the unemployment situation is for all nations, without exception, to cancel their war debts. I read a treatise the other day by an American professor in one of the economic colleges. It is called "America and the Balance Sheets of Europe". It goes very fully into this question, taking each nation in turn, and shows that these nations are heading, not slowly but rapidly, towards bankruptcy. He shows that in many states the income is as low as 28 per cent of expenditure, and he asks where this is going to end. He states that one of two things have to be done by these nations, either they will have to add to their debt, which will make a worse budget for them, or issue more paper money, which is equally disastrous. He points out, after a very well-studied exposition of the subject, that the only solution is for the nations of the world to cancel their debts universally, and, though an American professor, he suggests that the first step should be taken by America, because she has most to gain. He points to the anomalous and almost absurd position, that every nation in the world is demanding that Germany, and every nation, should pay what they owe in money, and they refuse to accept payment in the only manner in which Germany could possibly pay, and that is in goods. Germany says: "We have not a gold reserve to pay you, and we will pay you in goods"—The other nations say: "We do not want your goods". France has to a very small extent accepted some goods as reparation in connection with the damage to the devastated area, but it is a very small and restricted amount. The other nations absolutely refuse to take the goods. Germany says: "We are willing to work long hours at low wages; our currency has depreciated; we can land our goods in your market at a very low price, if you will allow us to sell you those goods in payment for our debt." But the nations will not accept these goods, and build up tariff walls against them. If the nations were content to cancel the war debts, there would be such a demand for manufactured articles that it would go far to do away with unemployment. That is a theory it perhaps does not become me to enunciate in this House at the present time.

The next item in the Speech from the Throne is the statement that the Government has taken steps to obtain better and wider markets, and this refers particularly to trade with Australia. I am particularly interested in that branch of the subject and I hope the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he makes the treaty with Australia, will not forget to take into consideration

the pulp and paper industry. Australia has a preferential tariff with the Mother Country on paper. If that tariff were extended to Canada it would be of the very greatest benefit to the paper and pulp industry, especially on the Pacific coast. I think there are some six large paper mills in British Columbia, four of them are in my district, and they employ a large body of men. There are two towns associated with those mills, and there are also logging camps, in which a large number of men are employed directly and indirectly by the industry. Two of the four mills are shut down, and the other two are running at half capacity. If this arrangement with Australia be carried out, of our getting the same preferential rate on paper as is given to the Old Country, it would give a tremendous stimulus to the paper mills of British Columbia and would to a large extent help the unemployment situation there.

We come now to the question of railway rates. There is a suggestion that some measure of relief may be obtained, or will shortly be obtained, in connection with railway rates. If this is anything more than a mere vague reference to the subject, if there is any established knowledge behind that, or any certain belief that this can be accomplished, if I had been drawing up the Speech, instead of putting this in an obscure corner of a paragraph, I would have displayed it in great, big letters two inches long, right across the Speech. Reduction of freight rates is one of the most important and immediately pressing matters that can be carried out in this House at the present time.

I should like to mention an incident; it is only an incident; but it can be duplicated, no doubt, in a thousand cases. This ocurred in my own riding. In the valley of Alberni, in which I live, there is a saw mill located at Port Alberni. It is not a very big mill as we in British Columbia regard saw mills; but it has a capacity that allowed it to send, not three cars, but three great trains a week of lumber into the prairies. This lumber was all consigned to the prairies, going out regularly three trains a week, with occasionally an extra train. In the fall of 1920, increased freight rates suddenly went into effect. Inside of three weeks that mill was shut down—that was about October—and it was not opened again until the following June. When it did begin to ship again, not one stick of lumber went over that railroad en route to the prairies; it is all going by water route to the Orient. That condition of affairs can be duplicated in, not one mill, but hundreds of mills in British Columbia. That gives an illustration of what high freight rates do as regards promoting or preventing trade. It contains a moral also for the railway company. That railway company are still running freight trains into that district, two trains a week; but for the most part they bring in empty cars and for the most part they take empty cars out. There is a little local freight, a few carloads of fish and so on; but for the most part those railway trains are running nearly as regularly as before, and they are carrying practically nothing. Would it not be far better to carry the lumber that was available for carrying, even at reduced freight rates? It is a matter of fact that any business or any railway can always secure a certain quantity of what might be called the irreducible minimum of traffic. If the corner grocery sells a loaf of bread at double the price at which it can be obtained at another grocer's store six blocks down town, it will always catch a certain trade, those who are in a hurry or in certain circumstances. That is the irreducible minimum. The railway that holds up its rates to a high extent will always catch that measure of trade that it is absolutely imperative must go over the road, and any railway will get that; but no industry or no railway ever paid its way on the irreducible minimum of trade or traffic; it is only the extra business, after the overhead is paid, that makes it profitable either to a business or a railway. When they cut down their freight rates and get the extra business, they get beyond the irreducible minimum and down to a profitable basis.

Some hon. members may be familiar with the London and Brighton railway which is a fairly large railway in the Old Country. In its report of last year it says that, owing to the high fares, nine million fewer passengers were carried. That is, not that nine million passengers were carried, but that nine million fewer were carried owing to the high passenger fares, and that is on a little railway running between London and Brighton. That is a specimen of what business one is likely to lose by increasing freight or passenger rates above what the traffic will stand.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there not an agreement now in existence in conection with the Crow's Nest Pass that expires in

a short time, and that is responsible for the increase given a short time ago causing those high rates of which my hon. friend complains? When does that agreement expire?

Mr. NEILL: So far as my memory goes, I think it expires some time this year—in June or July; and I earnestly hope the Government will take such steps as not to perpetuate it.

We now come to that much vexed and wearisome subject of the tariff. I will, however, promise hon. members that I will try to attack it from a somewhat different angle. I have in my hand, I think, a whole compendium of a great deal of wisdom on the tariff, comprised in two short sentences, which, I think, ought to be printed and hung up in every hall, committee room and office in this building. This is not my own composition:

1. That free trade and protection offer an interminable case for counsel on both sides.

That is one postulate.

2. That it is perfectly easy for anyone who takes the trouble to study both sides to make out a good case for either.

If hon. members appreciated those two axiomatic propositions, what a lot of trouble and discussion would be saved! I heartily agree with the first proposition, and for that reason I do not, for one moment, propose to endeavour to convert any hon. member to my way of thinking on the tariff question. When hon. members from the prairies say that they are in favour of free trade, I am perfectly willing to accept their word; I do not need to be convinced about the matter. I am willing to believe they know their business best and what would be best for that section. The tariff question is not a political one, but a geographical one, and you cannot change a man's belief, supposing you talked to him from now to Doomsday. The only way to change his belief would be to change his environment. If you take an Ontario manufacturer and transplant him into the district which these hon. gentlemen represent, you will see how soon he too will become a free trader. The converse holds good; put a man from the prairies into British Columbia or Quebec, and he will very soon have a change of tariff belief. But until that is done it is useless to try to convert hon. members, because they are most familiar with conditions in their part of the country, and surely they know best. Even if we could find some weakling who allowed his opinion to be changed by any poor argument that might be advanced, that would not amount to much, because every hon. member is, I am sure, pledged to his constituents in some measure on the tariff, and he would be bound to vote in accordance with the wishes of those who elected him. I will not, therefore, give my own opinion on this question: I will only state what we in British Columbia, or at least, the section which I represent, want and as to that I will quote, if you will permit me, a very few words from a manifesto which I issued at the time of my election. It comprises my sentiments in a very few words:

The Tariff will not be settled on political but on geographical lines as each section of the country wants a different tariff. The result will be a compromise.

Will it not be that? It always has been; indeed, it always will be. The result will be a compromise and therefore:

I will join heartily with the other British Columbia members in endeavouring to get as good terms as possible for British Columbia, that is a **somewhat lower tariff** on the manufactured goods we buy and such a duty on live materials we sell as will enable us to live and maintain B.C. as a White Man's country.

I was speaking then to the electors of the Comox-Alberni district, and of course I had their interests at heart. We want a tariff, as the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) said yesterday, on fruit. I will leave him to deal with that. We want not so much a tariff as protection—I would almost call it common honesty—on eggs. I would like to explain that. There is a small tariff on eggs, and the farmers do not ask that that tariff be increased. They are making a simple, modest request that imported eggs be subject to the same laws as our eggs are subjected to. Is that an extravagant demand—free trade or protection? Surely it is protection of the right kind. Hon. gentlemen who do not understand the situation will hardly believe that the situation is this. In Canada, there is a strict Egg Inspection Act. If I ship a carload of eggs from British Columbia to Montreal, they are not allowed to leave my station until they are inspected by an inspector of the Dominion Government and passed according to a strict standard. I know a case where a carload of eggs was being shipped to Montreal. It did not come up to the Government grade and was therefore rejected. The sale fell through and the man at the other end, in Montreal, bought American eggs, ungraded and un-

standardized, and at a lower price, with which he filled the order. All that the egg producers, those of the West at least, are asking, is that imported eggs shall be standardized the same as our eggs are. Surely that is not unreasonable. There was a meeting of egg producers and wholesale men the other day, at which, I thought, the wholesale men took a most selfish attitude. It was going to cause them some little trouble to change their system of handling eggs, and one of the arguments brought forward was the old time-honoured one that the Americans would not ship any eggs to this country if we put such horrible restrictions upon them,—horrible restrictions to which we ourselves have been subject for years. Well, we need not worry about that. Inside of four days after notice goes to the American importer here that he is to have his eggs standardized in accordance with the Canadian grade system, the regulations will be put into effect, and the eggs that enter this country will be standardized according to Canadian regulation. I do not think that this is at all unreasonable; we have a right to ask that the imported eggs should be subject to the same conditions as are imposed upon the local product.

Then we come to another brand of imported eggs, namely, Chinese eggs, from fowls fed on garbage under conditions such as I could not even mention in this House, although the records are there to be ascertained. The eggs are shipped here and consumed in this country. Some five thousand cases were imported into Montreal the other day, and it is satisfactory to me to know—seeing that we in British Columbia are suffering from the inroads of the Asiatics—that some of these eggs were consumed in Ottawa and were bought at prices paid for the best local eggs. That is a proven fact. In connection with Chinese eggs, we are not asking, as we might very well, with justification, demand, that these be prohibited as a menace to the health of the people of Canada. We simply ask that when Mrs. Housewife chooses to buy eggs, if she wants to get Chinese eggs she shall have an opportunity of seeing just what she is getting. We can then leave it to the good sense, and, perhaps, the patriotism, of the Canadian woman to make her choice between the best fresh eggs and Chinese eggs. To come back to the question of standardization of American eggs, is it not, as one man expressed it, a matter of protection in reverse gear? We are protecting the importer at the expense of the local man.

Now I come to the question of butter. I do not know whether there is a tariff on butter; perhaps the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) can tell me whether there is or not. If there is, it is a comparatively small one, and the farmer is not asking for any increase on that. What he is asking for is protection against oleomargarine. Oleomargarine was for many years prohibited in Canada because it was felt to be unfit for invalids and children. During the stressful times of the war, however, when butter was scarce and it was necessary to export as much as possible to France, the importation of oleomargarine was allowed. But it was never suggested that it was to be permitted to be used as a substitute for butter, for it is not such, it is only an imitation, and as that it was allowed to come in for consumption during that time. It is made from vegetable oils grown under tropical or semi-tropical conditions by cheap negro labour. When the war was over, the farmer in Canada naturally expected to be relieved of that competition. I saw a notice in the paper the other day that some one had said that oleomargarine ought to be allowed to be sold for the benefit of the poor; and by way of proof—a most inadequate proof I thought—it was contended that it was not hurting the butter industry in view of the fact that since 1919 more butter was being shipped to Europe than before. That only goes to prove, if it proves anything at all, that the producers of butter in Canada are being forced to seek outside markets by reason of the unfair competition from oleomargarine in the home market. But apart altogether from the question of protecting home industries, I say that, on purely humanitarian grounds, for the safeguarding of the health of the people, the use of oleomargarine should be prohibited. And I may say, Sir, that it is a well known fact that it is not the poor people at large who use oleomargarine; they have too little money to spend on such stuff as that, they have to buy butter simply because it is the most economical. No; it is the profiteers who use it,—they feed it to their servants and dependents. In the city of Rochester—a city which, I understand, is rather prominent in the promotion of sanitary and allied questions—there is an orphan home where, during the war, they were driven, like ourselves, to use oleomargarine. It

is the custom there to weigh the children regularly, and I have the record of one experiment. This is not an experiment that was made by the cow keepers in British Columbia or anywhere else in Canada; it was made by the city of Rochester, in the state of New York, where the people do not care two pins about our problems. They took seven children as a trial batch for experimental purposes. In the first six months these children were fed butter and they gained twenty-three pounds—I leave out the decimal points. During the next six months they were still fed on butter and the gain had increased to forty-four pounds. For the next six months they were fed on oleomargarine, the diet being otherwise the same. The result was a loss of nine pounds. In the next period butter was again used and the children made a gain of fifty-eight pounds. Now, that is an official report from the city of Rochester, and in view of it I say it would be only fair if we prohibited the use of oleomargarine. We believe it is detrimental to the health of young children. But apart from that important ground, I contend that, from the standpoint of the unfair competition it involves, the Minister of Agriculture should put his foot down on this manufacture and stop it. It may be said that Canadian dairymen ought to be able to compete in the markets of the world. Well, we are willing to compete in those markets, and we are prepared to pit our Canadian cow against her cousin in the United States or in New Zealand; but we do not think it is fair to compel the Canadian cow—I had almost said the Christian Canadian cow—to compete against a heathen nigger in the Central American republics or Southern states.

Now we come to another subject in connection with the tariff, and that is our coal mines. There are on Vancouver Island some five thousand men engaged in the coal mining industry, and with their dependents we must multiply this number by at least five to ascertain the total number dependent on this industry. Two of the mines are in the district represented by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) and he will no doubt deal with those. The mines in which I am interested are situated in Cumberland, where there is a population of 3,000 to 4,000. All last winter and most of last summer they were working only three days a week, and with the reduced pay now given to coal miners, and in view of the high cost of living, these men need not worry about the price of gilt-edged securities for the investment of any surplus funds. Their situation indeed closely approximates want. If there is any extra call upon their purse for sickness or anything of that kind it means that they must go into debt. It is important therefore to know why they are working only three days a week. The reason is very obvious and cannot be denied; it is because of the competition from fuel oil. That oil is imported al most entirely from the United States Some people think that fuel oil and crude oil are synonymous terms, but they are not. Crude oil is the natural product as it comes out of the well; fuel oil is the crude oil after certain valuable elements, such as gasoline, benzine and distillate, have been extracted. There is some fuel oil made at the Ioco refinery, but it is a comparatively small amount and is readily absorbed in the neighbourhood. The great bulk of commercial fuel oil used in British Columbia is directly imported as such from the States, and if a sufficient duty were imposed to make it more costly to use that oil, it would give a tremendous stimulus to the coal mines of British Columbia and Vancouver Island generally. We ask that a duty of two cents a gallon be imposed on fuel oil. It is not a very heavy duty, surely, and would be amply sufficient to meet the situation. It would mean six days' work a week to these thousands of coal miners, it would mean prosperity for those depending on the mines and for the industries associated with them, and it would constitute a great measure of relief from the unemployment under which the province of British Columbia is now suffering.

Mr. CARROLL: Is this fuel oil used in British Columbia for domestic or for manufacturing purposes?

Mr. NEILL: It is used, as far as I know, almost entirely for heating apartment houses and running locomotives. A great deal is also consumed, I regret to say, on our steamboats. Very little of this oil is used for domestic purposes. The imposition of this duty would not hurt any other industry, and it would not raise the price of gasoline or distillate, the volume of fuel oil manufactured in British Columbia being comparatively trivial.

In that connection I should like to remind the House that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), the late Minister of Trade and Commerce, toured my riding during the recent campaign in

the interests of Mr. Clements, the then Government candidate, and naturally in the course of his tour he showered jewels of promise wherever he went. He was the most promising man I ever saw in that connection, promises fell from him like water from a watering cart in our streets on a dusty day—and, I might add, the effects were about as ephemeral. Perhaps it is more appropriate that I should say promises fell around like manna from Heaven, and in the course of his tour through the district this bountiful Santa Claus I have been told—I would not guarantee the accuracy of my information—promised at one place an aeroplane postal service. Does the hon. member recollect making that promise?

Mr. STEVENS: No, indeed, I do not.

Mr. NEILL: I thought that was what the hon. gentleman would say. I am reminded by this incident how often we find in our course through life that the problems of human life can best be solved by resorting to the wisdom of the prophets of old. I think it was Solomon who said that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom. And in the multiplicity of promises is there forgetfulness! I leave it to you, Sir, and to the House to judge what a profligacy of promises he must have pledged himself to when he has forgotten such an extravagant promise as this. But, Sir, I must be frank—and I am always frank, especially when I cannot be otherwise—I will admit that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre did make a hit in one part of my constituency. In the city of Cumberland Mr. Clements, the government candidate, secured a majority of 181 out of a total vote of some 700 or 800, and for that result he was largely indebted to the actions of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre. I may mention incidentally that outside of places with votes of not more than 50 that was the only place in the whole vast riding in which Mr. Clements did secure a majority. In places where there were only a few votes, composed mostly of government henchmen, he did get a majority, more particularly in some of the northern parts of the riding where I was not able to go because my campaign was very short; in those places where his cannery friends were located he invariably secured a majority. In this connection I should like to tell the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) that those same cannery men who worked so hard and gave their time, influence and money in support of the then government candidates throughout British Columbia, are the self-same gentlemen who are besieging his office to-day asking for favours that they are not entitled to, favours which their then government friends on this side, to their credit be it stated, continually refused them. The voice may be a little different, it may be the voice of Esau, but the soul is the soul of Jacob. If you wish any concrete evidence of the way in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is being persecuted by this vicious lobby, you have only to look at his shrunken, wasted appearance to realize that the importunity he is subjected to hardly permits him to get his meals.

Coming back to the Cumberland vote, I should like to offer an analysis of the nature of that vote, because the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) might call Cumberland a Tory stronghold—a term which I would not use—and account for the result in that way; but the facts are very different. As a matter of fact, Cumberland is the last place, to my mind, for a Tory to expect favors from because it is composed of very intelligent electors. The class of men there, are miners and, as I said before, mostly Scotch miners. A great many of them are Socialists, and I may say that a large number of those that formed my committee in Cumberland were Socialists. I have the very greatest respect for the Socialism those men talk. Their brand of Socialism is nothing to be laughed at; on the contrary, it is a well thought out theory of economic laws which we perhaps sooner or later will have to consider. At any rate, I want to emphasize that they are a fine type of intelligent men. Why did such intelligent men vote for my opponent? There must have been a reason. Was it because the hon. member for Vancouver Centre assured them on his knightly honour that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was going to be returned to power? I do not think so, because they did not believe it. Well then, was it because he assured them in the most positive terms that he had been here and found that the main support of the Conservative government would be withdrawn if Mr. Clements were not returned from the district of Comox-Alberni? I do not know whether that was the reason, or whether it was because he pledged his assurance that he had positive information that Mr. Clements would be elected on the 6th day of December—he was very nearly elected, had he got only 1,300

votes more he would have been returned. I do not think it was any of those reasons. I think it was primarily and directly because the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, speaking as a Cabinet Minister, pledged himself and the government that if they were returned to power they would put an increased duty on fuel oil. That was the inducement that caused those intelligent men to vote the way they did, and I for one am not inclined to blame them. Hon. gentlemen, after what I have said of these intelligent voters of Cumberland, will recognize the kind of economic pressure that must have been put on them before they would have voted contrary to their inclinations, and I believe that it was in order to get this necessary boon of an increased duty on fuel oil. I might say that Mr. Clements was persona non grata with them; it certainly was not a question of voting for the man but of voting for the promise made by a prominent member of the Government. I earnestly hope that he will from his place in the House uphold the stand he took in that riding and see that the increase is granted. So well do I know him to be a man of his word that I feel—indeed, I almost fear—that if the Finance Minister does not grant that increase of duty the hon. member will deem it his duty to resign his seat as a protest against the policy of the Government—the only protest he can make because of the failure of the Government to carry out the pledges which he made on behalf of the government to be.

By the way, they gave me a banquet in Cumberland after the election, which was attended by many of my friends as well as by some of those who were against me. Among other things I asked a man who was there why they did not take my word for it rather than the word of the hon. gentleman, because I, too, promised that if elected I would press for an increased duty, and they might just as well have put their money on me as on my hon. friend. The explanation I got was something like this—I do not guarantee it, because it was only one man's opinion: "Well, we were in a hole economically; we were up against it; we had to help ourselves, and I am afraid the boys thought they would play a sort of safe game. We felt that if the Conservatives got into power, and we had supported them in Cumberland, for shame's sake they would give us what they had promised; but we feared that if they got into power and we had thrown them down, they have such a crude conception of statesmanship they would not deliver the goods; on the other hand, we felt that if you were elected personally and the Liberals got into power you would be decent enough to assist us and that the Liberal Government, having a wider conception of true statesmanship, would give us justice." So that after that striking tribute to the belief of these men in the traditions of the Liberal party I feel that I cannot do better than leave the case in the hands of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, with the assumption that they will give us justice—that is, if justice means an increase of two cents a gallon in the duty.

Now, Sir, we come to the question of railways. I note that the Government are going to make an honest trial of government ownership. Well, I do not deny them that right; I suppose under the circumstances it is the best thing they can do, the only line of policy they can follow. But for myself, Sir, I must confess to having no very hopeful anticipation as to what the result will be. The government is a body designed primarily for the administration of the country's affairs, not for the conducting of a business. The governmental body is unwieldy in itself and is poorly equipped for carrying on these business enterprises. Moreover, there is a constant change of personnel which makes a continuous policy very difficult to carry out. Members of government are too prone to respond to waves of popular feeling, and there is the ever present danger involved in political interest. Does any hon. member within the sound of my voice think that if there was an election to-morrow and the fate or even the prestige of the Government hung in the balance, and it was thought necessary in order to carry the election to promise a railway into some particular district, or a few additional stations, or a lower rate on wheat or potatoes—does any hon. gentleman think that these promises would not be made? If there is anybody in this House who thinks that such promises would not be promptly made under those conditions, he has my sympathy, and I think his friends should consult an alienist.

Just as a little instance of how these things work out, I may say that those hon. members who have come here for the first time must all be struck by the manner in which the government offices are scattered around this town. You go down to see a Cabinet minister, and after much prayer and fasting you are admitted; then you find

that the matter in which you are interested necessitates a visit to one of his deputies. You go to see the deputy, who is anywhere from half a mile to a mile and a half away, and the chances are that the other one is just as far off in another direction. One cannot help reflecting upon the impossibility of a corporation like the Canadian Pacific or a large steel trust conducting their business with their offices so distributed. It is not the fault of the present government, I know, or probably of the last. We heard a great deal from the right hon. leader of the Opposition the other day about the word "co-ordination." He wanted to know what it meant and how it could be carried out. There seems to be a good deal of doubt in the minds of hon. members as to just what co-ordination means. It is true that the Government themselves have not been in the co-ordinating business very long, but before they try their prentice hand at the co-ordination of the railways I suggest that it would be a good experiment to co-ordinate the government buildings in this city.

The word "co-ordination" has a fine sound; it reminds me of the experiences of my boyhood days in connection with the Shorter Catechism. Some of the phrases I still have in mind; "justification by faith; sanctification by grace; justification by works," and so on. All these sonorous phrases come back to us in times like these. As regards government ownership of railways, it may be that their state operation is justified by faith, but I very much doubt whether they will ever be justified by works.

There is another circumstance which makes me prone to doubt the advisability of plunging into a scheme of government ownership. As a young man I spent a number of years in New Zealand. There they had an even bigger white elephant than we have here, because their railways were not only government-owned—but,—Lord help them—politically constructed. A more disastrous condition it would be hard for the human mind to conceive. Well, they borrowed millions of pounds from the Old Country, and then, human nature being the same south of the equator as north of it, every member had to grab for his district as much of that loan as he could get. It did not matter whether his district already had a railway and did not need any more funds; he had to "make good with the boys." The consequence was that railways were scattered all over the country to a far greater extent than they are here. Not only were they put where they were not wanted, but they were laid out in a most peculiar manner. Suppose, for instance, that a railway was to be constructed from my seat to that of the hon. leader of the Government, and it had suddenly been discovered that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) had some political pull with the Government—indeed, perhaps that is true to-day. Well, the railway would start off with the honest intention of going direct from my seat toward that of the hon. leader of the House, but when it got a certain distance within influence of the magnetic attraction of the hon. member for Marquette it would proceed to his residence or estate, and then come back. It was no uncommon occurrence in that country for a man to lose the train at one station and drive on a few miles further and pick it up somewhere else. These are actual conditions, Sir; I myself have seen them. As was the case in Canada, rates were jumped when the squeal of the politicians was heard, and the farmers were actually hauling their wool in wagons—ox wagons in many cases—distances of thirty, forty or fifty miles, at the same cost as that of transporting it over the railway, as a protest against the methods employed. In fact, conditions got so bad that the people of New Zealand actually contemplated—it was advocated in the press and on the platform—the repudiation of the whole railway indebtedness. As a matter of making a fresh start they sent to the Old Country for an expert railway man and gave him full control—a ten or twenty-years' job. They said: "Go to it"—and he did go to it. He closed off the inefficient and unnecessary lines, dismissed one-third of the government officials, cut down the expense of operating, and ran it like a business man's railway; and eventually it did pay a small interest on the money invested. To my mind, only by doing something of that kind with our railways in Canada can we really accomplish anything. Go to the States and get an expert railway man. I am not decrying our railway men when I suggest that we should go to the States for an expert; I only say that because I believe it would eliminate the suspicion that would otherwise attach to any Canadian railway man, of representing a political party or association or group, who should endeavour to carry out this work. Get an expert railway man from the United States, put him in such a position that he would only be removable

by the joint vote of Parliament, and give him a free hand to see if he can possibly make it pay. I shall be only too pleased if the Government can make this thing pay. Miracles happened eighteen hundred years ago and there is nothing in theological dogmas to forbid them happening again, but I rather fear it will be like the answer given by the Scotchman who, when asked if prohibition was likely to carry in Scotland, said, "Well it might, but it's no likely."

One hon. gentleman drew a comparison between the profits to be derived from the railways and the profits made by selling liquor. I am afraid the two do not coordinate very well together. It is true that if you take enough of the one you will feel competent to run the other, but I do not think the comparison is otherwise a good one. As you know, the railway is a necessity, and the other thing is more or less of a luxury to most people, and a very expensive one. We all know that it is a peculiar trait of human nature that we kick to the last cent about the cost of our necessaries, but never kick about the cost of our luxuries. It is for that reason we make a fuss about the price of coal and the amount our wives burn, but very little about the consumption or the cost of the cigars we burn. It is a peculiar psychological fact in human nature that we do not mind any price for our luxuries, but are very stringent in the matter of necessaries. Now the railway is a necessity, and the other thing is a luxury.

My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), speaking the other day, said—and this fact comes home to some of us in the West—that they had had trouble in Ontario where boat and rail service met. He said that as the Railway Commission reduced the rates on the railway, the boat service put up its rates. We have somewhat similar conditions in the West. Not long ago when the people of Alberni kicked about their railway and boat service to Vancouver—it is partly by boat and partly by rail, both services being under the one company—they were told unblushingly, first of all by the railway, that they could not control the boat rates, and then they were told by the Railway Commissioners that the Commission had no control over the boat service. The way to remedy that is that advocated by the hon. member for South York—bring our coastal boat service under the control of the Railway Commission, and it would then be able to handle a situation of that kind where a joint service is being run in an inadequate way. In order that I may be able to obtain some support from the British Columbia members in advocating such a step, I might say that if this step were taken the railway pass given us by the Government would be good on the Canadian Pacific boats, which they are not at present—but that, of course, is only incidental.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is it not a fact now that the traffic charges of all these boat services run in connection with railways are subject to revision and control by the Railway Board?

Mr. NEILL: I think they are so subject on the Great Lakes, but not in British Columbia, where they run a coastal service; I am sure as to British Columbia, where we have this coastal service.

I now come to the question of immigration. I must confess at once I am not much in favor of increased immigration at this time. It seems to me it is a good deal like the man who thought he would benefit by following the advice that is given by some newspapers as to what shares to buy—there are people like that. He was advised to buy a thousand shares of a certain oil company at one dollar per share. He bought in the expectation of a rise, but in a few weeks he wrote to the editor that the shares had gone down until they were worth only a cent apiece and he wanted advice. The editor wrote back and said, "Buy one hundred thousand shares at a cent, and then the average price of your shares will be reduced accordingly." The case is somewhat the same with immigration. We have two hundred thousand men idle in Canada now, and are seeking to relieve the situation by bringing in a whole lot more. There is one thing I would ask the Government to do, and that is to keep away from the idea of having settlers from different countries establish a colony by themselves in Canada. That has always proved a mistake in the past. If you bring in a body of men from England or Scotland or elsewhere in Europe, and dump them on the prairies by themselves, they will become not a piece of Canada, but a piece of England or Bohemia or Austria. That is not a desirable way to build up Canada. Mix them up amongst our own people, and then they will become assimilated. I take this position: that the Government will spend a lot of money in bring-

4 p.m.

ing these men out, possibly money will be paid by the Old Country, and another large sum, no doubt, for putting these settlers on the land; a further sum will have to be forthcoming to provide them with implements and stock until they are on their feet. All I ask is that the Government take this land scheme and offer it to our unemployed. I am sure they would be surprised to find how many would take advantage of it. I know it is popular to say that the unemployed are all idle bums, and so on. I know that a great many of them would not care to go on the land, but a great many people in work to-day would be glad to go on the land, and if they had the opportunity, they would make way for some of the unemployed to take their positions in the city. Times are changing, and have changed, in that regard. I know the case of a man who has been on the land for three years. He was a carpenter working at $7 a day, but he foresaw the depression that was coming, and that he would be out of work, so he took up a piece of land, and to-day he is doing well; he is not making a fortune, but he is keeping his family and himself, and he makes one less in the ranks of the unemployed. If the Government will not postpone their immigration policy for a year, at least let them make the same offer of assistance to our own unemployed. Surely the men who have come here at their own expense are entitled to the same advantages as the men living in Galicia or somewhere in that neighbourhood. Let me remind the Government that a contented settler is the finest advertising agency you can have. Though his contentment may only be expressed in a badly written letter with a dirty thumb mark, it will have more drawing power in his little home village than all the flamboyant advertisements got up by the agents of the Government. That has proved to be true time and again. By the way, if any of them are coming to British Columbia, I hope that they at least will be told the truth. Tell them that they will have to compete with Asiatics; that if they are going in for fruit farming, Asiatics have a hold on that; if they are going in for strawberries, whole sections are absolutely in the hands of the Japs, who will take steps to see that no White Man intrudes upon them; if they are going in for small fruits, they will find the same situation there; if they go in for market gardening around any of our big cities, they will find the same situation there. There is what is known as a ring in connection with market gardening, at least around the city of Vancouver. A friend of mine was out at a farm and admired the potatoes on the table, and his farmer friend gave him a few pounds to take home with him. As you know, the great majority of domestic servants in Vancouver are Asiatics, and next day when this gentleman tried these potatoes his Chinese servant had cooked, he found them very poor, wet, watery, very unsatisfactory things. He thought there had been some accident with them until the same thing happened again the next day, so he asked his Chinese servant about it, and the Chinaman said, "Those potatoes are bad; they are no good. Let me get you potatoes that will be all right." There is a ring among these Chinese servants, and they will never buy produce from white market gardens. If their employer insists upon it, they will find the stuff unsuitable or it will be made to appear so, and eventually he will have to buy from the Chinese. That is an absolute fact that anybody in Vancouver can verify for himself. Let these people who are to come in be told that this is the competition they will be up against in British Columbia. Tell them also—and I wonder what British people will think of this—that their children will have to go to the same school as Asiatics. One of these the other day lost his temper at school, and instead of hitting his playmate on the nose he drew a knife and stabbed him in the back. Tell them that if conditions get bad their daughters will have to work in Chinese restaurants under conditions which I will leave to your imagination rather than describe. Tell them these things, and say that they must live according to the same standard as the others, which means that everyone down to a six-year-old child must be ready in fruit picking time to work sixteen hours a day. That is the only way to compete successfully with the Chinese and Japanese in British Columbia. But I hope we see the dawn of better days with this Government, and that we will be able to tell these people that the Government have taken steps to permit the white people to grow up under a white standard.

With regard to the provision as to the soldiers' stock and land, I will only endorse the way it was put by one of the members who spoke the other day. He advocated the revaluing of the land and stock and an extension of time to pay for it. I am heartily in sympathy with that idea, because it is good business. We

are going to lose the money and the settlers as well if we do not do that. Better keep the soldier settlers, and give them an extension. It is coming to them, and it is not their fault that they have not succeeded. We induced them to go on the land under big prices created by the war. They did enough for us during the war and let us shoulder the responsibility. I read an item in my platform last night asking for more considered treatment for the wounded soldier. That question crops up in the West. There are a lot of wounded men in the West, and we think they were not well treated. Their pensions were cut down to a minimum, and they have been at considerable expense. It has been suggested that these men are malingerers. These men who have served at the front and been wounded cannot be accused of malingering, and they ought to receive consideration.

The answer of the Government is that it means increased expenditure. Well there are ways of effecting economy without making the destitute soldiers suffer. I suggest that we cut off some of the ceremonial connected with this House. This is a democratic nation, and we might well forego, for a time at least, all these ceremonies. We have a beautiful restaurant upstairs, and it is a pleasure to take our friends up there, but it is run at a tremendous loss. I am willing, and I think other members are, to pay for our meals in future and save that expense. There are many ways in which economy could be effected without loss of efficiency.

Referring to the inheritance tax. Is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) aware that in New Zealand and in Great Britain they have an inheritance tax, or death duties which we do not have in Canada at all? We have a provincial inheritance tax, but no Dominion tax, and if we had such a duty in Canada as they have in New Zealand and Britain, the revenue would receive something like $30,000,000 a year, and it would come out of the pockets of the people best able to afford it, people who have built up large fortunes during the war and could well afford to contribute to the state after they have gone;—it might be better for them in the place where they have gone if they gave the country back some of their wealth.

I would also suggest that they might remove the Northwest Mounted Police from British Columbia. They were put there in a crisis in special emergency. They are no longer needed. We have an efficient provincial police force, and by removing this force we would save expense.

I mentioned last night that the eight-hour law was a part of the platform on which I was elected. I see no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne. The Trades and Labour council took it up with the Government, and I hope to see the Government, in the course of the session at least, make some pronouncement as to their attitude in the matter. If they are not prepared to assume the responsibility for enacting it, then they ought to call the provinces together, if it is decided that it is a provincial matter. It is a duty we owe, under the Treaty of Versailles, to carry this out as speedily as we can, in accordance with our pledges in that treaty. The same might be said of the old-age pension. In November, 1921, the British Columbia House passed a resolution unanimously calling attention to the fact that this government had assumed responsibility for the old-age pension and suggesting that it was time for them to take action. I do not expect the Government to take action on that matter this session, but I commend it for their consideration in a future session.

I wish to call attention to a further point and I am surprised that no other hon. member has taken it up. I am heartily in accord with the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) when he expressed the opinion that the Dominion Elections' Act should be removed from the statutes. I go further and state it should be removed as speedily as possible, that we may remove the stigma from our public life, that we have had an act on the statute which lends itself to almost every form of corruption. If we must retain the act let us change the name of it. It is now known as the Dominion Elections' Act, let it be known as the Dominion Elections' Corruption Possibilities Act. It may be said that I am using too strong words when I say that it encourages every form of political corruption. I think the statement is well-advised, because those of us who are lawyers know that if a man carelessly leaves his money lying around his premises he is as much to blame as the poor boy or girl who picks it up. You have often heard the judge in court say "You are encouraging theft by leaving your money around," and an act which is passed for the avowed purpose of preserving purity of elections should not permit or allow the gross abuses which are possible under that act. I speak from somewhat bitter experience in my own case. I have the data all here, but

have not time to go into it. I will only mention a few of the instances where this act, to put it mildly, lends itself to abuses. I am talking about the rural ridings where, I believe, a different system prevails from that in the cities. It lends itself to a great deal of illegal voting on election day. A man who is bad enough to vote illegally is not going to worry about signing his name to an oath, and he will come to the poll on election day from nowhere, take the oath and vote illegally. Further than that the act allows if it does not encourage, the disfranchisement of large numbers of people. I do not refer to two or three votes in some remote place, but I am talking about absolutely blotting out the votes of fifty or sixty electors. And why? Because it was known they were going to vote what is known as "wrong." I could point to half a dozen instances in the riding I represent where that was deliberately arranged, places that had voting booths for years and years, with perhaps a hundred votes. They voted "wrong" last time, and this year were not allowed a polling place. In other cases, they had to undergo considerable hardship to get to the booth, by travelling in an open boat. Do hon. members expect that women are going to do that for the sake of a vote? One old lady told me frankly that she would have to travel in an open boat, exposed to the weather for ten miles, and she did not think any one of the three candidates was worth the trouble, and I agreed with her. However she said her prayers were with us, and I think that helped. I was speaking to a man at eleven o'clock at night a few days before polling, and he told me, "You need not worry about the election, you are going to be elected." I said, "I am glad to hear that, now how do you know?" He replied, "I got it on the ouija board." There is another feature which perhaps is one of the worst features, and that is the fact that the legally nominated candidate cannot find out within four or five days of the election where the polls are to be. The thing was deliberately suppressed. I did not know, until five days before the election, where the various polls in the vast, scattered region up in the north end of my riding were to be. How could I, with the means of travel that prevailed there secure scrutineers for those various polling stations unless I employed an aeroplane? I wonder what the people of Ottawa would think if, four days before an election, they did not know where the polling booths were to be, and if they then found they would have to vote in a hamlet ten miles away. Yet that is what happened in Comox-Alberni, where we cannot get around easily to secure scrutineers. Perhaps the Government candidate's vote would not have been as large as it was had I been able to get scrutineers at those polling stations.

Another feature of that beautiful act was that it lent itself to registrars, some of whom were not too scrupulous, padding the lists. I know of one case where one of these gentlemen put 215 names on the list, almost the entire number of whom did not live in the riding at all, and some of whom had been dead for at least three years. Something should be done about that. I think three years is too long; when a man has been dead for two years, I think he should not be compelled to come back to this wretched sphere to vote. I firmly believe, if a man has been dead for two years, he would have too much sense to come back and vote Conservative, anyway. In that particular instance where 215 names were put on the list,—after the registrar had been arrested,—out of those 215 names, only 8 voted. This is an indication of what was going on. Another feature of the act allows the Government, on the advice of the candidate, to appoint his—the candidate's—own business partner as returning officer. Moreover, this returning officer did not have the decency to go out and take up an office elsewhere. This allowed the election to be held, to all intents and purposes, in the private office of the Government candidate, because the returning officer was not even a resident of the riding, he lived a hundred miles away practically, and he paid only one brief visit to the riding and that on nomination day. The rest of the election was conducted in the private inside office of the Government candidate. Do you wonder, Sir, when I say that 1,300 ballots were either taken out or given out of the returning officer's office illegally? These are some only of the practices which this act allows, if it does not encourage them. But like most of these things, it will come back like a boomerang upon itself. Some of these things I found out too late, only after the election; others I was aware of beforehand. I told the electors that we had got beyond any personal ambition of mine; that the world would still turn around; that Canada would still be in the North American continent, if I were defeated at

the polls; that it was a question of their rights and priviliges, more important far than my personal election or non-election. You remember the Apostle Paul, when he was brought before the Jewish Judge and he claimed that he was a Roman citizen and demanded to be taken to Rome. The Jewish Judge said "With a great sum obtained I this freedom." But Paul answered, "But I was free born." We were free born; but our forebears were not, and many of them for generations fought and struggled and shed their blood, and died, to get this simple common every-day right of the ballot. I told the people that in the election, and I think they appreciated the situation and responded on election day.

I surely can be absolved of any charge of endeavouring to make a stump speech or of theatrical action when I state, simply and quietly, that surely, if it is not the fundamental right, it is a fundamental right of the Constitution under which we live to-day that a qualified voter shall have a free and untrammelled opportunity to exercise his franchise on election day, without such an unreasonable objection as having to lose his job or to lose the day's work being involved, and that the election should be held in such a way that every body of men, no matter whom they intended to vote for, should be allowed fully and freely to exercise that right. I do not think I am going beyond reason and—modesty, I was going to say—when I say that is a fundamental right. If that fact is conceded, then the Liberal party who are in power here, if they are conscious or even pretend to be conscious of their responsibility to maintain those rights for us, must surely realize that it is their bounden duty to strike this act off the statute books as soon as possible.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend to you my congratulations upon your election to the high office in which this House has placed you; but in doing so, as an old friend and associate in political life, I want to express the regret that all your colleagues, and, I am sure, all hon. gentlemen in this House who had the opportunity and pleasure of sitting with you in other Parliaments, feel, on account of the fact that your eloquent voice will no longer be heard in advocacy of those principles for which you stood during your long political career. I hope, in other days, and, perhaps, under different conditions, it may be that you, Sir, will be able to give to your country and your party that same splendid assistance which you have given in times past.

I desire to express my appreciation—and I am sure I can voice the feelings of most hon. members—at the very interesting contribution to this debate just given by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). His coming into this House of Commons means a distinct addition to this Parliament, and we shall look forward with interest in the future to the ease and grace with which he approaches the consideration of public matters and expresses his views with reference to them. As one who has had the honour of sitting in three previous Parliaments, I may be permitted to say that I am sure that in none of those previous sessions have we ever been favoured by the addition of so many new members who have been able to present their views to the House and the country with the confidence, ease and ability that hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate for the first time have displayed. That remark applies to all portions of the House. This is an important time in the history of this country, and the ability, which unquestionably has been added to Parliament as a result of the last contest, has not been exceeded in our experience since Confederation. The problems that face this Government and this Parliament are the gravest that any public men have had to deal with since 1867, problems and conditions created very largely as a result of the destruction of political ideals by the Union Government which was formed in 1917, created by the opportunist policy which characterized the administration in the four years in which they interfered with public life and public business of this country. The result on December 6 was a notification to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that this country was sick and tired of Toryism masquerading under the title of the National Liberal and Conservative party. The very use of a name of that kind by my right hon. friend or those associated with him indicates their rank insincerity, because those of us who had the pleasure of sitting in previous Parliaments with my right hon. friend knew that if ever a hide-bound Tory came into Parliament, it was my right hon. friend; and I was amused at his attempt, by assuming a sort of dulcet tone, to lead hon. gentlemen who sit on his left, who have come into this House for the first time, into the belief that, after all, he was not a Tory,

that he was a Progressive of some kind, and that this criticism of him was all ill-conceived. He does not seem to accept the new situation with that grace which a man so long in public life might well be expected to display, He is still smarting under defeat. From 1908, when he entered Parliament under the patronage of Hon. Robert Rogers, until 1921, my right hon. friend had a wonderful period of political success. He made the mistake, however, when Sir Robert Borden retired from the premiership, of proceeding to usurp the control of public affairs. Everyone who recalls the events of 1917 knows very well that when the men who composed the Union Government went to the country they did so on the claim that they were to be absolutely non-partisan. They asked for a mandate for the period of the war only, and a combination of gentlemen associated with both political parties formed that government. They each and all declared, in various parts of the country, that the moment the war's necessities should cease they would return to the allegiance which they had paid their respective parties. No one ever thought, when voting in 1917 for Sir Robert Borden and his Union Government, that he was voting for the present leader of the Opposition to proceed to form a government of his own without a mandate from the people. Yet the right hon. gentleman proceeded to do so, and created the conditions which confront us to-day with reference to the railways, purchasing and appropriating railways at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, and creating difficult situations without any authority whatever from the people. Speaking in Toronto some weeks ago, my right hon. friend attributed his defeat to what he termed a mental rebellion on the part of the people. Well, I think he used a very happy phrase, because, from all parts of the country, in every province, there came from the people evidence that there existed a determination, as an hon. gentleman expressed it last night, that whatever men they might return to Ottawa they would see to it that they should "vote against Meighen." My right hon. friend intimated that the action of the province of Quebec, in its display of this mental rebellion, was the acme of infamy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I made no such statement, but I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman attributes it to me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am quoting from the report of an address delivered by the right hon. gentleman before the Conservative ladies of Toronto, in which he said, speaking of Quebec:

> In it had taken the form of Nationalism, a blight which masquerading under the banner of Liberalism had cried wildly for revenge because that part of the Dominion had been asked to submit to the same laws that bound the rest of Canada. That particular form of the expression of the spirit of revolt, the speaker felt, should be characterized as "the acme of infamy."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not make the statement as quoted by the hon. gentleman. What I said was that the conduct of the campaign in that province had reached, in its depths, the acme of infamy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Well, perhaps my right hon. friend has not recalled that one of those ministers whom he brought into being for a few short weeks was perfectly willing to deal with the situation down there which he condemned by the use of this phrase, and was perfectly willing to adopt as a candidate a gentleman who declared that the chief plank of his platform would be never to support England in any war in which she might be engaged. Let me remind him that when first he came into this House, in 1911, the government he supported owed its existence to the fact that there had been elected in the province of Quebec twenty-six or twenty-seven men called Nationalists, men who were returned on the principle that Canada should not embark in any of England's wars or participate in her affairs. He enjoyed his position as a member of that government, from 1911 to 1917, as a result of support from that quarter. Let me tell him, if he chooses to characterize in the same way the men and women of any province, in regard to the expression of their opinion upon him or his government in the last contest, that speaking for the province of Nova Scotia, I declare that we shall share the epithet he has applied to Quebec in this case. We will take these words as describing our own unanimity. My right hon. friend paid a visit to our province, and, in association with his Minister of Public Works, he made a tour, the progress of which might be compared to the famous march of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Our province has had a distinctive position in regard to the Conservative party. It has given to Canada three Prime Ministers who led that party: I refer to Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Robert Borden and Sir John Thompson. Now, the people of Nova Scotia heard my right hon.

friend; they listened to his weary wail on the tariff and his persistent declaration that there was no other issue before the Canadian electorate. He did not want to discuss railway problems, or unemployment, or anything except this theory that a tariff should be maintained—he ran away from everything else. The good people of Nova Scotia, including those who had supported these three Conservative Prime Ministers, having heard the right hon. gentlemen and his colleagues, decided that they did not wish him to be entrusted further with the control of affairs in Canada, and the majorities of the hon. gentlemen who sit in this House to-day representing Nova Scotia were materially increased as a result of the visit of the leader of the Opposition. I say, therefore, that if my right hon. friend regards the position of the province of Quebec as being the acme of infamy, we in Nova Scotia are not at all concerned about that term; we share with Quebec the blame it implies.

My right hon. friend does not seem to appreciate his position as fully as he should. Beneath the surface there is an indication of a desire on his part to resuscitate the old sectional feeling, as evidenced by his attack on the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) and the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) because they pointed out that the condition of affairs in this country was so serious. They said nothing more than what has been said all over the country in hundreds of constituencies. My right hon. friend, however, singled these gentlemen out as special objects of attack, suggesting that they were allied with some special interest. The leader of the Opposition received his answer very well from the Minister of Justice yesterday, but it does seem to me that in the opening of a new Parliament, with the great problems that face us, he might well have applied himself in his address to a consideration of the difficult task that lies before us and have dealt with some of the questions which have been raised in so many quarters of the House by hon. gentlemen.

Now, as I said before, the task before the Government is a very heavy one, but already there has come from all parts of Canada evidence of an optimism and a belief that responsible government has once more been restored, and that the days of War-time Elections Acts and the putting through of Canadian Northern Railway deals under closure have passed. The people look with optimism and confidence to the administration which has been formed by the hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the galaxy of able men surrounding him who represent all parts of the Dominion. The choice of the Liberal party in 1919, when the present leader of the House was selected to lead that party, has been more than justified by the people of the country. The splendid political tour which he made during the course of the election contest, the high standard on which he appealed to the people on all the questions that were before them, won the confidence not only of the members of the Liberal party but of a very large number of electors throughout the country who in the past had not given allegiance to that party.

Associated with him is the man who guided Canada from 1896 to 1911 through many financial difficulties, and to hon. Mr. Fielding—if I may use his name, Mr. Speaker—I think that this House and the country look with confidence to deal with the pressing financial questions which now confront us in the same successful manner in which he handled our national finances during his former term of office.

We also feel very proud, on this side of the House, of the hon. gentleman who for fifteen years so wisely guided the destinies of the province of Quebec with the result that her position to-day is admired and envied by all her sister provinces. We are very glad indeed that the hon. member representing the historic constituency of Laurier-Outremont (Sir Lomer Gouin) has become a member of the Government.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal with all the subject matters of the Speech from the Throne. Rather I desire to confine myself to what I conceive to be for the moment the most important question therein referred to—our national railways. We have heard a good many speeches from hon. gentlemen upon this subject and many arguments in favour of public ownership. To my mind public ownership need not be argued at all. The country owns these railways, and I propose to show that, having regard to their financial position to-day, there could not be found anywhere in the world a corporation or body of men who would undertake to buy and operate the railways. The country owns the Canadian Northern railway, as it was formerly called; it owns the Grand Trunk railway; owns the Transcontinental railway; and it owns the Grand Trunk Pacific and the In-

tercolonial railways. Those railways could not be sold to-morrow for the debts that are against them. Therefore, public ownership is here for the time being and must be given a fair trial, as the Government has decided. For the moment public ownership is not in issue.

In this connection I would submit that the Government should let the country know exactly the present financial position of all the roads composing the National system, because it is not at present very well known either to the country or to this House. We should understand exactly what their present financial position is, because if the Government's policy of giving these railways a fair trial under public ownership is to be carried into effect, as I am sure it will be, in order to determine whether or not Government direction and control is to bring to these railways the advantages and benefits which we would like to see accrue to them, we must know beforehand the exact position in which these railways stand financially. Operating accounts for the last three years in the fullest detail should be laid before Parliament. I am aware the position was taken last year that these operating accounts should not be made public, and I gather that the House was told at that time that such accounts should not be laid on the table for fear the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should find something in connection with those accounts which would enable its management to take advantage of our National system. That seemed to me to be a very flimsy reason. The time has not arrived in this or any other country enjoying British parliamentary institutions when you can lay down the doctrine that hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds are to be spent without the people or their representatives having the right to know the disposition of every single dollar. If we are going to give a fair trial to public ownership, then a most essential element is to have these financial statements laid down upon the table of the House. Only in this way can you know where you are going to begin under public ownership.

Let me say, I do not regard the operation of the Canadian Northern Railway, or the so-called Canadian National Railway, since 1918 as being operation under public ownership. What is the use of talking about public ownership of these railways when you have Mackenzie and Mann's officials operating them? What is the good of talking about the failure of private ownership rendering public ownership necessary if you take the gentlemen who could not operate these railways successfully under private ownership and put them in charge under government ownership? You have got to start square with this thing. We upon this side of the House do not want to be responsible for the peculiar policies that characterized our railway administration under the direction of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends. We want to start fair.

Allow me to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker. My right hon. friend and his associates have been very fond of asserting that they were not responsible for this railway problem at all. That has been reiterated time and again in that form of propaganda which my right hon. friend and his colleagues so well know how to use, and which he is so afraid somebody else might use, though nobody has any intention of following his lead in that direction. By his propaganda he has declared continually during the last two years that the Liberal party was responsible for the railway situation. Let us examine the facts. As I have already said, I had the pleasure of sitting in this House in three Parliaments, and I was here in 1911 when the right hon. gentleman and his friends took charge. What was the railway situation then? The government owned the Intercolonial, as it had owned it for forty-five years. It owned the Transcontinental, stretching from Moncton to Winnipeg. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had title to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Winnipeg westward. That was the position. Those were all the railways that the government of Canada had anything to do with when my right hon. friend and his associates took charge in 1911. The Transcontinental was under lease to the Grand Trunk Railway Company with respect to operation on terms which would have freed this country from any responsibility financially. But what did my right hon. friend and his associates do immediately after 1911? They appointed a commission with a view to discrediting the construction of that railway and of playing into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, who wanted to get rid of the contract. Eventually, after a couple of years, having laid the ground-work, they proceeded to let the Grand Trunk Railway Company escape responsibility, and the government took the Transcontinental over. Were we responsible for their action? Then, in 1913,

Mackenzie and Mann came to this House and asked the government of the day to loan them $15,000,000. My right hon. friend supported that request and the money was handed over. At that time Mackenzie and Mann, or the Canadian Northern Railway Company, assured the House that with this money all their obligations would be attended to and they would not come back for any further loans. But they came back next year for $45,000,000, and my right hon. friend was the gentleman who piloted the Bill for that loan through Parliament. On our side of the House at that time we moved the six months' hoist to that proposal and took direct issue with him and his associates. We have no responsibility whatever for the giving of that money. Let me remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that it was upon that occasion that the gentleman whom my right hon. friend took into his Cabinet as Minister of Justice just before the election—I refer to Hon. R. B. Bennett—told the House of Commons that the right hon. gentleman was nothing but the "megaphone of Mackenzie and Man." That was in 1914. Mark you, assurance was given to the House at that time that security for the loan had been given; that a mortgage would be taken; and that upon default, foreclosure would not be necessary, as it would in any other case—the whole property would revert to the people of Canada.

But that is not the whole of the story. My right hon. friend came to the House of Commons in 1917 and introduced legislation to take over the Canadian Northern Railway, which he put through under closure. A certain hon. gentleman who went to the Senate this session and who came here from the West to join the Union Government, save the country and win the war, might give us some of the reasons which contributed to that legislation. I know this: certain provinces of this Dominion were relieved of $110,000,000 of obligations which they had incurred for local railways, including the province of British Columbia, and that amount was made part of the debt of the country and charged against the Canadian Northern Railway. My right hon. friend went further and provided that there should be a reference to arbitration for the purpose of ascertaining how much Mackenzie and Mann were entitled to for the equity of redemption. The award was $10,000,000, and I will show you, as having a bearing on the present financial position of the country, that that was simply $10,000,000 thrown away.

Now, what is the situation to-day? A reference to the railway blue book which has been laid on the Table of the House shows that the mortgage and bonded indebtedness of the Canadian Northern Railway is $626,000,000, in round figures, and that the estimated value of the road-bed, tracks and terminals is only $632,000,000, a margin simply of $6,000,000. That is a pure question of bookkeeping. In order to get at the real position in regard to the matter, an actual valuation would be necessary, made by proper valuators, and that valuation would disclose whether or not the Canadian Northern is mortgaged for more than it is actually worth.

This, then, is what my right hon. friend did. And he has the audacity to come to this House and say that these conditions were created by his opponents, although all along he was the chief actor in the drama. Now, what did he do further? He was not content with taking over the railways mentioned, but in 1919 he asked the House to authorize his Government to make an agreement for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk. That agreement was made and the road was taken over. Then there were arbitrations as to values, all the dealings with complicated stock, and so on. He it was who took over the Grand Trunk. These are the railways which belong to the Canadian people and which this Government has to deal with. Would it, then, not be a most desirable thing, before we embark upon any enterprise of Government operation involving the expenditure of large sums of money, to inquire fully into the matter as suggested in the Speech from the Throne? The member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has been talking public ownership in this House for a great many years, but able as he is I would not say that he is an expert on railway transportation. Nor would I say that the former mayor of Toronto, who represents North Toronto (Mr. Church) and who spoke yesterday very lengthily and very glibly about "co-operation" and "co-ordination," is an expert on transportation, even though he did say that he could effect this co-ordination in twenty-four hours. The transportation question involves the most important considerations in the life of a country; men are trained from boyhood in its technicalities, in its details, in matters connected with administration. Would it not therefore, be prudent to seek the advice of those

who give their lives to the perfecting of their knowledge in regard to railway matters? Surely, ordinary common prudence should prompt us to say that the Government would have been right in suggesting that there should be an inquiry. Do you not think that instead of dealing in generalities we ought to have a statement before the House—and the Government, no doubt, will have it before them—as to just what the financial position of the Grand Trunk is? I am told that the deficit on the Grand Trunk last year was $15,000,000, Last year the deficit on the Canadian Northern was $70,000,000, of which amount $33,000,000 went to pay interest upon mortgage and bonds. It has been said that this deficit is due to the increased wages of employes, but the blue book shows that the increase in wages amounted to only $12,000,000, so that the deficit cannot be due to that alone; there must be other important reasons for it. I submit, therefore, that this House should know the exact financial position of all these railways before we embark upon any new policy or lay down any new lines.

We have to deal with most serious problems in regard to this matter. As I have mentioned, the hon. member for North Toronto would co-ordinate this system in twenty-four hours, but I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the Grand Trunk railway, which is proposed to be the subject of co-ordination, does not operate only in Canada; sixteen hundred miles of it are in United States territory. Forty-one per cent of the total tonnage carried by the Grand Trunk comes from the United States; seventy per cent of its freight traffic receipts is obtained in that country. The proposal is that this Government become a competitor in the United States, a foreign country, with American railways operating there. Grave international difficulties surround this question. There is no precedent in the world's history for one government operating a public utility within the territory of another without first making with that country a proper agreement or arriving at an understanding in regard to the matter. Take the case of the Suez canal; when the contract for that work was arranged, France and England had to obtain from the Khedive of Egypt his permission to proceed, although at the time the Khedive had very little authority. Take the case of the Panama Canal; when the United States undertook to construct that work they obtained from the newly-created Republic of Panama the concession which was necessary before actual operations were commenced. We are in this position with regard to the United States, that this Government, owning the Grand Trunk railway in that territory, would be dependent on the federal United States Government for all the laws they might pass with regard to the road, including liability for any taxation they might impose, and liable also to taxation and legislative interference by the six or seven states through which the railway runs. What would we think in this country of such a proposition as the American Government purchasing the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway? It is not inconceivable that that might not occur. All that they would need to do would be to purchase the stock as it was offered on the exchanges. What would we in Canada say if the American Government owned all the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway and wanted to operate that road in this country?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Did not Sir Wilfrid Laurier know when he made this deal that the Grand Trunk owned this railway in the United States?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend has not caught my point. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made no agreement with the Grand Trunk to operate any railway in the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The Grand Trunk was operating both sections.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not as the property of this Government. I am calling the attention of the House to the fact that a decision on this proposal that the Canadian Government should own and operate this 1,600 miles of railway in the United States is no twenty-four hour affair, it demands inquiry and careful consideration; and as an illustration of the necessity for that deliberation I am suggesting the situation that might arise at any time if the American Government purchased all the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway and wanted to operate that railway in Canada. We would certainly think carefully over such a proposition as that. And I submit from my short study of this question that our problem is a very serious one. It is not brought into Canadian public life as a result of anything done by the Liberal party, but is another of the many problems that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has laid at

the door of this Government. Let me give another illustration.

Mr. HANSON: Is there anything in the comity of nations to prevent such a thing happening? Does the hon. gentleman know of any precedent against it?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I can find no precedent in history nor any international law whereby one country attempted to operate a railway in the territory of another country. I pointed out that in the case of the Suez canal and the Panama canal, concessions were obtained from the countries through which they ran.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has my hon. friend forgotten that the United States has operated railways in Canada?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The United States Government?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In war time, perhaps; but my hon. friends know very well that that is no answer to the contention I am making. Many things were done in war time, as my hon. friend knows, by agreement and consent. Will my hon. friend, who wrote a report on the railway question, tell me if he knows of any case in the history of the world where in peace time one country operated a road in the territory of another without having the consent of that other country? No, my hon. friend cannot do it; it is impossible for him to do it. I am only submitting these as reasons why we should give due thought to this matter. The problem is not one that can be solved overnight.

My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has called the attention of the House to the situation with re-
5 p.m. gard to the railway that runs through the Maritime provinces, and he proved conclusively, I submit, that that was a railroad which was built, not under any legislation of this Parliament, but under legislation passed by the Imperial Parliament, providing for the construction of that railroad and providing also, as a matter of law, I submit, for its operation. Anyway, both political parties have for forty years proceeded to operate that railway in the light of what is claimed to be the intent of the British North America Act. From 1878 down to 1918 that railway was operated on the lines which, we say, the Imperial Act demanded. My right hon. friend's (Mr. Meighen) propensity for Orders in Council is very well known, and when Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann were given charge of the railways in the western part of Canada he passed an Order in Council on the 20th of November, 1918, providing in part as follows:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council is further pleased to order and declare that the persons from time to time comprising the Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, shall be and they are hereby appointed a Board of Management of the Canadian Government Railways and are hereby given the powers vested in the General Manager under the general regulations of the Canadian Government Railways adopted by Order in Council of the 22nd January, 1914.

That meant that Mr. Hanna and his co-directors of the Canadian Northern Railway were given the powers which are declared and set out in the general Railway Act of the Dominion Government, which are no more than the powers which were exercised by Mr. Gutelius when he was General Manager, and by Mr. Pottinger who was also General Manager for many years. But, notwithstanding that their powers were limited, these gentlemen, the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway, proceeded to treat the road as if it were part and parcel of the Canadian Northern Railway. They proceeded to remove all responsibility and authority for matters connected with the road from the Maritime provinces, where it had always been, to the city of Toronto; and the result of that change, for which the right hon. leader of the Opposition was responsible, was that a situation was created which became absolutely intolerable in a business way and every other way—a situation which those of us representing constituencies along the line of the Intercolonial railway have been sent here to tell this House and the Government must be remedied. My right hon. friend is well aware of the feeling that existed in regard to this matter. My opponent in the county of Pictou in the last election was one of the directors that my right hon. friend appointed for the Canadian National Railway, and realizing the feeling that existed in the constituency he issued a statement. Referring to the proposal that the management of the railway should be removed from Toronto back to the Maritime provinces, he said:

> This proposal was some considerable time ago placed before the Minister of Railways and the Premier and approved. I have assurance of the Premier that just as soon as the necessary departmental changes are made, and this policy can be arranged, transfer of departmental work will be made from Montreal to Moncton; and the people of the Maritime

Provinces may expect this within a very short time; I expect before the end of the year to see arrangements above referred to in full actual effect.

My hon. friend who represents Royal in the province of New Brunswick went on record as follows:

I am in favour of restoration of Maritime rights in connection with C.N.R. In fact, it is in my platform which I have put before this constituency.

And the present Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) also put the case very well in the public press just before the election. He said:

In reply to your telegram asking my opinion on Maritime management of C.N.R. let me state that section 145 B.N.A. contemplates Maritime control of operation and freight rates on Intercolonial under control of competent men in sympathy and touch with local conditions.

I could read statements from other supporters of my right hon. friend pledging themselves to do—what? To have an Order in Council passed—and this is what we ask Mr. Speaker, cancelling this Order in Council which appointed Mr Hanna and his co-directors, the general managers of the Intercolonial Railway, and providing for the appointment of men who will be in sympathy with our local conditions, and who will attempt to understand the operation of the road.

Mr. CRERAR: Would the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): All right, my lord.

Mr. CRERAR: I desire to thank my hon. friend for the compliment he has paid me. As a matter of information, will my hon. friend state what advantage would accrue in the operation of a system under his proposals which do not exist at the present time?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I could begin by telling my hon. friend what disadvantages would be done away with. Probably that is the best way to answer. All that we are asking for is simply what we have had for forty years. Our condition is not the same as that of British Columbia. We are asking simply for the restoration of conditions which existed for forty years under both political parties, who interpreted the Imperial Act along certain lines. Situated as we are at one end of the Dominion, and to a certain extent out of the beaten track of operation of the trunk line railways in Central Canada, more particularly in the summertime, when the whole volume of trade runs to and from the St. Lawrence, I contend that we should have intelligence and sympathetic management. The conditions of operation to which I refer have been enjoyed by us for forty years. British Columbia never had any such condition as that. There never was any operation along the lines we are asking for. Let me give an illustration. We hear about freight rates. My hon. friend told us that it cost his constituents out west 50 per cent of the value of their oats to carry them down to Port Arthur.

Mr. CRERAR: Not my constituents—further west, from Alberta.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Let me tell him that to-day, under the existing management, they charge our coal companies in Nova Scotia 60 per cent of the value of the coal to carry it to Montreal. They charge us more to carry coal to Montreal than they charge to carry coal from Lovett, Alberta down to Prince Rupert, although it is a longer distance, and they have to go over the Rockies. That is an illustration.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend proposes that the control of rates should be taken out of the hands of the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It has never been in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That is the situation. I might explain the matter to my hon. friend. The followers of the administration of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) led the people of the Maritime provinces to believe that this railway was under the Railway Commission, and when there was complaint about railways his friends down there always said "This is fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and there is no use kicking. This man Carvell, and his associates are bad men, and they are fixing the rates." That is entirely incorrect. It never was under that board at all. The Minister of Railways under my right hon. friend's administration approved the tariff fixed by Mr. Hanna. That is the way the rates were fixed, and it was in order to clear up the question that we attended the meeting of the board when freight rates were being investigated in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman not know that all those schedules are first approved by the Railway Commission?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know that, but I will tell my hon. friend that I personally appeared before the Railway Commission in the province of Nova Scotia and asked them to declare where they stood on this question, and whether they had any right to fix rates or any responsibility in regard to rates, and they said, "No."

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they had final authority.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend is probably not aware of it, but they had a letter from my hon. friend the late Minister of Railways, Hon. Dr. Reid, telling them that whatever rates were fixed for the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. John would be adopted on the other road. Mr. Hanna, the general manager of the road, under the Minister of Railways and the railway department, fixed the rates, and they are responsible for the rates. It is not merely a question of rates. Nothing can be bought along the railway for any purpose whatever, unless it is purchased in Toronto or up in Ontario. Take the question of coal. Here we are in Nova Scotia, the only coal producing province in the Dominion east of the Rockies. These men in charge of the railways purchased over a million tons of coal in the United States, brought it in last year, and hauled it within a measurable distance of the city of Quebec. We could have supplied that coal from our mines, and our miners were out of work at that time. That is an indication of the utter lack of sympathy that has characterized the management of this railway, and I want to say that every man that lived along the line of that railway, whether he sits on this side of the House or on the other side, was pledged in this respect at the last election.

I wanted to put before this House these two situations, which warrant the statement that the Government was going to inquire into this matter, and that there should be due consideration given to the question of co-ordination, having regard to the situation of the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk. I have no hesitation in saying that if by legislation this Parliament undertook to take away any rights or privileges we have under the British North America Act, it would be the duty of the local legislatures of our provinces to appeal to the Imperial Government to disallow any such legislation. There are two important things in regard to this matter that are well worthy of the attention of the House and the Government. So far as we are concerned in the Maritime provinces, we ask no exceptional favours. The freight rate problems are general throughout the whole country, and we are perfectly willing to pay our proper share in regard to that, but we do not propose to have the management from Toronto sending down to us Canadian Northern engines and cars, and taking our locomotives away and running them on other railways. We do not propose to sit quietly down and permit that to be done. We do not propose to have these men who do not know anything about our business down there trying to dominate us and our personal interests in our province. That is true of all the Maritime provinces, and I venture to say there is not a man from New Brunswick on the other side of the House who will not support the position I am taking in regard to this matter.

We have given a great deal of care and thought to this question, and the result of all these things I have mentioned shows that the people who have been directing the government-owned railways for the last three years have not been able to produce results that have been satisfactory to the country. I think every hon. gentleman will agree with that. My hon. colleague from Nova Scotia (Mr. Fielding) has a very heavy and grave task before him in dealing with the problem, to obtain the finances necessary to meet the deficit. I do think the solution of this problem is of the greatest possible importance to the whole country. It is a most serious matter for these gentlemen who live in the West, and it interferes with us in the East as well. How to find a way out in the best interests of Canada is the problem, and I sympathize with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) on account of the very heavy responsibility that has been placed upon him in dealing with the heritage that comes to him from the maladministration of the right hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I do not think we can have in this Parliament any pretence from him or from any of his followers that this railway situation was occasioned by any act of the Liberal party. It is here purely and solely on account of the partisanship, the living-from-day-to-day policy, that characterized him and his followers in dealing with all the questions which they dealt with in the past.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance laughs at that. Perhaps he will tell us the way to solve these problems, because we would be much interested to hear what he has to say on the subject. This is not a laughing matter. I have spoken very strongly on this question of the responsibility for the conditions that confront us, and this problem is not going to be got rid of by my hon. friend laughing. The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) is responsible for taking over the Canadian Northern Railway, for the loans and advances made to it, and for taking over the Grand Trunk, without any consideration of the problem which faces this Government to-day, as to where they stand in regard to international complications with the United States when they approach the question of co-ordination. The problem is before us now. The situation is such that every man of independent mind in this House, no matter on which side he sits, will join in giving the Government every possible consideration and assistance when they come to deal with this question and attempt to find a solution for the transportation problem which will not only lighten the burden imposed upon trade and industry but relieve the pressure upon the overstrained financial resources of the country. To that end, I hope there will be no dissention or division between those of different positions in this country. There should be no antagonism between agriculture, commerce and industry. All should work hand in hand in order to bring about a solution of these problems. They should not be adversaries, but rather mates and partners anxious to forget anything on which they might divide, glad only to join with every possible ardor for the interest of our common country in the solution of those questions that confront us to-day.

Hon. Sir HENRY L. DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to commence my remarks in rather a different atmosphere from that created by the last speaker. I had hoped to commence with a discussion rather of things as they are to-day, than of the things of yesterday to which he referred. I wonder if my hon. friend realises that there has been an election. From the amount of spleen that he has displayed, from the attack that he has made, I rather think the hon. gentleman believes he is still languishing in the shades of opposition. He talks about large issues in the country. What was the big issue that he made in his opening remarks? Why, the great task to which he set himself was the discrediting of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). If it is true that there is this task and it is the most important task which his party is confronted with, we feel that we have a first rate leader, and the more sticks and stones that are thrown, the more we shall be confirmed in that opinion. I do not know whether my hon. friend desires to assume the role of the fault-finder on the Government benches. He seems to be exceedingly qualified for the post. I do not know exactly where his fault-finding is going to end; but if he will not take my advice—and I am quite sure he will not; I would not expect him to do so—I wonder if he will take the advice of the Toronto Globe in its reference to this very question which, after all, is really the one underlying the hon. gentleman's remarks, the belittlement of Ontario and all that Ontario stands for, on the one hand, not, of course, for purposes of injuring Ontario, but for the purpose of creating favourable prejudice elsewhere or the other. I shall read an editorial from the Globe of March 11, 1922, and it has to say this on the subject of my hon. friend. The article is headed:

> Useless Faultfinding. Addressing women at the Montreal Reform Club, Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M.P. for Pictou, N.S., accused Ontario of narrowness of outlook.
>
> He said: For Ontario, Canada, is bounded by the river Ottawa on one side and by Sault Ste. Marie on the other. Everything outside that territory does not count in the estimation of that province. It is an indication of a narrowness of mind unworthy of anyone living in Canada.

That is a quotation of the hon. gentleman's speech as given by the Globe. The Globe goes on:

> Mr. Macdonald does not know Ontario at first hand. He is building a wide accusation on a narrow basis, the sayings of a few narrow-minded men and narrow-minded newspapers. We have broad and narrow people here, as they have in Nova Scotia. In any case, nothing is to be gained by Nova Scotia making such accusations against Ontario, or Ontario against Nova Scotia. Mr. Macdonald should go up against the Philistines at home.

Again, I say that if the hon. member for Pictou is not willing to take my advice—and I do not expect him to do so—let him at least regard the voice of the chief organ in Ontario of his party; and if again he will have no conception of what that newspaper says, and thinks nothing of it, let him, at least, think of Canada and ask himself whether it would be worth while to continue, at a time like this, to attempt to set

up provincial prejudice, the one province against the other, or whether, after all, the problems of the day are not sufficiently great and serious to invite the best efforts of a united Canada.

For a moment, I make no further reference to the lamentations of my hon. friend. I shall have, I am afraid, to deal with them in a little more detail later on; but I should like to commence now just where I would have wished to commence, had it not been for what has taken place. Mr. Speaker, here we are with a brand new Government and a brand new Speaker, and I want, in the first instance, to congratulate my hon. friends very heartily on the first-rate victory they have achieved. I cannot agree with some of the methods employed by them in the winning of that victory, but they are happy and contented and I rejoice personally in their happiness and contentment. If the Prime Minister were here I would address a few remarks of personal thanks to him. It is a great pleasure to me, for example, to be able to congratulate him on the appointment which he has made in filling the office of Speaker. The present incumbent of that office I have known for many years as a friend, and I rejoice to see the Chair of this honourable Chamber so ably filled. I should also like to congratulate the Prime Minister upon his selection of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I am quite sure that out of the many followers of whom the Prime Minister boasts none is better fitted to fill that important position than the hon. gentleman whom he has called upon to assume the office. I am sincere in what I say in that regard.

Something, however, has happened this afternoon that compels me to qualify somewhat these remarks. The Minister of Finance deserves our sympathy as well as our congratulations, but I fear he has exhibited in the past two little failings which at this session of the House may become very important in their significance. He has too little faith in Canada and too little faith in the possibilities of the British Empire when dealing with the question of reciprocity; on the other hand, he has a great deal too much faith in railways and in the statements of railway contractors and promoters. And in view of the remarks made this afternoon I am afraid I shall have to give to the House a few brief quotations to show the misplaced greatness of his faith in the representations of railway contractors and promoters. I regret that it should be necessary to refer to ancient history, but it is impossible for me to refrain from doing so on this occasion. Hansard reports my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific matter, as follows, on May 26, 1904:

> Last year my right hon. friend the Leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made the statement that we could provide for the obligations entailed by this scheme out of one year's surplus. The statement which my hon. friend made in that off-hand way was absolutely and literally correct. I showed that by setting aside some $13,000,000 or $14,000,000, which was somewhat less than our surplus, we could provide for the payment of the seven years' interest which we are under obligation to give to the company. By our agreement we gave them seven years' free rental on the eastern division and seven years' free interest on the mountain sction of the western. I pointed out, upon the authority of an actuary, that by laying aside $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 we could provide for the complete payment of that obligation and that, therefore, was the measure of what we would have to pay.

Again, in the same debate, referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific project, he said:

> —When the project was brought down to Parliament, it was found that the scheme was so bold and comprehensive, so carefully thought out and guarded in the public interest, and entailed so small a charge, comparatively speaking, upon the public treasury, that these hon. gentlemen were amazed that the Government should have been able to negotiate such a scheme.

My hon. friend, I say, has too much faith in the figures of railway promoters. He mentions the sum of $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. Why, Sir, that line already has cost the country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And is still costing the country money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I do not know what may happen in the future, but it is costing a great deal now. I think it costs now more per annum than the whole of that estimate; at any rate it is costing a very enormous sum of money. There is another question to which I wish to refer, and it gives me much pleasure to do so. I had expected that the task would fall to me of saying something about Canada's position, and establishing the fact, as it can easily be established, that of all countries that have taken part in this war, from its commencement, as Canada did, of all countries whose effort at all compares with Canada's in any one of her activities, having regard to her income and population, not one is in a better position than Canada. This is a claim I have made before, a claim that has also been very generously and free-

ly made by the financial papers and financial authorities of foreign countries in the best position to speak on this subject. I have said before that we were in at least as good a position as any other country outside of the great United States, which, of course, entered the war a good deal later than we did; but the duty of re-asserting this fact has been removed from my shoulders by the frank admission that appears in the Speech from the Throne. My hon. friends, who a short time ago saw nothing but darkness and ruin ahead of us, and talked of annexation with the United States as a result of the country's position, just in a few brief hours discovered that not only was my claim correct, but that they could go further and say that the position of Canada is better than that of any other country. Now that they are in office they make a wider and stronger claim than I have ever done. May I congratulate my friends upon their newly found faith in their country. These conversions are splendid. It does one good to see doubting Thomases who are quivering and quaking, afraid of annexation and all kinds of bogies of this kind, turn round, when they attain the ministerial benches, and from gloomy doubters become valiant upholders of their country's position. Again I congratulate them. I admit that I was amazed, although I ought not to have been, because there were apostles and emissaries going out telling them how awfully mistaken they were in what they had been saying, and that after all the financial newspapers knew more about the question than they did and were perhaps worth heeding. And so the gospel of optimism was commenced. I should not be surprised, because I notice that on December 22, my hon. friend the then member-elect for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell)—and he is a financial authority, Mr. Speaker—was talking on this very question, and I find that he is reported in the Gazette of December 23, as having said:—

> The time had come for turning away from the dark side of things, that it was well to look away from the sombre tints shown during the campaign and with the aid of a strong immigration policy, work together for the development of Canada as a unity, and not as a country made up of easternism and westernism, was the message which Mr. Walter Mitchell, M.P.—elect for St. Antoine, and late provincial treasurer, gave to the Commercial Travellers at the annual meeting of the Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association, held at the Windsor Hotel last night.
>
> "Do not believe in the dark pictures we painted for you during the election," he said amidst laughter. "I would have painted them still darker had I not been afraid that my majority would be too big."

So it is, Mr. Speaker, and I ought not to have been surprised that my hon. friend, financial critic and authority as he is, had started this great work of conversion of the Liberal party from pessimism as far back as December 22. I congratulate him upon his success.

In the course of his speech my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) ventured into a calculation as to the popular support given this party, whose defeat he was so cheerfully gloating over, and upon whose defeat—now that he is in his seat—I freely and sincerely congratulate him. Why, he said, if the majority of the votes only were considered we—the official Opposition—would be given merely 22 seats. Well, I would have thought that in the case of what I believe to be the first Canadian Premier holding office with a substantial minority vote, the hon. gentleman would have found it just as convenient to say nothing about that matter. But perhaps he is rather proud of that position. It is quite true we were not dealt with very kindly. Personally, I think we got not only the worst of the fight, but I believe we got worse treatment than we merited. But let us see how this works out.

Of a total of 3,121,844 votes cast in the general election—I cannot vouch for these figures, but I believe they are correct—1,296,723 were cast in favour of the Liberals, representing 41.53 per cent of the votes polled. My hon. friend talks about the minority candidates returned. Why, this is entirely a minority Government, and if his principles are correct, he should resign from office. It would be a dreadful thing, of course, to borrow some of the language used by him on a previous occasion when he talked about usurpation by a minority of the rights of the majority, but his language seems to be applicable to the present situation. The Conservative vote was 971,502, or 31.52 per cent of the total, while the Progressives with 769,387 votes polled 24.64 per cent of the whole. I should like to give my hon. friend the member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) credit for drawing my attention to this question. I was chaffing him for not undertaking what seemed to me to be his absolute duty in this House as official leader of the Opposition by reason of the fact that his party had a considerably larger representation than we had. He said to me: I cannot follow you in that

reasoning, because after all you got over 200,000 more votes than we did. Well, analysing these figures I find he was right.

The unit of representation per member for the Government supporters averages therefore 10,989; the Conservatives, 19,430 per member, and the Progressives 11,836. We have 118 members supporting the Government, 50 Liberal-Conservative members, 65 Progressives, and 2 Independents. If we were to take the basis of the vote of the Liberal-Conservatives as the basis of representation, the Government would have only 66 seats as against our 50, and the Progressives would have 39. If we take the Government unit, the Conservatives would have 88 seats as against their present 50, and the Progressives 70 seats. I think the fortunes of war have dealt pretty kindly with my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and that on reflection he will think that after all he should not perhaps gibe us too much on forming a party which can only properly count 22 members.

If there is one thing that this House ought to do during the present session it is to pass a redistribution bill. The Speech from the Throne does not indicate any very extensive legislative programme. My. hon. friend is the head of a minority government. I do not know what the future holds in store for him or for his party; nobody knows; he himself does not know,. In order, therefore, to ensure something like fair and proper representation of the people in the next Parliament, the necessary steps to effect redistribution should be taken at once.

We have heard a good deal about campaign literature. Definite pledges, platforms and statements have been referred to by my leader and brought to the attention of the Prime Minister. Am I unfair in saying that the Prime Minister's reception of this recapitulation of campaign promises was, to say the least, cynical? The Prime Minister tells us not to take seriously this campaign literature; not to take seriously the pledges given to the people during the election campaign by the different parties. The hon. gentleman reminded my leader of a certain poster which contained the statement that Canada needed a certain very eminent gentleman, and went on to remark that the country did not think so. But if the cartoonist was wrong; if that idea was for the moment mistaken, is that any reason why the plighted word and solemn pledges of gentlemen returned to office should not be observed?

What is the use of an election if those who have voted for the victorious party find that the pledges on the strength of which they voted never existed? Does my hon. friend intend during the present session to bring down a bill to amend the Criminal Code? In that code there are laws dealing with misrepresentation,—and I may point out to my hon. friend that the crime of misrepresentation is only complete when the offender charged gets the goods. My hon. friend has the goods here; he is in office. Anyone who by false pretences, or misrepresentation, obtains property, even of infinitesimal value, is guilty of a crime and liable to a long term of imprisonment. Does my hon. friend think it is a small thing to say that faith with the people may be broken, that representations made for the purpose of obtaining office may cynically be disallowed? I am disappointed, more than disappointed, in the attitude of my hon. friend. I have had a high opinion of his character, and I am sure that upon reflection he will admit that such a serious matter cannot be disposed of by an easy gibe.

I am disappointed in my hon. friend for another reason. You know, Mr. Speaker, something happened during the last election—the Liberals discovered something during the campaign. Why, they discovered Toronto, and they proclaimed their discovery in their pre-election literature. Here is another of those things to which the Prime Minister thinks we should not pay attention. I was in hopes that what I am about to read was a distinct conversion of the great Liberal party to the just claims of Toronto. What do they say? Here is a campaign advertisement graced by my hon. friend's picture. I use the word "graced" advisedly; it is a very good portrait.

Mr. CHISHOLM: We cannot hear a word of what my hon. friend is saying.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very sorry. Among other things I was observing that this campaign document is graced by a fair picture of the Prime Minister.

Mr. McMASTER: That is good so far.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: First rate; it is all good, but apparently it is not to be "taken seriously." It reads:

> Is Toronto, which produces over twenty-three per cent of the total revenue of the Dominion, entitled to adequate custom house facilities, and a post office worthy of a city of the size and importance of Toronto?

Was it not the duty of the representatives of this city to secure, long ago, the construction of the viaduct, the custom house and post office? These great public works that Toronto needs and is entitled to should be commenced immediately, in order to relieve the present unemployment in this city.

I was sure, Mr. Speaker, until my hon. friend made the answer that he did to my leader, that in the Estimates there would be provision for these much-needed works.

I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in his seat; I congratulate him upon his most recent successes. I am particularly glad to see him here, because I wish to draw his attention to these words in the advertisement which I have just read: "in order to relieve the present unemployment in this city." I wish to point out to him further that for the period ending January 31, 1921, the percentage of employment in the trades reporting, was 90·1, and the percentage of unemployment, therefore, 9·9. For the period ending January 15, 1922, the figure was 80·6, unemployment, 19.4. For the last week that I have been able to get information, January 31 of this year—my hon. friend will have more recent information—the figure was 78.9, with an unemployment ratio of 21.1. I would like to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour that compared with the same week of last year, at a time when he was disturbed by the spectre of unemployment, we have to-day nearly three times the amount of unemployment, and I would ask him whether, in view of that unemployment, which he professed himself concerned about, and sincerely I believe, he does not think these public works should be proceeded with immediately, as the candidate's advertisement says.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (resuming): When the House took recess at six o'clock, I was discussing the advertisement published in the city of Toronto, in the interests, among others, of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, and dealing with the unemployment situation. I still hope that that is not to be included in the list of discarded pledges by my hon. friend the Prime Minister. I would be very loath to think that the underlying motive of that advertisement was to signalize the direct return to what is vulgarly known as pork-barrel politics in Canada. That the only idea was that it should be a bait and a bribe to Toronto to elect the Minister of Labour, and that, as a penalty for his non-election—that the admitted measure of justice should not be extended to that municipality. It was either one thing or the other. I sincerely hope it was not the latter proposition, but I am afraid we may expect disappointment. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) in his seat, but it is within the memory of all of us how insistently he fought for Civil Service reform, how he piloted through this House the Civil Service Act, how the very name of patronage was something most distasteful to him, but I notice little kites up in the air already, and some newspapers, very close to the administration are drawing attention to and making attacks on the Civil Service Commission, and most startling of all, I see one of these kites now being flown by the senior member for Halifax. I read from a Halifax paper, I think the Chronicle, this note, which appeared in the issue of February 9:

Name Patronage Board

At a meeting of the Liberals in Halifax yesterday, the following were named on what is said to be a patronage committee; Alderman Findlay, Harry Murphy, B. W. Russell, Ralph Hendry, Mayor J. S. Parker, and C. H. Bennett. These men were selected by the Hon. A. K. Maclean and Dr. Edward Blackadder.

I could not commence to in any way vie with the hon. gentleman in the tremendous claims that he made for the total abolition of patronage. It was his long suit. We find that that long suit was played when he was in the Union Government, to make sure that no patronage could be indulged in by the Union administration, the Liberal-Conservative administration, but patronage of the oldest and worst type can be indulged in just as soon as the Liberal administration takes office. We all know what the idea of the kite is, how these things are thrown out for the purpose of seeing just how they are going to be received. The hon. gentleman still has time to say that he does not intend to stultify himself, that he meant what he said, that he believed, and still continues to believe, in reform—and I may tell him that there was more reform granted to the people of this country in the last five years than in the preceding twenty-five years—and that now, simply because his political friends occupy the treasury benches, he is not going to throw into the

discard the principles which he affected to hold most dearly. I do not know what advice the hon. gentleman is getting as the result of the publicity given to this proposed change. I hope that he will take advantage of the present situation to deny that he has any intention of proceeding further and by disbanding that committee.

We have had lots of misrepresentation, and I think many of the misrepresentations —and I want to be fair about it—were made in the heat of conflict, as they are often made, without proper information as to the facts. But I would like to impress upon the gentlemen who now form part of the administration that misrepresentations can no longer be indulged in, that we are entitled to facts and that the business of the country should be conducted on a basis of facts. Let me illustrate what I mean by this, and I am going to address myself again to the Minister of Labour. I do not know whether many of the gentlemen in the House have had the privilege of hearing the Minister of Labour talk. He is a most eloquent and convincing talker. I think sometimes he gets carried away by his own eloquence, and says a great many things which he never intended to say. I may be wrong, but at any rate I would like to approach the discussion of one or two matters to which I am going to call the attention of the House, in that spirit.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, you should have heard the eloquence of my friend in the last campaign. You should have heard his denunciation of trusts and combines. He left nothing to be desired. These denunciations were delivered with the greatest force and eloquence and there were some peculiarly bad combines which he directed special attention to. He did me the honour of coming to my constituency and delivering a tremendous address denouncing anything and everything in his endeavour to make a hit. I have notes of his address taken at the time. He picked out for a very special part of his attack these iniquitous trusts and combines. He fastened all this upon the back of the late government. They were the protectors of the trusts; they created them; they fathered them; they aided them; the trusts were their children. He quoted Biblical phrases in connection with them; he found new decalogues in connection with them, and he was going to do tremendous things with them. Why, you should have heard him speak of Sir Charles Gordon

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

of that iniquitous concern, the Dominion Textile Company, the concern that he had been waiting for two long years for an opportunity to hale before a proper investigating committee and to exhibit in all its nakedness and frightfulness to the Canadian people!

There was another concern that he said a great deal about, the Canada Cement Company. He disposed of the Dominion Textile Company and the Canada Cement Company to his complete satisfaction, but he never told the people that both those companies were incorporated under the Liberal regime. His charge was that they were Conservative creations. The fact is that the merger of the Canada Cement Company took place in 1909, and the merger of the Dominion Textile Company took place on January 4, 1905. I am making no charges against those companies. The charges were made by the Minister of Labour. He has been in power for some time; he has had an opportunity of considering the case of that awful man, Sir Charles Gordon. He has passed upon his case; he has sentenced him for his crimes and iniquities by sending him over to Genoa for the purpose of representing this country at that great conference. The minister (Mr. Murdock) laughs. Oh, the election is over! He charged us with having the support of these companies; and if he did not know, he ought to have known that, at the very time those charges were made the name of Sir Charles Gordon was to be found upon the nomination papers of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). That was the sort of thing that we took uncomplainingly.

The hon. member had a bigger complaint than that. Sir, the most monstrous, the most dreadful octopus, the worst of all the companies in the world, the one that surpassed all others in frightfulness, according to his way of putting it, was that dreadful organization known as the British Empire Steel Company. Why, my hon. friend waxed eloquent even for him; he rose to a height of superlative eloquence when he was denouncing that concern, and he went on to tell the people how he had investigated it and had found that, in the capitalization of the company there was no less than $230,000,000 represented by water or by good will. He went on to draw such a harrowing picture that it would bring tears to the eyes of the most hardened, as to the tremendous, awful burden that was cast upon the unfortunate people of Canada who would have to pay for all time

dividends on watered stock, dividends on values that did not exist, simply because the wicked government that was, countenanced such things. And he stopped there, for if he had told the truth his purpose would not have been served. If he had told the truth, it would have been known that the minister and his friends were responsible for that incorporation. If he had told the truth to the people of Ontario, he would have said: "This is the investigation that I made. I found this tremendous amount of water. These incorporators came to Ottawa with their petition for incorporation. They went away without it and they took practically the first train to my political friends, the Liberal government of Nova Scotia and they got their incorporation." If he had gone further, he could have said; "Why, Mr. Macdonald, K.C."—he was not then member for Pictou; he has since been elected—"Mr. Macdonald, one of my political friends is general counsel for, or at least very high up in the councils of that company, representing them, working for them. Ah, yes, here I am also, walking the goose-step with Ned Macdonald in our nondescript army." But he did not tell us anything of that kind. Oh, no, there was nothing that was said about the facts. After all, it is all ancient history now; I hope it has gone not to return; I hope that, with office, my hon. friend will stick to facts. I wish him every success in his department. The country needs success in the administration of the Department of Labour; and as regards those who sit around me, my hon. friend can take no proper step to help labour, no proper step to help unemployment, but his hands will be upheld by those sitting on this side of the House.

Are we very much better off to-day? I am hoping we are, but are we? Look at the discrepancy that we have between the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Marquette. It is not a discrepancy as to a mere matter of form; it is a discrepancy that is vital. It goes to the question of establishing fairness and loyalty to his friends on the part of the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) or else a willingness to desert them and to scrap his party. He has taken his position and the leader of the House has taken his. They are diametrically opposed, the one to the other, and I am afraid we cannot do anything to help solve this question except to point out that, in view of all the circumstances, in view of the fact that a meeting was held of the members of this House supporting the leader of the Progressives, and that these matters were favourably considered, the great probability is that the leader of that party was correct in what he said. But, as I say, we cannot do much one way or the other to solve the question. It is a pity that we have so early in the session, such a sharp divergence on a matter of fact involving a question of veracity as we have between these two hon. gentlemen.

Well, we are attacked rather severely in connection with our railway policy. All the troubles of the railways, according to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) are attributable to the one man of whom, for some particular reason, he seems to try to make a Machiavelli. The Prime Minister dealt with the same question and did me the honour of referring to a report which I made to this House some years ago. I wonder whether he will put the rest of the report into effect, or whether he is going to confine his endorsation to just a few lines of it, because those lines serve, for the moment, a useful purpose. I wonder whether he believes what that report shows as to the woeful waste, the reckless extravagance, and the manifest impropriety of the whole Grand Trunk Pacific and Transcontinental venture; or is his endorsation applicable merely to these few lines? Well, it is quite true that the figures quoted by my hon. friend are correct. It is equally true that at that time the mileage of railways in operation was nothing like what it is to-day. It is perfectly true, for example, that in 1911, although the lines had been very largely completed, neither the Grand Trunk Pacific nor the Transcontinental was reported as an operating railway in Canada. But to adopt the argument based on the figures of the mileage of railways in operation would lead to the result of charging the Liberal-Conservative party with the responsibility of it all, the party that did its very best and fought its hardest to stop that iniquitous scheme. Why, hon. gentlemen know that railways are not operated immediately on their completion. Those gentlemen who come from the West know that long after construction has been completed much time elapses before any application is made to the Railway Board to open the lines for operation, and there have been brought to the board, time and again, cases which could not be dealt with simply because the lines concerned, although completed, had not been declared by the company to be ready for operation and the

operation was carried on by the contractor. Furthermore, I think the House knows very well that, in connection with the right to charge operating expenses to capital account, there was a very special reason for a great delay on the part of the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific in making the necessary application to the Railway Board, although the lines had been completed. To such an extent was this the case that the question was considered as to whether or not Parliament should take to itself power to declare the lines open and ready for operation although the companies themselves had not done so.

Now, I desire, in the plainest possible terms, to take issue both with the Prime Minister and with the member for Pictou as to who is responsible for the overbuilding of railways in this country, and who is responsible for this mess. Did any gentleman in this House, Mr. Speaker, ever hear the suggestion, until made by the Prime Minister in this debate, that it was open to this country to cancel all the charters that had been given and to set aside all the bond issues that had been made? Not only were these bond issues made, but the moneys had been provided and were in the hands of the trustees of the issues; and these moneys could be applied only to the one purpose. The fact is, as is very well known, that the great part of these undertakings had been completed at that time, that the right of way had been bought throughout, that a large proportion of the steel had been laid, and that the companies and the Government that had endorsed their bonds were absolutely committed to the undertakings and had to go on with them. I say that every charter, which is responsible for the overbuilding of lines in Canada, where that overbuilding to-day is burdensome upon the public, was authorized by the Liberal Government. Why, during the whole long term of the Liberal administration, during fifteen years, there were only two years in which there was not some Canadian Northern legislation giving charters or guarantee charters, guarantees, and the like. My hon. friends will find a great number of them, and they will further find only two years when none was granted. I do not want to weary the House by giving a list of all these, but I should like to specify some of the main charters,—charters which have resulted in unnecessary mileage, and consequent financial embarrassment.

Hon. gentlemen know that the invasion of Ontario by the Canadian Northern has proved very, very expensive, and is now demonstrated to have been for the most part entirely unnecessary. The charter for the line from Montreal to French River was granted on July 20th, 1905, but if you count the railway as in operation you will find that in 1911, according to the Prime Minister, we became liable for it. For the line from the township of Chisholm to Capreol, their divisional point in Ontario, the charter was granted on the 19th May, 1909. For the line from North Bay to Port Arthur, linking up the system with the West, and committing the country absolutely to the project, the charter was granted on the 15th May, 1902. When you get out farther west you will find that the charters for the lines from Dauphin to Battleford and thence to Edmonton were granted on the 29th June, 1897, and the 15th May, 1902, respectively. There is no doubt of one thing, Sir, and that is that, generally speaking the prairie lines of the Canadian Northern are good lines. If the Canadian Northern had been left where the Laurier administration found it, on the prairies, and allowed to expand there, and had devoted the hundreds of millions of dollars which were sunk in the building of unnecessary lines in the East towards giving absolutely necessary lines to the western farmers, its prairie system would indeed have been a great asset to this country. I repeat, those lines were good and necessary lines.

But the Canadian Northern system was not to stop there; that bold administration was determined to continue extension to the Coast, and it granted a charter for the line from Edmonton to Vancouver on the 11th August, 1899.

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it not a fact that the line from the Rockies to Vancouver, known as the Canadian Northern railway, was built under a provincial charter granted by the Government of Sir Richard McBride?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will deal with that in a moment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why not now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We will get to it in proper order. Why this anxiety?

Mr. GRAHAM: There was never a line built under that charter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am pointing out that so far as the corporate administration was concerned, these rights

were given. The whole of that expensive Ontario-Quebec system was constructed under legislation of the former Liberal Government. It is absolutely true that, having got their charter from the Laurier administration, the promoters of the Canadian Northern system went to the British Columbia government and, for the purpose, as I think, of evading Dominion regulation, constructed that remaining link through that province under legislation granted by the provincial government. There is no question about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is also no question about the bond guarantees and the construction grants which these sections of the system got.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in British Columbia.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, they were appalling. I do not know whether my hon. friend is responsible for them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I say not in British Columbia.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I believe they got that chiefly from the local government.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not chiefly, but wholly until the Conservative Government came into power.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is entitled to that bit of encouragement.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a very important distinction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let him have it. But what does he say about the Government that with this line arranged for, with the charters standing, chooses deliberately to build a third line, paralleling the two existing lines, at its own cost in part and entirely on its own authority. Why, Mr. Speaker, there may be some room for argument that this country could support, and would support, two transcontinental lines; but when the Laurier administration embarked upon the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific they embarked upon a project which committed this country to three transcontinental lines, and I cannot find appropriate parliamentary language to properly describe such an act.

Let us see if that is an over-statement. The charter for the line from Edmonton to Vancouver was granted four years prior to the Grand Trunk Pacific project. It is true it was built under another charter; but the right to build was there. From Dauphin, Manitoba, to Edmonton, the charter was granted one year prior to the Grand Trunk Pacific project. From North Bay to Port Arthur the charter was also granted one year prior to the Grand Trunk Pacific project. There is another very extraordinary circumstance which shows that the administration of that time had a belief in the idea that three transcontinental railways could be supported by this country, because the charter for the line from Montreal to French river was given by that administration after the Grand Trunk Pacific project had been launched.

Well, construction goes on, guarantees are given, and millions of dollars of public money are placed at the disposal of the promoters of these railways. Then 1911 comes along, and with construction largely carried out, governments everywhere committed, the moneys in the hands of trustees—all this done, it is now suggested that we ought to have stopped. If ever there was something which goes beyond eleventh-hour repentance, something which occurs just before the end of everything, you have it in that suggestion.

I wonder if some of the eminent legal gentlemen on the other side will later give us the benefit of their views. If they do, we shall perhaps be told in what manner the Dominion could legally have interfered with a matter directly involving property and civil rights; involving the issue of bonds, the placing of money in the hands of trustees, the liabilities of provinces and even of the Dominion itself. But the suggestion could not have been intended to be taken seriously. The hon. member for Pictou says that because we did these things we are responsible for everything. But what would he have had us do? Did he want the settlers who had been induced to come to this country left without the transportation service which they were assured they would have, left without any way of getting out their crops or getting in their food supplies? What would he do with regard to the many villages and communities which would be without railway communication? What would he do with the commitments here and there and everywhere? What would he do with the large government guarantees, Dominion and provincial? He knows very well that there was just one thing to do: to carry on as best we could; to make the best of the exceedingly bad situation that had been created for us.

The hon. member says that we were responsible for the loan to the Canadian Northern. Every cent of the loan of 1911 went into the property, and the same is true of the loan of 1914. We did not want to take the baby; the government did everything it could to get rid of it. Not until everybody in Canada was sick and tired of putting up funds for private companies were the lines taken over. Is it not better, if we have to spend money in connection with foolish and improper undertakings, that we should at least know where every cent is going? Is it not better that if they are a success the country should get the benefit of it? Is it not better that the Canadian taxpayer should, to use a commonplace expression, get a "run for his money"?

Well, we are to blame for another thing, the hon. member says; we are to blame because the government consented to arbitration. I will tell the House very frankly that my own view as expressed in the report to which reference has been made was that there was no equity in the Canadian Northern. I took that view, and I still hold it. But the government were in this position: they were entering into possession of a property, and the usual thing when governments in civilized countries enter into possession of somebody else's phoperty is to have a free and independent arbitration for the purpose of finding out what that property is worth. The usual course, therefore, was followed in this case: three independent arbitrators were appointed. I have not heard any attack made by hon. gentlemen opposite upon the character, the standing, or the ability of any one of these arbitrators; nevertheless we are blamed because we carried out an award made by a board composed of men of the highest standing.

Then, we are frightfully to blame, the hon. member suggests, because we did not know that the Grand Trunk had an American mileage. Is it not a tremendous discovery which the hon. gentleman has just made—that the Grand Trunk has an American mileage? Well, my hon. friends will have no difficulty in carrying out the project if they approach it along the lines of the report which has been made. That does not call for government operation as talked about by the hon. member for Pictou. It does not mean that this Government will report to or take orders from the Washington government. It simply means that company operation will be carried on in respect of the lines in American territory and reports made to the Washington authorities with regard thereto by that company. The only difference is that company would be owned not by private, English shareholders but by the people of Canada generally. I do not see anything sinister in this. I am sure that so far all the trouble in this regard has been manufactured by my hon. friends. If they stick to it long enough; if they talk about it loud enough, I dare say they may find a sympathetic reception on the part of some across the border, but if there is trouble, the country will know how and whence it came. Is there any trouble in connection with the ownership of the Soo line by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Why, the Soo line gets along just as well to-day, owned by Canadians, as it did when owned by Americans. It is the same old company; reports are made in the ordinary course, and there is no trouble. The Michigan Central running through Ontario has no trouble in Canada, nor have I heard of any difficulities arising in connection with Mr. Hill's lines in the West. I have never heard any civilized country say that simply because the whole of a people of a very friendly neighbouring country are interested in an enterprise operating partly in their territory, the people of that neighbouring country shall do no business with them. But in the minds of these gentlemen who approach the subject with so much sympathy, this circumstance is a terrible bugaboo. I only hope that what I have heard is true: that a fair chance will be given national ownership.

But I wonder who is reading the situation most correctly? The Montreal Star has had an editorial upon the subject,—and the Montreal Star and Montreal Gazette are two papers referred to by my hon. friend from Marquette as being strangely sympathetic with the new administration. As to these papers we have the suggestion coming from governmental benches—yes, from an old member of standing—the suggestion of loaves and fishes. It is certainly a suggestion I would not make. Yet one hon. gentleman made it. I wonder why. I wonder what kind of a loaf and what kind of a fish that is. I wonder what kind of a monogram it would have upon it. I do not think any hon. gentleman on this side of the House at any rate, yes, or on the other, would have much difficulty in guessing what cabalistic lettering would appear upon them. Well, the idea of the Montreal

Star, in its editorials, was plainly that the opportunity was an opportunity to prove the absolute impossibility of governmental ownership in this country, and if my friends are sincere in what they are about to undertake I would counsel them not to have very many gentlemen speak along the lines followed by the hon. member for Pictou, unless they want to be put in the position that they are absolutely and entirely sure that trouble will be made in the United States, so that they will have some excuse for getting out of the obligation which they owe to the people of this country.

There was another thing said by my hon. friend, the Prime Minister. He blamed us on this side of the House for our unsympathetic handling of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I wonder what on earth he meant by "unsympathetic" handling of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Good heavens, Mr. Speaker, this country was being bled white to look after that baby! Did he want millions more thrown away to keep it going? How much more ought we to have given it? Mr. Speaker, there are some projects so far removed from reason that the most reckless expenditure would be insufficient to save them. Some day perhaps we may have an asset in the Grand Trunk Pacific; but we have not to-day. Yet we are charged with being unsympathetic. We here are only interested, and I think I can speak in this connection for every member on this side of the House, in seeing that the property of the people of Canada gets a fair chance. We know that it is so easy to stifle and kill the project that frankly we are afraid a good deal will be made of the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou. In answer to his remarks to-day I read calculations given to the House by the Minister of Finance at the inception of the Grand Trunk Pacific project Now our vote last year on that account, if I remember rightly, was $26,000,000. Yet the whole cost of the undertaking, according to the figures given by the Minister of Finance at its inception—I am sure they were not his own figures but were supplied him by the railway—was to be $13,000,000, just half the necessary vote taken in the

9 p.m. House last year. It is wonderful what railway people can do with figures. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you have read the award in the present Grand Trunk arbitration. If you have read it you will have some idea of what railway officials can do with figures. As to the question of figures used by the Grand Trunk, some very harsh things have been said, but I prefer to take what their own arbitrator—not the arbitrator appointed by the Government or the third arbitrator—but what their own arbitrator says. On page 58 of the Award—I will cut the reading down as much as possible—he says:

> In 1913 the operating revenues were improperly increased apparently in order to justify the declaration of a dividend on the three series of preferred stocks, a full dividend on the first and second, and half on the third. Then came a period in which the London management was anxious to induce the Canadian Government to take the burden of the Grand Trunck Pacific off its back, on the ground that obligation to run and finance the Pacific Road might lead to the bankruptcy of the Grand Trunk. That led the London management to understate their operating revenues and charge the Audit Office Fund during the years 1915, 1916 and 1917 with an aggregate of nearly eight million dollars that should have appeared as additional revenue.
>
> In 1919 and 1920, when the sale of the road to the Government was being faced as the best course, manipulation of the accounts was directed to making the financial condition of the road seem better than it was.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, wonderful things can be done by people who juggle figures and who do not seem to care very much as to the accuracy of the reports they sign.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I take it that he agrees entirely with my remarks.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that he has not in view, perhaps has never heard of, the statement that was made use of in the campaign in West York in connection with the Grand Trunk employees, a statement that was used well in the interests of my hon. friend's party. It was to the effect that a promise had been given Mr. Kelley, either that he would be left in control of the Grand Trunk system, that the Grand Trunk system would not be taken over, or else that he would be put in charge of the National roads. I wonder if that is what my hon. friend was thinking of when he said "Hear, hear,"—if he meant that so far as he was concerned he was going to see that no gentlemen that had anything to do with the deception worked on the people of this country by these reports shall have anything to do with the management of the people's roads. I take it that that is what his "Hear, hear" meant. We still hope, Mr. Speaker that the chance given will be, not a chance to make certain failure of the roads, but

a chance which will enable the country's properties to be successfully administered by trustees on the country's behalf.

I was very much pleased that I had the honour of being present at the impressive debut by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) the other day. I heartily congratulate him on his wonderful success. It is a grand thing to have heard him, the big man from Quebec, in his first deliverance. Hon. gentlemen who heard him cheered him to the echo and I agreed with them.

Mr. GRAHAM: He may be right nevertheless.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He made a great speech. My hon. friend says he may be right, but I am not going to tell my hon. friend what I was thinking of at that particular moment. But I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman although great in admitted ability, did not cover the questions in this debate at all. Take for example, his statement that my right hon. friend insinuated improper motives to the hon. gentleman in the last election, saying that he was influenced by the great interests of Montreal. It is quite true that he was in the same canoe with these great interests. It was quite true he was the most dexterous steersman of that canoe, and handled it beautifully, but none of us on this side of the House would, for one minute, insinuate that the hon. minister was merely a tool of any big interest. He is too big a man. He is a big interest himself. Who is there bigger in Montreal than the hon. Sir Lomer Gouin? Who is there more connected with interests in Montreal than that hon. gentleman—and nothing can be said against him on that account, on the other hand, it is very much in his favour. I think those on the other side have been very wise in having associated with them a man of the hon. minister's brilliancy, but no one on this side of the House insinuates that anyone was pulling him by the nose. We think the operation was rather reversed. However, the hon. minister was wrong in some things. He was wrong when he said that my right hon. friend's reference to him as master of the situation was simply for the malign purpose of injuring Quebec and keeping alive feelings in that province which ought to have disappeared long ago. If the hon. minister would only give my right hon. friend credit for ordinary intelligence he would see that the suggestion was ridiculous. What in the name of common sense has he to gain by keeping alive in Quebec the present feeling against him? Would anyone but a lunatic adopt such a course? I have heard him called all sorts of names by gentlemen on the other side, but never heard him described as a lunatic. The hon. gentleman is simply wrong. Does he say that these great newspapers, the Montreal Gazette and the Montreal Star, are enemies of Quebec? Take the newspaper that worked up that roorbach about so many Montreal people losing their jobs and work being sent to Toronto—does he think that paper is inimical to Montreal? I would hardly think so. Let him look at any of those papers and say what they think as to who is the master mind. Let us see what the Gazette, which is so friendly to the Government says about it. I read from the publication of December 26, where I find the following:—

> When Mr. King jilted Quebec, and sought a union with the West there was joy in Toronto, but the rejoicing was premature as J. J. Morrison and Henry Wise Wood forbade the acceptance of the Liberal Leader's general proposal, and now he must turn for consolation and support to Quebec, the province he discarded. Mr. Crerar is here but will not enter the cabinet. He is willing but cannot deliver any substantial support Mr. Hudson has also returned to the Independent Liberal class, and he may follow Mr. Crerar's example. Political chaos reigns here, and with the failure of Mr. King's attempt to displace Quebec by western support there threatens to be instability in federal affairs until the people have an opportunity to revise their judgment of December 6th., Mr. King cannot lead, he must be led.

This is the extract from the paper friendly to Montreal and to Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does the hon. gentleman think that Tom Blacklock, who writes these articles, is a friend of the Government?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know who writes it, but I know it is printed in the Gazette, and I do know above all things that the Gazette is loyal to Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the paper of the Tory party.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well let us see about that. This article continued—

> Mr. King was prepared to betray his party and to discard his policy to secure the Progressives, while Mr. Crerar was prepared to eliminate his party; but neither party would submit to betrayal. Sir Lomer Gouin and Senator Dandurand arrived here Friday night and "spanked" Mr. King.

I do not believe that the Minister of Justice did spank the hon. Premier, but I

will just draw attention to this one thing, and I am only doing it for one purpose.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And that is that it is quite idle for hon. gentlemen to think that because any hon. gentleman happens to come from Quebec nothing can be said against him without the charge coming from that side of the House that we are endeavouring to create disunion between the provinces. The situation is an intolerable one. Was the Gazette article writen to injure Quebec? My right hon. leader in his speech on the Address merely referred to the editorial in Le Soleil and read it without comment, and, because he read an editorial of a leading French paper without comment, the Prime Minister assumed one of his severe oratorical expressions—he can be severe—and warned my hon. friend that he had better be careful how he proceeded with this kind of thing. Does it come to this, that a French newspaper cannot, loyally to Canada, be read west of the Ottawa river? I would not have thought so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who says so?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will ask my hon. friend a question. What was said by my right hon. leader on this most deplorable question beyond reading that reference? That is all he did. If the mere reading of it caused that outbreak from the Prime Minister, is there any need for my hon. friend to ask that question? There ought not to be, and he knows there is none. I point to this merely for the purpose of showing that my leader can have no reason for following the course that, without the slightest possible foundation of fact, has been ascribed to him. You know, Mr. Speaker, it all started in an imaginary speech referred to in the Globe, and supposed to have been delivered by the leader of the Opposition. That was copied in all parts of Canada; and the very moment that it came to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, he denounced categorically ever having made the speech, and he asked the Globe to give the reference. He has asked for it many times; but although that information was asked for a year and a half ago, the information has never been given. The speech was never made. There is a controversy going on in Ontario at the present time between the Globe and the Farmers' Sun. The issue seems to be as to who is the worse liar, and I do not think they have yet settled it to their satisfaction. It may be that they both win; but I am quite sure that the Globe will make the Farmers' Sun work hard. This party has not that enmity to Quebec which is suggested. Was the campaign run upon that line? Everybody knows that it was not. But, with some people, any old thing will do, and the great problem of the Government at the present time, as disclosed by the speech made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), is to kill politically the leader of the Opposition. I would like to tell my hon. friends opposite that they cannot do it.

The Minister of Justice confuses what was said by the leader of the Opposition in his references to him. He seems to object to references to himself. Why, that was mentioned in the speech of the member for Pictou as evidence of ill-feeling, bad blood, on the part of the leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition picks out for reference the most prominent men connected with the campaign. He has referred often enough to the Prime Minister, but simply because he happened to refer to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) and to the Minister of Justice, why, of course, it was insult to Quebec that he meant. My hon. friend knows that is ridiculous; everybody knows it is ridiculous; but I suppose it will continue. The hon. member, however, mistook the object of my right hon. friend's remarks. My right hon. friend was not attacking the Minister of Justice; he believes in the statement made by the Minister of Justice; he believes that the stand taken by the Minister of Justice is correct. He still believes, what he has always preached and preached just the same everywhere, that this country requires protection. Was that an attack made upon Quebec by the hon. member for Marquette, when he dealt with the same question and at greater length than my right hon. friend did? He was attacking a policy of the Minister of Justice. My leader is not attacking the fiscal policy of the minister. I think it may well be said that while my leader went down to defeat, the principles for which he fought were principles which were, in the large, endorsed by the majority of the people of this country. Why, what is said by the Minister of Justice might just as well appear in our platform. He believes in proper protection for the boot and shoe industry, and I think he is right in that be-

lief. He believes in proper protection for the Quebec worker. We know that the Quebec worker requires protection, and we think the minister is right in that regard. In his final declaration, he says that he still believes in the Laurier-Fielding tariff. So do we, except that it is a little higher than ours, and except that certain changes have been made in the commerce and business of this country which to-day render certain items unnecessary. I say that it was higher than ours, and I will give my hon. friend the figures. The first complete year of the Laurier administration, 1897-98, the average ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable imports was 29.7 per cent, and on all imports, dutiable and free, 17.5 per cent. In 1909-10—that was after the second revision—the duties amounted to 26.8 per cent on dutiable imports, and to 16.5 per cent on total imports. The duties collected in the years 1920-21 on dutiable imports amounted to 21.2 per cent, and on total imports to 14.5 per cent.

The truth is that the present tariff is considerably lower than the tariff to which the Minister of Justice proclaims his allegiance. Let me take items which my hon. friends to the left would be more particularly interested in. In 1910, the year before the Laurier administration went out of power, the average duty on agricultural implements was 20.2 per cent. Under the reciprocity pact if passed, that duty would have been cut to 17.3 per cent. The present average duty on agricultural implements is 14.6 per cent. So, again, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken when he thinks that there is any attack made on him because of his fiscal policy. As a matter of fact, it is entirely, in principle, consonant with our own. We think the duties are too high; some of them, we believe, could come down. On the other hand some of them are too low. We believe that at the present time, with the tremendous amount of unemployment we have, it is little short of a crime for this country to be importing over $200,000,000 worth of goods that can just as well be produced at home.

Something is said about reciprocity. I wonder if it would not be possible some day to sit down and approach this question purely from a business standpoint. The suggestion in regard to reciprocity is that we can buy more from the United States and that they would take more from us. Well, I do not know any way in which we can compel them to take any more from us at present. I think there was a great deal in what the hon. member for Marquette said, that, while he was pleased to see the Minister of Finance go to Washington, at the same time the visit was ill-timed. Of course it was ill-timed, but was it made for the purpose of securing reciprocity? Or was it made for the purpose of influencing gentlemen to my left? Are we not buying enough from the United States?

There is one argument made by my hon. friends to my left, an argument which I have heard more than once and which has something to recommend it if the circumstances will justify it. They say that if you do not buy you cannot sell; you can only do business if you are ready to create a credit, so that the outsiders with whom you want to do business may be in a position to trade with you. There is a good deal in that, if you have not already established credits. But you can establish credits in many ways. For example, you can establish credits by importing coupons which represent your interest payments, just as much as you can establish credits by importing American automobiles. It is just the same. I wonder if hon. gentlemen realize that this country to-day is importing coupons in the neighbourhood of two hundred millions a year. Commitments outside, moneys that have gone to build the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the like, the moneys borrowed by our municipalities, here, there and everywhere and by governments, and the moneys borrowed by industrial companies outside the country, amount to something like $200,000,000 a year. It used to be calculated at $180,000,000; but it is now said to be nearer the figure I have given. Have you considered what that means, what a tremendous amount of buying credit that represents, that is taken out of the country every year to pay commitments in interest, profits, etc.? You must begin your calculations with that in mind.

There is another thing for my hon. friends on my left to consider. They have more than once pointed out, in referring to the great success of the United States, that they have no duty on shoes and on several other things. The United States had very large duties on everything that they sought to manufacture, until they captured the whole of that manufacturing market, and when there was no necessity for having a duty on anything it was taken off. It will be agreed that the United States has done pretty well. It is a great country with a marvellous outside trade. For the fiscal year 1869-70 the

United States imported, per capita, $11.77; in the year 1879-80 she imported per capita $12.57; in the year 1889-90 $12.28, in the year 1900-1 she imported per capita $10.23. Then, during the war, every one got extravagant; every nation was spending lavishly, and the great United States, in the year 1920, as against $10.23 imported in 1901, imported at the rate of $47.22 per capita. At the sight of this that great financial colossus becomes alarmed and you have the Fordney Bill.

Mr. CRERAR: Is not that due to the fact that the prices of goods have doubled, and in some cases trebled?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The importation has increased four times; but if my hon. friend waits, I think he will agree that the prices have not had so much to do with it.

Mr. CRERAR: They certainly have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not care if the prices have increased. I am saying that the financial giant of the world became alarmed at an importation per capita of $47.22, and immediately introduced the Fordney tariff. Yet the people of Canada, in the year 1920-21, bought at the rate of $145.90 per capita. Mr. Speaker, are we not buying enough? Surely any one who knows the facts will admit that we are. What is the effect of the Fordney tariff upon us? My hon. friend refers to prices. Well, that is of importance, although prices had begun to drop. I have not these figures brought down to date because I have been out of the Finance Department for some time, but for the first four months of this fiscal year as compared with the same four months of last year, or on the one hand with the Fordney tariff in operation and on the other hand before it went into operation, we have the following figures on farm products, such as butter and its substitutes, cheese and its substitutes, meats (fresh or frozen), meats (prepared), potatoes, cattle, sheep, wheat flour and semolina, wool and milk (preserved or condensed), for the four months without the Fordney tariff our exports to the United States amounted to $33,546,000; with the Fordney tariff in operation they dropped to $10,070,000.

What about their exports to us? Always it has seemed to me most absurd that we have such large importations of agricultural commodities into an agricultural country. My figures there I have had put into quantities because you cannot get a comparison as well with prices. In butter, cheese, mutton and lamb, pork (fresh), bacon and ham, canned meats, potatoes, tomatoes, grapes, pears, peaches, eggs and honey, our importations in 1920, before the Fordney tariff was adopted, amounted in quantities to 27,499,000; with the Fordney tariff in operation our importations amounted to 45,124,000 in the like quantity of units. At a time when our sales to the United States dropped from $33,500,000 to $10,000,000, an enormous drop, we increased our purchases of these American agricultural commodities by 63 per cent. And yet some gentlemen think the tariff ought to be left just as it is!

And on this question of agricultural imports the burden thrown on the United States was not very great after all. I read from their Agricultural Staples Report on the tariff, Series No. 20:

> During the four months July to October, 1920, inclusive, imports of wheat amounted to 12,109,217 bushels, valued at $28,146,296; and of flour to 222,002 barrels, valued at $2,535,182. Substantially all of these shipments came from Canada, and were shipped during the latter part of September and in October.

To show what a comparatively small part that plays in the American market, let me complete the quotation:

> During the same four months the exports of wheat from the United States amounted to 117,981,296 bushels, or $339,278,520, and of flour to 6,055,829 barrels, valued at $70,144,803.

In other words, they exported $70,000,000 worth of flour in that period while they imported from us $2,500,000—a negligible proportion of their export business; and in wheat they exported $339,000,000 worth while we sent them $28,000,000—less than a tenth, and yet we have all this fuss and trouble about it.

One or two opinions I ought to refer to, Mr. Speaker, expressing the American standpoint on the tariff. On October 20th, Congressman John W. Summers announced that he was framing a bill for a tariff on imported wheat, with particular reference to Canada, which he expected to introduce in Congress at the opening day of the next session in December. He did not specify the tariff decided upon, but said it would be a "good stiff duty."

The New York Evening Journal of November 3rd had the following to say on the subject:

> During the first two weeks of October, Canadians sent five million bushels of wheat into the United States, competing directly, of course, with American farmers. Rather a nice situa-

tion for Canada, able to use this country and the farmers of this country as a dumping ground whenever it is convenient, and able in war to get for Canada and "the dear Old Mother Country" wheat raised by American farmers at a price limited by the American government. No wonder many emigrate from the United States into Canada.

It is hoped that Harding, during his administration, will do something to make the buying power of the United States profitable to Americans first, Canadians and other outsiders afterward.

Then let me quote from the American Economist, one of the foremost American papers supporting the Republicans:

It may be set down as final that the Canadian tariff revision will be purely with reference to Canadian interest and not that of the American exporter. That is the way Tariff revision ought to be undertaken. If the Canadian Government were to give first heed to the desires of the American exporter, it would be time for the Canadian people to put the Government on the scrap heap and to select one that could write across the papers of its legislation "Canada First."

I might state for the information of the House that that opinion was written before December 6. And yet we hear it suggested to-day that with our industrial and agricultural markets as they are, Parliament, instead of legislating for the benefit of Canada, should turn around and reduce the tariff, thus further disrupting our industrial situation and ruining the home market of the farmer. An hon. gentleman to my left said the other day that the home market was not much good, and would not be for another fifty years. What market, I wonder, does he think he is going to get under reciprocity? Why, with reciprocity —and you have had reciprocity with the Americans—they handle your goods just as long as it pays them to do so, that is, so long as there is a ready sale for them and it merely adds to their exporting surplus and so puts them in a better position to control world trade. It is only when you have a staggered, bleeding and exhausted Europe, unable to buy goods that the United States will refuse your business. What difference has the Fordney tariff made to the price of wheat to anybody? How much higher is the price of wheat to-day in the United States? Why, the fact is that reciprocity has nothing to do with the price. You all know now that the price of wheat is governed by the Liverpool market. Under reciprocity you give them the business to carry over for you and let them make the profits on mill feed and everything else to the detriment of your dairy herds, or you do it yourself at a time when both you and the Americans can sell. But at a time when both have a difficulty in selling, reciprocity or no reciprocity, you will be left just where you were. There are some commodities which can only be marketed at home; practically the whole of the dairy market is domestic. One of the difficulties encountered by agriculture to-day is the collapse of the home market as the result of the lack of buying power and lack of employment; yet some gentlemen think that if you make that condition worse, if you further impoverish the country, you will gain something. Reciprocity with a country which is the ultimate consumer of your products is a splendid thing; reciprocity with a competitor in business very much bigger than yourself is a very dangerous thing.

Reciprocity is not a new thing. We had a reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. My impression is that it was designed to run a specific time, but whether or not that is the fact is not of importance. Our total exports grew during that period from $7,000,000 to $49,000,000. The results were fully felt in the national trade of the year 1868, when our total exports fell to $27,000,000. The reciprocity proposed in more recent years was something which could be abrogated at any time; there was no obligation to maintain it. In view of the one thing which made reciprocity desirable to the American people—the profits in the handling of our goods—and in view of the subsequent collapse of the buying markets of the world, no one can honestly think that reciprocity would have stood up for two minutes against the farmers' bloc in the United States, who are now getting what they want in the way of concessions.

I am honestly and genuinely interested, Mr. Speaker, in such an arrangement of the tariff of this country as will help the people of Canada rather than the American exporter. We have a tremendous amount of unemployment and the solution of that problem ought to be the chief concern of our public men. Many of our artisans, good workmen, men entitled to a job, are out of work, and we are still importing in excessive quantities things that these men could make and ought to have the opportunity to make. It is true that as the result of a campaign carried on last year, the carnival of outside buying has diminished. What are we to say to the workers of this country when the fact is that during the past five years our purchases from the United States have been $1,700,000,000 in excess of our sales to

them? Are we to say to them that it is our intention so to arrange our financial affairs that that enormous amount shall be still further increased? If any word of mine can have the slightest influence on behalf of the Canadian workingman or can benefit in the least degree the Canadian home, I have no apologies to offer, Mr. Speaker, for the length of my address.

On the motion of Mr. Irvine the debate was adjourned.

PRINTING, LIBRARY, AND RESTAURANT OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker informed the House that a message had been received from the Senate communicating to the House the names of the senators appointed to act on behalf of the Senate on the Joint Committees of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, the Library and the restaurant.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.

Monday, March 20, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the Session, resumed from Friday, March 17.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sympathy that I refer to the absence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) from the House, especially when we consider the cause, the regrettable death of his brother. I am sure that the deepest sympathy of this whole assembly will be with him in his bereavement.

I have, along with other hon. members, I am sure, concurred in the congratulations that have been extended to yourself, Mr. Speaker, and therefore, it is not necessary to reiterate them. But I wish to congratulate the Government on being the Government. It might have been the Opposition. I wish to congratulate the Opposition on being the Opposition, because it might have been the Government. And, then, I wish to congratulate the Progressive group for the extraordinary position which they hold in this assembly. I think we may say that we have here, in tableau, that famous philosophic formula of Hegel. He attributes all progress to three factors, and we have them here. On the right of Mr. Speaker, we have the "thesis." On the immediate left of the Speaker, we have the "antithesis," and then along this side we are hoping we shall have a "synthesis." Of course, there can be no real progress until we reach an equilibrium between the two contending forces, and then we are in hopes that the Progressives will make the synthesis which will make the progress.

I do not think I would be justified in contributing to the prolonging of this debate if, by any chance, hon. members who preceded me had dealt with the two points which I am now going to take up before the House. This opportunity of expression comes to all of us as a traditional inheritance through our parliamentary system of government and it affords, in some instances, an exultant hour for doing so. Already two parties, striving for power, have had an opportunity to show their prowess. Already we have seen the war-scarred leaders of the past campaign flash their gleaming sabres of repartee across the old historic battleground, and nobody killed, so far as I have been aware; but, at least, each has done his best to establish the traditions of the party to which he belongs. Others of us, those who happen to be celebrating our political birthday, the first one by the way, and also those who are venerable in the service in this House, have received this opportunity as a means of giving our old hustings speech a much-needed airing. But perhaps the greatest pleasure which is afforded by this means of expression which comes to us on the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, is the opportunity to give expression to ideas which, under a different parliamentary system, might possibly be our contribution towards the legislation of this country.

The Speech from the Throne must, of necessity, deal more or less with generalizations, and one is never too sure about agreeing whole-heartedly with generalizations, especially when we recognize that these deal very largely with matters of administration, and are really not legislative matters at all. For instance, in the Speech, we have talk of the good time that is coming bye and bye. I have no fault to find with the good time; I hope it is coming and that it is not so far off; but I have my doubts about that. We are told that foreign markets are being negotiated for. That is another matter

that is in the hands of the administration itself. We are told that the responsibility for unemployment will not be assumed by the Government. We are told also that a postal conference has been arranged between the United States and Canada—another matter that has already been dealt with. We are told that the delegates have been chosen for the conference at Genoa—another matter that has been already dealt with. Then, we have two co-ordinations, one of the Government railway system—another matter which is largely administrative, as was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen)—and one of the Defence Department, another mater of administration. We are to have some change in the tariff. We are not told whether that change is upwards, or downwards, or sideways; but it is to be some kind of a change. Then, perhaps, something is to be done with freight rates. That is a summary of what is contained in the Speech from the Throne. In so far as there are legislative matters in this, and giving to it the most generous interpretation, I find myself in agreement with a good deal; but I also find myself in disagreement with some parts which I will mention before I have finished my remarks. I am, however, more particularly concerned with some things that are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, so upon these things I will, more or less, concentrate my effort.

Of course, we all have matters of paramount importance; their paramount importance and their urgency depend, of course, upon who is talking about them; but with me there are two matters of paramount interest which, so far, have not been brought before the House. The first is the necessity for the readjustment of this govermental institution in keeping with the changes that are reflecting themselves in the various groups which we have in this House; and the second is to find food, clothing and shelter for people who, we are assured by the Government's statistician, have actually produced about twice as much of these things as they are permitted to use. The first is a political question, and I feel constrained to deal with it because the difference betweeen this House to-day and any previous parliament rests in the fact that we have some new political alignments and political expressions that are represented here directly as a result of what we may call a political revolt against the party system of government. If that political revolt was necessary on the hustings, and if it has already taken place in many constituencies throughout Canada, it is just as necessary that it should take place in this House. So that it is well that some emphasis should be placed on the importance of this question.

The other question concerns a pressing industrial problem which we can scarcely afford to pass by without serious consideration. I believe that we are to-day face to face with a new social order, and I think fundamental economic and political reconstruction of society is imminent. The evidence of this is found in what is commonly termed "unrest," and surely there is sufficient unrest, not only in Canada but throughout civilization, to make us pause and inquire into the meaning of it. On consideration we find that we are doing to-day in Canada and in other parts of the civilized world, precisely what the world has done many times previously in its history: society is seeking to accommodate itself to the new developments in life, industrially, socially, politically, and otherwise. This unrest of which we hear so much is, therefore, nothing new, although people seem to fear it; it is only a repetition of what has occurred at other periods of the world's history. We might go back in imagination to the time when society was in its plasmic form, when the individual first passed into the tribal state. There must have been unrest at that time, though, manifestly, not to the same extent as there is to-day, because the conditions of society were so much more plastic. When that tribal society passed into the state, involving slavery there was another period of unrest; and when slavery gave way to feudalism the same disturbance was repeated. And the same is true in regard to the replacing of feudalism by capitalism or individualism. Now, if we were to conclude that society, as it exists at present, had reached the ultimate stage of its evolution, that we were to stop here and go no further, then I should be at a loss to explain the meaning of this unrest. If, however, we come to the conclusion that society is still upon the march and that we are at the present moment at the intermediate stage between individualism and some other type of society, then we must ask the question: Shall not this Government seek to mould this political institution of Parliament which I presume does represent to a very large extent the industrial development of the country to the inevitable changes that we are witnessing, in such a manner as to make it work as smoothly and with as much justice to all parties as possible? To speak of mak-

ing any modification in our parliamentary system may, to some minds, smack of irreverence or lack of appreciation of our British constitutional system. But let me hasten to say that it is really out of the profoundest respect for the best spirit of our British system of government that I am going to put forward my proposal.

The greatness of the British constitution, it may be said, lies in the fact that it is not fixed; that is, it possesses the elasticity of life. It has that most necessary quality, adaptation; and it has always in the past been able to accommodate itself to the changes that have taken place in industrial life. It is not, of course, like the American constitution, which is more or less fixed. That constitution is very much in the nature of a political yardstick. It is brought out from time to time, and the people are virtually told: you must not cut off more, or less, political cloth than you were told to do by Washington. The British constitution as it has been well described by someone, is a constant progress "from precedent to precedent." We shall not therefore find ourselves violating the great principle of the British constitution in seeking to secure modifications of our present parliamentary system to accommodate changes in our own political life. Someone—I believe it was one of our lady politicians in Canada, not, by the way, the lady member of this House (Miss Macphail)—has asked the question, what has made Great Britain great? In answer to her own question she said pratically this: In every great crisis of the nation's history, Great Britain has always possessed men of sufficient vision and sufficient courage to see coming changes and to make them before revolt forced the issue; and in that, she said, is to be found Britain's greatness. Now, every system, whether of government or of economics, has sprung from some fundamental human need; but we know also that systems which at one time possessed qualities of great value and which have served well in the past, through generations have become an actual hindrance to progress. Sometimes institutions have got so much out of touch with actual life that they stand in the way. If therefore systems and institutions spring from fundamental human needs, we must recognize that such needs are the paramount things to be considered, and that no system at any time must take precedence to human interest. Systems have been made by men for men, and this boasted system of ours was also made by men to meet human needs; and there is no good reason why we should not make it better if we can, or modify it so as to suit our own purposes and serve our own time better than it is capable of doing as at present constituted. Systems that have continued after having ceased to be of the greatest usefulness have the tendency to mould men after their cast-iron fashion rather than to recognize the principle that men should modify systems. And that, by the way, seems to me to be just about what this Government wants to do. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has said on the floor of the House that he had made an offer to the Progressives that they should have an opportunity, if they desired it, of securing representation in the Government; but he added the proviso that this must be upon the condition that they should cease to be Progressives, and become Liberals, whatever that might mean. That is exactly what I am complaining about: it is a system seeking to modify the representatives of the House to its regulations, rather than recognizing the right of representatives to modify the system to suit themselves.

There is the difference; the Government like any other institution, must be a developing organism, inasmuch as we happen to be a developing people—humanity itself is a developing organism, if we may consider it as a unit. Therefore, this Government must keep pace with the people which it seeks to serve, and it must be prepared to meet with the ever-increasing complications of our industrial system. Look for a moment at the principle of development. That principle has been stated for us most admirably by Herbert Spencer in his "First Principles." You remember how he traces for us the trail of that principle as it goes through, first of all, the material universe. He takes us through that universe from the time when it was a whirling orb of fire in space to the time when it began to sustain living organisms, and on to the highest achievements of man in art and in social institutions. And the principle which goes through all those processes and systems is this—a movement from the simpler to the complex and from the indefinite to the definite.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, to show that we are in harmony with the very principle of development itself, I would draw the attention of hon. members to the complicated political situation which we have

here. In the first place, I want to speak of the group sitting to your right, which represents the Government; and it is sitting there because it happens to be the largest group. It happens to be so for a number of reasons, chief of which is that we have a system of voting which makes it very difficult for us to receive the proper expression of the will of the people at the ballot box, and if the figures given by the late Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) be correct, the Government represents about 41 per cent of the popular vote. But I am not quarrelling with that at all. They are the Government because they happen to have the largest group in this House, and they represent in my opinion—the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) notwithstanding—the financial interests of this country primarily, but having, naturally, the desire that all the rest of us have to do the very best they can by the rank and file of the people as well. Of course, they have vociferated loudly against that charge, and some of them have actually risen to the point of oratory and punctuated their sentences with that much abused word, democracy, and told us that they seek to represent everybody. Well, democracy, no matter whether the term be used by hon. gentlemen on your right, Sir, or by those on your left, in popular parlance simply means an attenuated diaphanous nothing. As a matter of fact, the Government must take to itself the stigma which the hon. leader of the Opposition has placed upon them of being the representatives of the big interests. Then we look to the group which forms the so-called official Opposition, and I think we may say that they also when in power represent the big interests. They are what we might call to-day the politically unemployed, and are waiting their opportunity to serve the same interests, primarily that the present Government will serve. The third group is composed of representatives of the organized farmers. The fourth group—well, I must not forget the Independents, because I believe an hon. member stated that he was an Independent, that there were some others whom he described as half-Independents, and still others who were near-Independents. So, presumably, we have there also the nucleus of a group.

But that brings me to the consideration of the group for which I have the honour to speak this afternoon—the Labour group. We are very small, and for several reasons.

[Mr. Irvine.]

We are small because the great body of Labour has not yet been swung into political action; we are small also because the system of voting by means of which the present government holds power with 41 per cent of the total votes polled has prevented us through its gerrymandering from receiving the Labour vote that has been cast; then, again, we are small because of the way we are accustomed to measure things by so many tons avoirdupois, so much displacement, or by so many heads. If we are to measure that way we shall not make much of an impression on this House. However, I wish to state that the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) is the leader of the Labour group—and I am the group. But even if we are small, I should like to say, without any presumption whatsoever, that a small living seed, however small it may be, is greater than a dead trunk, however bulky it may be.

But the point to be made in this analysis is that each group represents a definite economic interest, and it is really futile to vociferate to the contrary. Each group has the right to be here and to make a contribution to the government of this country, and I am speaking in favour of the idea of so modifying our parliamentary system as to permit each group to make that contribution in a manner that will be satisfactory to itself and serviceable to Canada. The complex nature of this House is, as I have just intimated, evidence of the political betterment which corresponds to the nature of the economic structure of the state. Moreover, it is merely a replica of that which we find throughout the provinces. We find four or five groups in every provincial legislature; we observe the same tendency in Great Britain; we find some six groups in the parliament of South Africa; we find numerous groups in the parliaments throughout the various countries of Europe, each one reflecting that industrial development which has taken place during the last century.

These new factors mean a progressive readjustment of our political institutions in harmony with the economic life of the state. They must also be in harmony with the law of life generally; and that law, as stated by another authority, is that the internal must change to correspond with external changes. If that correspondence be not met, then there cannot be the fullest life. Therefore if this Parliament is to function in the highest interests of our people, it must find some way of modifying itself to correspond with the changes which

I have referred to as having taken place in the constituencies outside. Our parliamentary system prohibits us from taking, as groups, any real active part in the government. We have a parliamentary system which presupposes only two parties. In other words, our system puts us in the position of a farmer who has equipment for a two-horse team; by and by he gets another team and he has four horses, just as we have four groups; but not having the equipment for those extra horses they just stand in their stalls and eat oats —they do not do anything. That is the position in this House to-day. We have four groups, but we are working under a two-party system, with the result that the other two groups have little opportunity of making that contribution to the government of the country of which they are capable.

I would like to draw attention to this also: strangely enough, the 117 members who sit at the right of Mr. Speaker have generously undertaken to assume all the responsibility for the government of all the people of Canada, permitting the 117 who sit to the left of Mr. Speaker to go scot free, without any responsibility, without any regard to policy, and to become carping critics. Indeed, in some instances the 117 to the left of Mr. Speaker will do their best to hinder the other 117 from doing their work. That is the situation as I see it.

With regard to the selection of the Cabinet; with regard to the administration of the civil service and all appointments pertaining thereto; with regard to legislation itself, the Government has picked the pack and left the House to play with the rags. We may not enjoy playing with the rags, but it is all we have to play with at the moment. The procedure, then, would seem to drive representatives of Labour or members of the Progressive party either into the camp of the Opposition or into the camp of the Government. In other words, there is a refusal to recognize that there should be a place for such a person as a Progressive or such a person as a Labour man. As has been stated by the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Crerar) and also by the leader of the Labour group (Mr. Woodsworth), we are here to co-operate; that is the principle upon which we wish to work. But co-operation is not a give-away game; there must be some reasonable basis for co-operation, and it is in the hope that some such reasonable basis will be laid that I am dealing with this subject. For instance, an issue develops here; something is advocated by the Government which Progressives or Labour men cannot support, and we have to choose between the defeat of the administration and the principle involved in the issue. Now, I as a Labour representative, have no interest in bringing about the defeat of the Government. I do not want to see this Government defeated; on the contrary, I want to see it hold on and do good work for the people of Canada. I have at least some confidence in it; I believe it is sincere and that it is going to try to do some good work. But when an issue develops in respect of which we differ from the Government in principle, we shall be forced to follow the principle involved in the issue; and then, as I understand the ordinary parliamentary practice, if the measure involving the Government policy is defeated by a vote of this House, the Government is bound to resign. To my mind, that is not a sound practice as things are to-day, and it should not be continued. I would like to see not only the Labour and the Progressive representatives but also hon. members on the Government side quite free to vote upon any issue according to its merits and without any thought of saving the Government.

So far as the hon. Prime Minister has taken cognizance of the political developments to which I have referred, he has used it as a basis to re-establish the party system on psychological grounds. In his able article which appeared in Maclean's Magazine just before the beginning of the campaign he sets forth the philosophy of partyism on psychological grounds. Summarizing his theory with regard to the matter, I would say it is this: that we are born Grits or Tories, it is a matter of fixedness of mind, and these peculiar manifestations which take the form of Progressive, Labour and Independent are the result only of conditions brought about through the psychology of the war. These, he says, will pass away and we shall settle back to the two types of mind,—Grit and Tory. Well, if that is true, then we have removed the political struggle of the centuries from the field of economics, from the field of politics, even from the field of psychology, and have brought it into the field where it is nothing more than a contest in fecundity. That is, if you are ever going to defeat the Liberal Government, more little Tories will have to be developed. That is the argument he has put forward. But as a matter of fact, the party system does not rest upon psychological grounds, although psy-

chology is always involved. If you go back to the history of the parties you will find that their origin rested upon a very definite economic basis. If you go back about two hundred years you will come to the beginning of this "grand old party" system of which we hear so much boasting and of whose glorious traditions we are frequently reminded. And what were those beginnings? At the beginning of the industrial period a few old feudal lords who were able to survive the catastrophe of the passing away of feudalism, wishing to retain at least some of the power which they had enjoyed, organized a party called the Tory party. The word "Tory" meant in those days "bog-trotter". Then, at the dawn of the industrial period, certain others challenged the right of these Tories to have all the political power, and their party was called "Whig"—a Scotch word, which by the way, means "soor dook"— sour milk, if you please. Both these parties did excellent work; through many centuries they struggled with a great deal of sincerity. They made a splendid contribution to democratic government; they have been largely responsible for arousing in the people of this age a deeper desire for that greater democracy which is reflected in the principles of the Progressive and Labour groups in this House. But we must not stop there. There were only two parties at that time because there were only two conscious economic classes. But if there had been six economic classes two hundred years ago, would our ancient forefathers have had a two-party system of Government? I hardly think so; I think they would have established a six-party system of government. So to-day we have this complicated political system reflecting industrial development, and we are called upon to do for the twentieth century what our forefathers did for the centuries that have preceded us,—to modify the system of government in such a way as to make it practicable for Labour groups and Farmer groups to co-operate with any other kind of group in the best interests of this country. That is the plea I am trying to make; and in that connection I suggest—for it can only be a suggestion, of course,—that the Government move in that direction by not considering the defeat of a Government issue the defeat of the Government. That is not asking for very much,—and by the way, it might come in very handy sometimes for the Government, because it is not very strongly established as party governments go. We have just had, in the resignation of the Manitoba government, an instance of the operation of this objectionable principle. There, a Liberal government was in power, although it was in the minority. If such an arrangement as I suggest had been effected there, they might not have been voted out of office; but situated as they were they could not adopt any courageous policy; they had to move along very cautiously, and, as a matter of fact, did not do very much of anything. Remove that condition of defeat when a government measure is voted down, and hon. members will be free to deal with the various issues coming before them according to their merits. It might also help to do away to some extent with what is called the "official" Opposition. The "official" Opposition is rather a strange thing to those of us who have been witnessing it in operation for the first time. Of course there is a psychological justification for opposition. It is admitted that what we call "opposition" is a factor in progress. But such opposition, if real, is always based upon a fundamental difference in principle. Viewed in this light, opposition is inevitable as long as the human mind is limited and has to deal with infinite problems. But I know of no place either in the world of matter or in the biological world where opposition exists for its own sake, except in parliament, and there we do find it established seemingly for its own sake. We do not need to cultivate that opposition which is justified by progress. That is a spontaneous thing; it springs from the very nature of the issue itself. Moreover it is constructive, because its ultimate aim is the discovery of the truth. But the opposition as we know it to-day is more or less of a crude burlesque of that psychological opposition which we find inseparable from a consideration by finite minds of infinite problems, and the Oppositions of parliament have one by one degenerated into a cantankerous negation more intent on casting slurs on the administration than upon cultivating a positive body of opinion. They are more anxious usually to gain power by sophistry, innuendoes and destructive criticism than by demonstrating their ability to have power by their wisdom. They seek power more through the weakness of the government than through their own strength. And, remember, I am not referring to the present Opposition in that regard. The present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was Prime Minister of this country not so very long ago, and the present Government was then the Opposition, and it must be

said that the leader of the Opposition had, when Prime Minister, perhaps the heaviest task that has ever fallen upon the shoulders of a Canadian statesman. What did we find at the time? The artificial political alignment that supported him collapsed, industry stopped to breathe after its great war effort. Thousands of returned men were coming home to civil life, themselves a problem, and constituting another problem by intensifying the struggle in the industrial field. The state had been bled white financially, and, worst of all, the enthusiasm of the people was dead; but notwithstanding all these difficult conditions he had to face, the Prime Minister of that day had to contend with a carping, critical Opposition that passed no opportunity whatsoever to use any idea that could be used either by innuendo or otherwise for political purposes. I am not criticising that Opposition for being in opposition; that is the nature of this thing we call opposition; both they and the Government were doing excellently well what they were supposed to do. But I am speaking against the thing itself. I am not referring to any personal action. Personality has little to do with the governmental structure other than as it governs the responsibility of individuals to conditions which they cannot control unless the source from which they spring is altered.

We have had some very brilliant passages-at-arms in this debate between the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, but as I have already indicated, that amounts to little. The people of this country are not interested in that kind of thing. We are not interested as to whether the leader of the Opposition has discovered that the Prime Minister is saying something in this House different from what he said during the campaign;—if he is, that is a matter for congratulation. Nor, on the other hand, are we at all worried if the Prime Minister has discovered that the leader of the Opposition has changed his mind since the Speech from the Throne several years ago; for that, too, would be a matter for great congratulation. So what seem to them matters of serious crime are matters of great congratulation for the people generally. Moreover, I have noticed that the Government insists upon rubbing it in that the leader of the Opposition is a bad loser. Well, there is another virtue, and that is not to talk too loudly about a little victory you may have secured, and I think that might fit the Government about as well as the charge which they make against the leader of the Opposition. But, after all, these things do not really matter. I think it was Bentham who wrote in the eigtheenth century, "A man of talents should use them for his country in every way in which he can be serviceable." I therefore would suggest that the undoubted talent which the leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister of this country possess should be used by them in a patriotic sense, that is, on the great questions that are confronting the Canadian people at this time. I would like to see their keen intellectual powers of analysis centered upon such questions as the national debt, our paralyzed industrial life, unemployment, and the co-operative social order that is dawning.

Before passing from this subject, I want to say that I believe that any Opposition as we have it to-day is a very dangerous thing, because it seeks to undermine the confidence of the people in all forms of government whatsoever. We have had some manifestations of that desire in the past few years both in Canada and Great Britain. There have been people who said "We do not believe in any kind of government". Why did they say that? Surely, if all that is said by oppositions of governments, and all the charges made by governments against oppositions are to be believed, it is no wonder that the rank and file of the common people should have a very low concept of government. So, I want to say that in my opinion the opposition tactics in our party system are doing more to undermine the respect and confidence of the people in any kind of government than any other institution in the Dominion of Canada.

Belloc in his "House of Commons and Monarch" tells us that the House of Commons is an aristocratic institution, but that aristocracy has ceased to be aristocratic and the people have lost their awe and worship of the aristocracy, which really constitutes the basis of the system. This Parliament might be described as in some sense an oligarchy with a democratic visiting card which it presents once in every four years, but even if we dignify it by the name of a democracy, we might take a good hint from Belloc and realize that if we continue to use this kind of tactics we shall disgust the people even with democracy, and they will not want to continue an institution of this kind. Moreover, we find that the spirit which is generated by the antagonism of party-

ism is not the best kind of spirit. The Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), towards the close of his address the other day, made a plea for co-operation or unity. While I noticed that the hon. gentleman took shelter behind the old feud between the provinces in answering the charges of the Opposition, nevertheless, I think the plea which he made was very timely.

I want to make a plea for co-operation. Let us get over this cantankerous negation of oppositions, and let us make it possible for every one to make a contribution and assume some responsibility for the deliberations of this Parliament. I believe that co-operation can be worked in parliament just as it is working in the great industrial system. I believe in co-operation in government, because it is already working unconsciously in the industrial field. I believe in co-operation in government because the fact of interdependence between the industrial life of the nation and international life is one of the most significant facts of modern history. We have been forced to co-operate through the industrial process of our time, and we are also being forced to co-operate in government by the political necessities of our time.

I want to speak now of the next question, which is that of the food, clothing and shelter of our people. We have already produced twice as much as we are permitted to consume. You will remember the problem as it was stated so admirably and so graphically by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). He gave us something of the extent as well as of the intensity of this problem of unemployment, and he advanced, among other things, the consideration that organized labour throughout Canada has endorsed, some scheme of unemployment insurance chargeable to the industries of the country. We emphasize that because it is a necessity at this time. We do not recognize that it embodies an ultimate solution of the problem. But inasmuch as the governments—Dominion and provincial, as well as municipal—are to-day handing out for no service, doles which corrupt those who give and corrupt those who receive, it might be as well if some insurance scheme were developed which would place upon the shoulders of the Government the responsibility of finding work for those people who to-day are receiving doles for doing no work. I will not, however, traverse the ground which my hon. friend covered; I will take up this problem from a slightly different angle. I would like to say that I was very much disappointed with the statement in the Speech from the Throne that this Government considers it to be the duty of the municipal and provincial governments to look after the unemployed. I want to say in that connection that a mere statement in the Speech from the Throne is not sufficient to throw off the shoulders of the federal government the responsibility for unemployment which grows out of the industrial system of this country. The unemployment situation is but the fruit of a tree, the roots of which reach to the very subsoil of our national economic system. Unemployment is a permanent thing as long as the present system exists. In this connection I wish to quote very briefly from one who ought to know what he is talking about in this regard; I am going to quote an excerpt from the report of a commission of the Ontario Government of which Sir John Willison happened to be the chairman:

> The result of their enquiries has impressed on your Commissioners most forcibly the fact that the depression, which occurred in 1914 and 1915, was but a phase of the movement alternating between inflation and depression, which is a characteristic feature of modern industry. A false sense of security should not blind the business world, in times of thriving trade, to the fact that wide-spread unemployment is likely to recur in future.

Seemingly, this is a recurring defect in our system, and we have to find out where that defect resides. What is the situation to-day? Let us confine our inquiry for the moment to Canada. There is somewhere a chronic defect in the industrial machinery. We find on the one hand that great industrial enterprises are on the very borders of collapse; we find that industrial strife is rampant; we find that unemployment is extensive and exists throughout the Dominion. Employer and employee, producer and consumer, alike are dependent on the industrial machine provided for the individuals of the nation by producing goods as, when and where required. This is, of course, the accepted purpose of industries, namely, to produce goods that will meet the needs of humanity. But production for money has in some ways superseded the production for the supplying of human need. In this substitution of a secondary aim, we find the cause of our industrial chaos.

4 p.m.

Now, let us look more definitely at this problem. Will anyone say, will any hon.

member of this House say, that our factories are idle in Canada to-day because there is no demand for our goods? Will anyone say that our factories are idle because we have not sufficient raw material or sufficient plant to produce goods? Will anyone say that our factories are idle because we have not got the men to put in them to produce goods? In so far as demand goes—and I think you will agree with me that demand is one of the first necessities to any industrial enterprise—I question whether it was ever greater in the history of Canada than it is at the present time. The population as a whole would seem to be desirous not only of maintaining its present standard of living, but of raising it wherever possible. For the desires of Labour men have long since passed the mere asking for a greater wage; they are asking to-day for a fuller life, for the means of education, for the development of every potentiality which they possess. Not only so, but it is safe to say that there is an actual demand, through under-consumption in our home market to-day, for about twice as much as we are now consuming. The housing condition is a case in point. It has been estimated by a joint conference of the building and construction industries of Canada which was held, I think, in Ottawa, in May, 1921, that we need 158,000 new houses. Now, that was some time ago. Just take into consideration the increased need through marriages and immigration, and I do not think it is overstating the facts to say that to-day we need at least 200,000 new houses in Canada. With a need such as that, with the necessity for 200,000 new houses, we have 200,000 men walking the streets of our cities without work. On the other hand we have unlimited supplies of natural resources and sufficient plant to convert these natural resources into commodities necessary for the building of these houses. Yet the factories are idle, men are idle, and we have not got the houses. Clearly, then, the paralysis of industry in Canada is not due to lack of demand; it is not due to a lack of natural resources; it is not due to a lack of plant; it is not due to a lack of people to operate these plants; but it seems to be due to a lack of finance, to a lack of financial credit if you wish. If that is not what it lacks I would like the members of this House, and particularly the Government, to take this question up and tell us what is lacking. Surely it is time that somebody discovered what is lacking. At the very least, we cannot afford to pass the problem by without studying it. It is here for us to solve, it is pressing, it is important; and so if what I have stated is not what is lacking it might be well if someone would come and tell us what is lacking.

The former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) spoke to us several hours but failed to touch on this question. I was in hopes that he would give us his views upon such a thing as the gold standard and the futility of trying to restore it; I am still in hopes that the present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) will give us that information, that we may know whether it is worth while chasing that ancient rainbow, trying to catch up with the credit system which seems to recede from us two steps for every one we are able to move towards it; and that we may try to find out whether there is anything wrong with the system of credit. In this connection I would like to quote to you very briefly from the statements of some men who presumably would know something about the unemployment phase of industrialism in its relation to the credit system. The Premier of Great Britain has declared that "Credit is the oxygen of trade." Professor Gustav Cassels, the eminent Swedish political economist, has denounced the deflation system, the withholding of credit facilities from trade and industry, and says:

> This policy is responsible in great measure for unemployment and world trade stagnation.

Sir Peter Rylands, President of the Federation of British Industries, declares:

> Another direction in which some relief might be found would be provided by an increase in the purchasing power of the community.

Sir William Beveridge, Director of the London School of Economics has asserted that

> —the ultimate cause of unemployment lay in the credit system.

Sir Auckland Geddes, speaking before the Canadian Bar Association told a story of a Scottish friend of his who had ventured into this field of inquiry, and who, after very extensive study, came to a conclusion, which he gives in the following words:

> I believe we'd be rid o' a' this trouble if people would only realise that money is a metaphee-sical obstruction, and not a reality.

But if, as these men of great standing say, credit is the breath of life to industry, if it has the power to bring world organizations and industry to stagnation, if it has the power to throw hundreds of thous-

ands out of employment, then even though it be a metaphysical obstruction, or even though it be a mere accounting system upon the books of the world, it is a question of sufficient importance to engage the attention of this House, and to call forth, for the information, not only of this House, but of the people of Canada, all that financial experts in our midst may have; first-hand information, given to us in such a way that it may be understood.

The present industrial plight, as we have seen, is not caused by a lack of demand; it is not caused by lack of raw materials, or plant, or equipment, or people to work. What then is the cause? I assert that it is the credit system. The present credit system has failed, seemingly, in its proper function, which is to link together, in some way, the needs of the people with the productive powers of the people, and the credit system lies, too, at the very base of our industrial pyramid. But there is some element of profundity that surrounds the study of credit. We are shoo-ed away from any attempt to find out anything about the banking system, and it is assumed that the ordinary layman should never dare to attempt to sound the unfathomable depths of this wonderful system of finance. As a matter of fact that may be very true, but we find that people, nevertheless, are beginning to challenge it. There is, of course, great difficulty in finding the proper information. Credit, being of a basic character, its nature is not easy to discover. Moreover, it involves a great deal of technical study which the common citizen wishes to dodge if he possibly can. Nevertheless, the credit system has received a challenge. Organizations throughout Canada are studying it now to the best of their ability. I have in my hand a resolution which I desire to read to the House, merely for the purpose of sustaining this point, that credit has received this challenge, that great organizations today are making it a subject of study, and that, in spite of the quietness and oblivion into which it has been thrown, they are going to find out about this thing. This is a resolution passed at the annual convention of the United Farmers of Alberta, and although it is, perhaps, a little more lengthy than the other quotations which I have given, I will read it simply to show hon. members that these people are thinking about this system. I am not saying that they have the right idea in this resolution; I simply say that they are on the trail of the idea, and that some day they will find it:

Resolved that the United Farmers of Alberta request their elected representatives at Ottawa to present a bill to the House of Commons for enactment having for its object the establishment of a loan department along the following lines:

1. That the Treasury Board shall issue on the terms and for the purpose herein mentioned, full legal tender notes from time to time to meet the business requirements of the country;

2. That all such notes shall be legal tender for all and payable for all debts, public and private, and shall be a first lien upon all the assets and services of the people of the Dominion for their redemption, and all Dominion currency now issued shall be made full legal tender;

You see, it is technical.

3. That this money be loaned direct to the people at cost, on the following securities: Federal Bonds, Provincial Bonds, Urban and Rural Municipal Bonds, on improved, inhabited and used farms, the amount so loaned not to exceed a fixed margin of safety. The range of securities upon which loans are made to be gradually extended from time to time by statutory amendment as experience and development of the system shall warrant:

4. That upon the payment to the department of any loan, the amount of money so received shall be held in the department and either cancelled or used in making new loans to meet the requirements of the country. Preference in these loans to be given to those parts where interest rates are the highest.

5. That the earnings from the Loan Department from all sources after paying the conservative and legitimate expenses of the department and its branches, if such exist, shall be applied to the payment of the general expenses of the Government, thus reducing taxation upon the people.

You see, the question is up; it is the coming question; people everywhere are studying it, and we have demands for things such as national banks. Some people seek to repudiate the gold standard and to substitute for it hours of labour. We have again such means of exchange suggested as "time energy." There are a number of other suggestions, and I am going, just for a few minutes, to introduce into the House the principles of another system. I am not declaring this system is any better than the others; I am going to present its principles, simply in order that I may be permitted to make a certain request to this House with regard to proposals which I shall hereafter set forth.

Money has at least two functions,—although those of us who are expert financiers may find other functions for it. It is a medium of exchange and it has also a power to represent demand. This second power seems to be the greater or more

important of the two; and though there should be a definite relation between money and ability of production to fulfil demand, we find that no such relationship exists. We have criticisms levelled against it, not only because of the cost to the people, not only because of the manner of its issue, but because of the way in which it is controlled. The whole price of an article must cover wages, salaries and other dividends. Therefore, it cannot be expected that the wages of an individual can buy back what he produces, inasmuch as the price of the thing that he produces, includes his own wages, overhead expenses, cost of raw materials, and the dividends and profits of the operators. If your wages happen to be fifty per cent of the price of the article, you can obviously buy only fifty per cent of what you produce. Incidentally, that is exactly what we are doing in Canada. According to the figures of the Dominion Statistician, we are producing twice as much as we are permitted to consume. The demand is still great; but with the wages paid to us, we cannot buy back enough of what we have produced to meet our needs. The present system of credit is not, according to some people, the best thing for industry. The home market is, of course, determined by the amount of goods that the wages that are paid to the people at home can buy. If we can buy only fifty per cent of what we produce, our market is limited by fifty per cent. Consequently, we find our Government looking out for foreign markets, and this was stated in the Speech from the Throne. Where are we going to find them? Foreign markets do not come to us like driftwood, and are not picked up on the seaboard, foreign markets can be created only when we are able to increase the purchasing power of the people who live where those foreign markets are; because it is only by increasing the purchasing power of the people that you can enable them to buy from you. How does the Government propose to increase the purchasing power of the people of South Africa, of Europe, of China or of South America? I think it is more reasonable for us to hope that we might increase the purchasing power of the people of Canada. If we could enable the people of Canada to buy twice as much as they are now buying, we should have a very extensive home market. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was right, when during the recent campaign, he emphasized the necessity for developing home markets. Of course, I part company with him immediately when he says that we are to develop the home market by increasing the tariff. He will develop the home market by increasing the tariff, while, on the other hand, strangely enough, the Government will develop it by the opposite method of decreasing the tariff. Well, we can leave the two parties to fight that question out between themselves. Personally, I do not think it will make any difference to our markets whether we increase or decrease the tariff, because that is not really a fundamental economic question at all. It is, rather a most excellent political football, which has been kicked across the field of public opinion for forty years, with no effect in increasing foreign markets. Neither the Government that advocated an increase of the tariff, nor the Government that urged its decrease, has advanced the markets in this country very materially. So that we may be justified in looking in other directions for a market for the produce of Canadian workmen.

The greatest charge I have to make against the present Government is as regards the issue of credit money. It is not necessary to say that the banks to-day have a monopoly of the issuing of financial credits; and the credit is usually issued in the interests of the shareholders and not for the benefit of the country. It is also issued with an adherence to the gold standard and not on a proper economic basis. The volume of credit is created and issued by the banks irrespective of demand or ability to produce. Thus we in Canada to-day are really at the mercy of Wall Street, whether we realize it or not. We are manipulated by them, from booms to slumps, at their convenience. To remedy this I believe that some new system must be found; or perhaps there should be some reorganization of the old system,—that is for the Government to consider. I believe, that first of all, there must be a regulation of prices upon an economic basis. This would mean that prices would be determined by a correct ratio between total national production and total national consumption. At present, prices include cost of plant and overhead, materials, dividends, wages, etc. These expenses are charged and are paid always by the consumer,—there is no one else to pay them. Prices therefore could be reduced by the amount of capital expended in production, which expenditure could be made good to the capitalist by an issue of Government treasury notes. Such notes would represent the difference be-

tween the total cost incurred and the total price received. In this way prices would be reduced automatically without a loss to any private enterprise. The recognition of real credit as created by and belonging to the community must underlie any such proposition, and we therefore, of course, look upon credit in this respect as being a correct estimate of the ability to produce and deliver goods as, when, and where required. You will recognize in that statement the famous Douglas definition of credit, a system of credit which is being advocated by some very great authorities in the financial world at the present time. I am not, of course, setting it forth here, as the one inevitable way, but I mention it more in detail than I mention the others because it seems to me to be the most practicable; and I shall possibly look at the question further before I conclude.

There are two factors employed in real credit, namely, needs to be satisfied and ability to produce; and both producers and consumers are necessary in the creation of such credit. On this basis treasury notes could be issued periodically to represent real credit as it expands or contracts. There could not be any inflation such as was experienced during the war that would be checked by the regulation of prices. Such a system might be arranged on the principle of decentralized control. It would not operate properly in a bureaucratic system such as would likely be developed by government ownership. Government ownership is a very difficult thing. It is yet to be tested, and I have not very much faith in it whether in regard to railroads, or banks, or any other institutions. It may be a very good midway between individualistic control and any other form which might be in process of development. Government ownership might not do any more than transfer control from an efficient autocratic corporation to a less efficient and possibly bureaucratic state organization. But, by a proper decentralized system of controlling credit on the basis that credit is created by the community, belongs to the community, and should be operated by the community, it might be possible for organizations such as Boards of Trade, the Manufacturers' Association, the United Farmers, the organized Labour movement, the Great War Veterans' Association and similar bodies, to handle their own credit. But first we must realize what credit actually means and proceed to establish a system on that basis.

[Mr. Irvine.]

We should also require to have a national clearing house. In other words, a proper democratic system of credit should be organized, a system which would provide the greatest amount of local responsibility and control consistent with that measure of unity necessary to secure efficiency; in other words, a method which would combine the excellencies of individualism and of communism without involving the errors and weaknesses of either.

Let me put this system before the House by means of analogy. We hear much talk to-day of commonwealth; we have substituted the word "commonwealth" for the old term "empire." We are now known as a "commonwealth of free nations." As a matter of fact, however, we have no commonwealths to-day, but if we had a commonwealth there would be, I presume, an annual dividend of surplus national wealth to be divided amongst its citizens. That, of course, would be very Utopian, so Utopian that we can scarcely even mention it. But the Douglas system, to which I have referred, and which I would commend the House to study, would make it practicable to receive our dividend in the commonwealth in the form of reduced prices. One credit system is based on the idea that real credit is created by the community through its producing power and belongs to the community, by whom it should be operated. The other credit system assumes that credit should be created for and by a small group of financiers to be handled on the gold basis of value with a view to the shareholders' profits, and not in the interests of industry. The latter is our present system, and its central error is that it is not concerned with the production of goods but with the production of money. If you make credit facilities more available there follows an immediate inflation, which reduces purchasing power, as happened during the war. Under the system I mention, however, this would be impossible by reason of the regulation of prices on the basis of a correct ratio between the consuming power of the people and their producing power. The fixing of prices which we had during the war was not, of course, of the type which I referred to. That was more or less mechanical, and it left too much power—dangerous power—in the hands of a small commission. It was an annoyance both to manufacturers and retailers, and did not contribute a sufficient quota of good to recompense them for all their trouble. But there would be no dan-

ger in any such system if we could find a measure of local control such as I have suggested.

With regard to foreign markets in connection with our credit, inasmuch as we cannot create foreign markets, unless we can increase the purchasing power of the people of the countries with which we wish to trade, we had better turn our attention to our own markets. If we had control of our own financial credit it would be possible for us to do something to exploit these vast natural resources of which we have heard so much on the floor of the House already this Session. Take, for instance, our water powers. If we could develop those powers through a proper credit system and in a social way, it would be of very great benefit to our manufacturing interests. We are told that we must get more manufactories in this country. Very well, the only way, we have been told so far, is to try to reduce the wages of the labouring people in order that there may be cheaper production and a greater ability to compete in the foreign market. But it would be a far better way if we developed our water powers so that our manufacturers could produce so cheaply as to be able to sell their goods in all parts of the world; and the very fact of such cheap production here would attract other manufacturers to this country. That, in my view, is a much better way than that which we are pursuing at the present time.

We must recognize that the competition for trade among the nations of the world arises out of a false credit system which has no regard for the needs of the people or their producing power, but seeks to build up merely a money system, and promotes competition for world trade, which competition is really at the basis of every war, that thing the world is trying to get away from. In this connection I want to quote the words of President Wilson. In a speech at St. Louis in September, 1919, he said:

> Peace? Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here or any woman—let me say, is there any child—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? The war was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war. The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought that Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry.

Sir Auckland Geddes, addressing the Canadian Bar Association in this city last year, said:

> I believe rather that the war was a product of existing world unrest than that it is a cause, an effective cause, of the unrest which exists just now; for the war, if you cast back your memories, will appear as the climax of a period in which the relations between the nations were growing more difficult, and you will find also associated with that period of international unrest a period of unrest within the countries.

Inasmuch, then, as we have here not only the cause of unemployment, the cause of the disruption and paralysis of industry in our country, and the cause of international industrial strife leading to the great wars which we all deplore, I should like to suggest to the Government that a representative committee be appointed, composed of members from the Manufacturers' Association, the Retail Merchants' Association, the Organized Farmers' Association, the Labour forces of this country, and similar organizations, to investigate the present credit system, how it functions, its relation to modern industrialism, and if it is a contributing factor to unemployment. I would further suggest that that committee should also make the closest possible inquiry into all the systems, particularly the Douglas system, proposed in support of a credit system that would be economical, serviceable to democracy, and in the best interests of our industrial life. I believe the Bank Act comes up for revision next session. It would be a very excellent thing for the committee I have suggested to report very fully at that time, for surely whatever is done in amending that act must be done in the light of the fullest and best knowledge, and perhaps on this subject we as individuals are not so fully informed as we ought to be. I should like to see the best experts obtainable engaged to deal with the problems incident to our credit system, so that before the Bank Act is amended we may have the fullest possible information in our possession,—information which will enable us to solve the problem itself and so meet the pressing needs of the people. The Douglas system has been endorsed by such a recognized authority as Arthur Kitson, who was challenged by a committee of business men in Great Britain to produce some solution for the industrial problem in that country. That system has also been included in the Sydney University course in economics. Therefore, it is a system that

cannot be laughed out of court until we have had some chance of disclosing any weak fundamental points in regard to it, if that be possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a new Parliament, this is a new country, and this is a new age. I have advocated that we must first of all remodel our parliamentary institutions to the extent that there may be possible a basis of co-operation for all these new political factors which are a reflection of the industrial development of our time. That, surely, is not asking too much. Such a remodelling would be a good thing not only for this Government but for all governments. It would infuse some real meaning into our debates and enable us to treat fully on its own merits every issue that may come under discussion. I have also suggested that a committee be appointed to investigate what seems to lie at the very basis of our industrial troubles, namely, the credit system.

I am sure that we may place the most generous interpretation on the promise of the Government that it is going to do its very best to give us good government during its tenure of office. I am looking to it for a type of statesmanship which will be worthy of the new age in which we are living, but I am bound to say that in the Speech from the Throne there is no indication of that breadth of vision or of that courage which the people are looking for at this time. Vision to see the new path leading to a co-operative state, and courage to abandon the old path, are the two indispensable qualities of modern statesmanship. In his book, "Industry and Humanity," which I had the pleasure of reading some years ago, the Prime Minister has dealt to some extent with the problem that I have referred to, namely, the industrial problem, and in that title alone he has got the true relationship of the problem of industry, its relation to humanity. In this new government I hope there will be a decided movement towards the bringing of our industrial life into harmony with the great aim suggested in that book, and that our industry shall be run for humanity, and not for money as is the case to-day.

Might I conclude with a short quotation from the manifesto of the British Labor party, that great Magna Charta of modern times? It reads:

> We must insure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting but on fraternity—not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or brain—not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach toward a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world—not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject colonies, subject classes, or a subject sex, but in industry, as well as in government on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest possible participation in power both economic and political, which is characteristic of Democracy.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the hon. member (Mr. Irvine) in extending my personal sympathy, and, so far as I may, the sympathy of this House, to the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the bereavement that has come to him in the death of his brother.

The debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, particularly in a new parliament, is or ought to be a fair reflection of opinion throughout the country on the public questions of the day, and should, therefore, be helpful to the Government as regards both legislation and administration. I have given some attention to the discussion that has taken place so far, especially to the speeches which have been made by members of the group known as the Progressive party. In my judgment, the discussion has been creditable to these representatives: they seem to me to be sane, intelligent, practical men. No country has much to fear from men whose interests and investments are rooted in the soil. No country has much fear from men who own their own farms and till them. Hon. members of the Progressive party naturally look upon things from a western viewpoint, and we in the East perhaps, look upon things from an eastern viewpoint. But when we come together to discuss these matters freely and frankly, we shall, no doubt, arrive at satisfactory solutions of the problems which confront us.

Members of the Progressive party are sometimes accused of wishing to bring class legislation into operation. There may be something in that, but is class legislation an unknown thing in Canada? In my judgment, Sir, we have had class legislation in this country for forty years, and it has been advocated by very intelligent men. We had an exemplification some years ago of class domination. when the great trade arrangement of 1911 was made between this country and the United States. Undoubtedly the reciprocity agreement was in the interests of the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen, of this country; particularly was it in the interests

of the farmers. It was a trade arrangement which both political parties had expressed themselves in favour of and which nearly every public man—and private man, too—had endorsed. It was a better trade arrangement than we ever thought we could obtain. Yet certain class interests—largely in Ontario, though in some of the other provinces as well—selfishly, I think, and unfortunately, turned down that trade arrangement. If it had not been for the action of these classes at that time, possibly we would not have a Farmer's party in Canada to-day.

We have heard a good deal of discussion with regard to that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne relating to immigration. Several of the hon. members who have taken part in this discussion seem to approve of the idea that immigration of the right kind would be a great advantage. Prominent men outside of the House have also given expression to that view, notably the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The idea seems to be that it would be a very desirable thing for Canada if we could get men from Europe or from the United States to come here, take up land and increase our farming population. That would be immigration of the right kind, it is argued; and immigration of the wrong kind would be the incoming of mechanics, men accustomed to industrial pursuits, who would locate in our cities; and it would be the wrong kind of immigration because there is unemployment; there is not enough work for the men that we have. But is there no unemployment on the farms? Are farmers making money? Are they even making ends meet, either in the East or in the West? I think not. I know the conditions in the province from which I come; its people are almost entirely engaged in farming and fishing, and I endorse the statement that was made by an hon. gentleman on the other side a few evenings ago: that the farmers of this country are living on their capital and hoping that times will improve. Under these conditions, therefore, would it be desirable to bring into this country immigrants of the farmer class? I do not know, but it is a question that is open for consideration. If the output of our farms were increased by one-third or one-half, where would we find a market for our products? We might, perhaps, market more wheat than we are producing, but I do know that in respect of some agricultural products we cannot find a market now at any price. I speak particularly for the province from which I come. The climate and soil of Prince Edward Island are admirably adapted to the growing of potatoes. Last year we had no market whatever for our potatoes, we could not get five cents a bushel for them; the farmers had to haul them out and dump them in the fields. This year conditions are nearly as bad. I understand that in Western Canada some of the farmers did not thresh their oats last season because the price obtainable would not pay for the threshing and hauling to the railway station. Therefore is there room under present conditions for more farmers in Canada? Would it not be better if we tried to improve the conditions so that those already on the land would remain there and not flock to the cities as they are doing at the present time? The province from which I come is losing its population steadily, year by year, and decade by decade, and what the end will be is hard to say.

I heard the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), who is an apple grower, state in the House a few evenings ago that he was a strong protectionist, because the protection that he and his fellow-orchardists got on their apples enabled them to charge the men on the plains more than they could otherwise obtain. That is good sound protectionist doctrine; but is it fair to the other fellows? We in Prince Edward Island do not want any privileges in the sale of our potatoes. Indeed, we are anxious to meet the competition of the world, and if we had the privilege of sending our potatoes into the New England states free of duty we would consider ourselves a happy people. Our soil and climate are admirably adapted to the growing of potatoes, and we think we are just as capable, granted a fair field and no favour of raising what our climate and soil are adapted to as any other people in the world. We fear no competition. Now, why did my hon. friend from Yale and his fellow-orchardists need protection? Why were they not able to grow apples in competition with the states to the south? As I understand it, the soil of British Columbia is fertile, and the climate favourable for the growing of apples. The land is much cheaper than it is in the states immediately to the south, in Washington and Oregon, for instance, and I suppose my hon. friend would not deny that the people of British Columbia are the equal in intelligence and industry of their neighbours to the south. Then, why cannot they produce apples just as cheaply? There must be something wrong with Canadians if

they cannot meet fair and reasonable competition.

There is a reference in the Speech from the Throne to the extension of markets. I shall have to be a little local in some of my remarks on that subject in order to be practical. I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the fact that the markets we had a few years ago in the province of Prince Edward Island have been almost ruined under the late administration, partly through the legislation that was passed, but more particularly through the administration of the regulations enforced under that legislation. We had a trade in dressed meat with the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. We had also a trade in live cattle with these islands, and also with Newfoundland, until a regulation was put in force by one of the departments, under legislation, I suppose, preventing us from shipping outside of Canada any dressed meat of any kind unless it had been inspected by government inspectors. For a year or two after those regulations were put in force the Government had inspectors in some places, but lately that was done away with, and now we cannot get any inspection at all and the trade is being killed. It was quite customary for the people living in Newfoundland, where they do not raise agricultural products sufficient for their own use, to send their vessels to Prince Edward Island in the autumn and spring of the year, but particularly the autumn, to bring back agricultural products such as potatoes, turnips, oats and hay. They would also take back a few carcasses of dressed pork, a few of dressed beef, and perhaps a few of mutton. That was a trade that we carried on for years to the mutual advantage of both peoples. Nobody was injured by it; nobody was poisoned when we had no inspection. But when these regulations were put in force we could not carry on that trade. These vessels would come to the outlying ports and when there was no inspection the animals could be killed on the day the vessel sailed, or the day before, and with a fair wind the vessels would be back in their home ports in two or three days and the meat would arrive in good condition. But when the regulations were put in force the animals had to be inspected at Charlottetown, which was distant some fifty or sixty or seventy miles in some cases. That meant that the animals had to be killed several days before the vessel was ready to sail. There was also the additional expense of the freight to Charlottetown and back and the cost of inspection. You did not know what day the vessel was going to sail, as they would wait for a fair wind, and that increased the difficulties of carrying on this trade to such an extent that we are not carrying it on now.

Another business that we had which was very profitable to us was the canning of poultry. We have canning establishments on the island, and we raised large quantities of poultry and eggs, and disposed of a large quantity every year. Formerly, we could can the poultry and ship it to the United States, Newfoundland and other countries, but that trade has been stopped because everything has now to be inspected. We have now to send our poultry to the United States, to Boston, in carload lots, pay the duty, and get what we can for it, and they are carrying on there the canning business that we should be doing. We are a bureaucrat-ridden people. There are apparently men in the offices in Ottawa who think they know more about trade conditions than the men who are actually engaged in the business, and they put all kinds of foolish regulations into effect without considering the local conditions. I suppose that something may be said for these regulations in large centres such as Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton, where inspection of the larger slaughter houses can be easily carried on, but the trouble is that the men in the departments at Ottawa do not appear to take local conditions into account at all, and apply the regulations in a cast-iron way. I bring these things to the attention of the Government in the hope that better regulations will be devised.

These are the things that make life on the farm hard. There are other grievances. The manner in which the Income Tax Act is at present administered, as respects the farmers in some of the provinces, is almost intolerable. It is foolish; I think it is worse in our province than in any other part of Canada. Circular letters are sent out to the farmers from the Taxation office asking them to make a return respecting everything that is raised on the farm; they have to make a report on the quantity of butter, eggs, milk, cheese—everything they consume in their own families. Now farmers do not weigh their products or keep such accounts as will enable them to furnish the desired information. With our retail merchants trade is largely a mat-

ter of barter; and yet each merchant is required to keep an account of the name of every farmer, or every person, from whom he buys agricultural products, such as butter, cheese, eggs, pork, hay, oats, potatoes; and he must also furnish the post office address of the seller, state whether married or single, and give the price paid—details such as no ordinary retail merchant keeps. Yet he is threatened with all kinds of pains and penalties if he does not comply with the regulations and send in a report containing the desired information. What is the result? The country merchants, through a dread of being fined, make out bogus reports—they cannot do otherwise. It is alleged that these reports are desired for the purpose of checking up the transactions of the farmers, to see if they are making proper returns and whether or not they are liable for income tax. Some merchants have refused to make such reports and in consequence have been threatened with dire penalties. A number of farmers have also refused to do as requested; the reports demanded are so complex in character that it would really require a fairly proficient accountant to draw them up in such a way as to satisfy the taxation officer. I am convinced, Sir, that fifty per cent. of the additional taxes raised in this way would not be sufficient to pay the salaries of the men and women engaged in this inquisitorial work. It is, in my opinion, the most expensive method of raising revenue that could be devised.

Seeing that I have condemned the present method, it is only fair that I should be asked to suggest a better plan than now exists. I will do so willingly; I suggest to the Finance Minister that he increase the Sales Tax.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: I say, yes. The people of Canada have to raise a large revenue, and there is no question but that the simplest and most inexpensive way of doing so is through the medium of the Sales Tax. Considerable revenue is now derived from that form of taxation and it could be doubled without adding one dollar to the cost of collection. It is an easy matter for wholesale men to keep account of their turnover; they are doing it now and making returns to the Government of their sales, on which the tax is levied. It is a very easy matter to extend that system, because there would not be any book-keeping difficulties or any additional expense to the country involved. In any event, such a plan would be infinitely better than the present inquisitorial method of trying to get the farmers to make a return as to everything they produce and consume.

The other day an hon. member referred to the question of daylight saving, and I notice that there is a query on the order paper with respect to it. It seems to me that a daylight saving law is a very unwise thing. There is nothing to prevent persons in any part of the country from retiring and getting up an hour earlier, but why change the hands of the clock, why pretend that it is seven 5 p.m. o'clock in the morning when we know it is only six, or that it is six o'clock in the evening when we know it is only five? Such a procedure seems quite childish. In the country districts the day's work is not much more than half done at five o'clock; there is still a great deal of labour to be performed after that hour. Young men and young women in the country read or hear about the hours followed in the cities; they hear of men going fishing or shooting, going away to enjoy themselves in some way early in the afternoon when the sun is still high in the heavens, while they have to work hard. It makes them very much dissatisfied with their lot in life. They make up their minds to leave the farms, just as soon as they can get away from them. It is not a big question, but it is one of the things that make the young men and women in this country dissatisfied with farm life. It seems to be a foolish thing. In the province from which I come, conditions are such that I believe 25 per cent of the male population wish to leave the farms and to go to work for the Government, particularly to get into the railway service where eight hours constitute a day's work, and where, if you work for five or ten minutes after that, you get paid for an hour and a half, the wages being at the rate of time and a half for overtime. Young stationmasters along the line of railways in the country places leave their offices at three or four o'clock in the afternoon; their day's work is done, and they go away in their automobiles for a ride through the country. Every farm boy sees them, and he decides that, at some time or another, he is going to be a station master; he is going to get into the railway service; he is going to get time and a half when he works for a few minutes after hours. Those are the conditions that are making life on the farm difficult and dis-

tasteful at the present time, and until the occupation of farming is as profitable and conditions are just as agreeable on the farm as they are in other occupations, young men and women will leave the farms and flock to the cities, and immigration will not cure the evil.

I have listened to some speeches which have been delivered by hon. members representing Labour in this House, and anybody who has given any consideration at all to the subject, will admit that unions and brotherhoods have done a good deal for the manual labourers of this country and, indeed, of all countries. But is there not a possibility of carrying these things too far? Is there not a danger to democracy when men largely cease to think and act as individuals and think, act and vote in groups? I am afraid there is, and I am afraid we are travelling pretty far along that road at the present time. Unless men take into consideration all classes in the community, farmers, fishermen, miners, lumbermen, men engaged in the industries, and are willing to give to all hands fair-play, a fair deal and a square deal, democratic government is in some danger. I would commend these ideas to labour and railway unions and brotherhoods, in Canada.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member think the ordinary labour man, who is identified with a union, has lost his identity any more than a man who has $800 worth of stock in the Canadian Pacific or any other great commercial organization in this country?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not just prepared to answer that question. We are all selfish; unfortunately, man is a selfish animal; but, in my judgment, so long as we can think and act largely as individuals, in the moral order we are responsible and accountable for our individual actions; the same would apply largely to the political order, and in getting away from that, or, at least, far away from it, we are travelling a dangerous road.

A good deal has been said about the railway question, and I am going to say a very little upon the subject because we have not much information regarding it, and are promised more before the session closes. Both of the old historical political parties in this country, that is, the Conservatives and the Liberals, are blaming each other for there being too many railways in Canada. In my opinion, both parties are to blame. In this northern hemisphere, we have very serious geographical disadvantages. Somebody has said that Canada is nine provinces long and one province wide, and that description fits very well. In our railway building we have tried and, perhaps, honestly tried to overcome those geographical disadvantages; we have tried to trade east and west, and, perhaps, in trying to give depth to our country by building railways, we were doing what we believed to be a patriotic duty. We may have overdone it; but if we were trying to do a good thing; we are not so much to blame. We have to meet the situation as we find it. Anybody who gives the matter intelligent consideration, knows that our natural lines of trade are north and south; everybody who wants to see that, can see it just as well as Goldwin Smith saw it. But many of us have not the courage to say it, because we fear we shall be misrepresented if we do. If we cannot establish lines of trade north and south; we are tremendously handicapped in Canada just for that reason, and the effort made to build a railway to Hudson bay and to establish a line of trade through that sea with Europe is, in my judgment, impossible, but, nevertheless, it was a patriotic effort to give depth to our country. I do not think it can be made a paying commercial proposition, and whether or not we shall ever be able to overcome these natural disadvantages is a question.

In the province of Prince Edward Island, from which I come, we cannot trade except with the Maritime provinces. Confederation has been an injury to us. We cannot send our products to the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa and other places, because the farmers immediately surrounding those cities are able to supply their needs. We have to sell our products wherever we can find a market, in Europe or in the United States, and the tariff compels us to buy, at an enhanced price, in the manufacturing centres of the country, the things we need. Protection and Confederation may have been and, perperhaps are, good things for Ontario and parts of Quebec, perhaps all of Quebec, and other portions of the Dominion. We have to make the best of it, I suppose. But that is the condition of affairs, and when we hear our friends from the middle of the country complaining that we in the East and the people in the West are in favour of trade arrangements with the United States and are opposed to the principle of high protection, or of protection at all, I think

they would view things just as we view them if they were in our place.

Now, I want to say a word to my hon. friends from the West in regard to public lands and resources. This was discussed by some hon. gentlemen in this debate; and I heard one hon. member, I think my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), make the statement that when Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered Confederation they insisted on retaining possession of their natural resources and their public lands. Ontario and Quebec, of course, did the same, but they did not get a subsidy in lieu thereof. They did not get a cash subsidy as well; they were satisfied with the possession of their natural resources. Now if I understand rightly, when the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—particularly these two provinces—were formed, they were given their choice whether they would have their lands or a cash subsidy instead.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: They were not given that choice?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, they took the cash subsidy, anyhow. I am informed that they preferred the cash subsidy; but now, if my information is correct, they want both natural resources and cash subsidy. I put it to the hon. gentlemen themselves, would that be fair to the other provinces? I would refer to Prince Edward Island particularly, because that province has an especial claim. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation we had no lands. We never had any lands, because they were given away by the King to some favourites in England many long years ago, which gave rise to a great agitation against the absentee landlords, who were finally bought out. We were given a cash subsidy in lieu of public lands, because we were in an inferior position as compared with the other provinces of Confederation at that time. We were allowed a lump sum of $45,000, or about 50 cents per head of population. Manitoba came in a year after, I think, and in lieu of public lands was given the exact amount we were receiving, namely $45,000. Since then Manitoba's revenue has been increased two or three times, and the subsidy in lieu of lands has advanced proportionately. Our subsidy for the same purpose, on the other hand has never been touched. When Saskatchewan and Alberta come in some years later they were given a large subsidy in lieu of public lands, I believe about $1.50 per head of population, besides other payments as well for the erection of public buildings and for other purposes. Prince Edward Island, however, was left in the position she had held in this regard since Confederation. I may mention that the arrangement with Saskatchewan and Alberta was that the subsidy would increase as the population of the provinces increased; but our subsidy was fixed, so that we never had an increase. Have we not therefore a particular claim? I think so. I think it has only to be mentioned to be admitted by every member of the House and by every citizen in Canada. Manitoba's subsidy was afterwards increased to bring it to the level of that received by Saskatchewan and Alberta. But we stand where we have always been. We have an especial claim, I say, and I want to put it to the fairminded men from the West whether that claim does not deserve every consideration. I have only to state the case, I believe, and its fairness will be conceded. We want to be heard when these adjustments are made, whether in this House or in some other place.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did not the Dominion Government assume a large indebtedness in connection with the Prince Edward Island railway?

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad indeed that my hon. friend has asked that question, because I was forgetting it. When we entered Confederation we were charged with every cent that the railway cost. We built our own railway. It has since been added to by the Dominion Government, but at the time we entered Confederation we had a large mileage that was charged to us in the debt against the province. I am very glad that the hon. member has asked this question. Now, with regard to the western provinces, I understand that they, and particularly British Columbia, became liable for immense sums of money to the Canadian Northern Railway for lines of railway through those provinces—liabilities that were enough to put those provinces into financial difficulties. The federal government relieved them of all that burden, took over all the railway indebtedness and relieved them of all bonds, guarantees and provincial obligations in that regard, and it is a part of the public debt of Canada upon which the people, including those of Prince Edward Island,

are paying interest. That fact, I think, strengthens tenfold the case of the Maritime provinces, and particularly of Prince Edward Island.

My remarks, I fear, have been somewhat disconnected, but I trust I have put before the House views that may be helpful in solving the question with which the Government has to deal. The questions that I have dealt with, at any rate, are live questions in the province from which I come, and I think I have stated the case from the point of view of that province fairly and reasonably. The views I have expressed appear to me, at all events, to be reasonable, and I hope that the Government may find them helpful in the administration especially of the taxation of the country, from which we hope to get some relief. I may say that I have discussed this matter with the taxation office here and they have promised some modification; but I should like to see the whole thing wiped out and the farmers relieved from the inquisitorial investigations that are going on, because they are doing no good so far as our province is concerned. Unfortunately, we are not sufficiently wealthy individually to be able to contribute anything worth speaking of to the revenues of the country by that method of taxation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to thank you and the hon. gentlemen of this House for the attention that has been so graciously accorded me.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the first person on this side of the House to speak to-day since the House has been made aware of the sad bereavement which has come to the family of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), may I take this opportunity, through you, Sir, of expressing to him and his family our sincere sympathy? It is on occasions of this kind, when the angel of death lays its hand upon members of our families, that we find we are indeed all akin, and whatever other matters may be in our minds they are immediately dismissed and we feel nothing but personal sympathy and sorrow for the grief stricken ones. I speak with the utmost sincerity, and I know I voice the sentiments of those around me, in extending to the Prime Minister our profound sympathy.

This institution, known as the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, is cherished I think by all who are students of and acquainted with our parliamentary procedure. You, Sir, with your lengthy and intimate acquaintance with this procedure and your profound knowledge of the history of the development of Parliament, will, I am sure, agree with me when I say that this institution should be carefully guarded so that when occasion arises we will have available for the representatives of the people the freest opportunity for the expression of their opinions. Criticism is sometimes directed —and I have noticed some in the press during the last few days—at what is sometimes termed the needless waste of time in this debate. Occasionally, I am ready to admit, it seems somewhat difficult to understand why individuals will occupy so much time with utterances that apparently contribute very little to our advancement, but I think it will be generally conceded that this debate in the main not only measures up well with former debates, but in my estimation it surpasses any that I have listened to in the past thirteen sessions. So while I admit there is occasionally perhaps a little recklessness in the use of the time of Parliament, on the whole I think we and the country receive benefit from the preservation of this institution. A very frank and vigorous expression of opinion by hon. members on problems of which they have more or less intimate knowledge must inevitably result in some good to the country, and I am convinced, Sir, that that is practically the best and the only way by which we are going to approach a solution of many of the difficult problems which now confront us. I am equally convinced that intolerance, prejudice and parochialism in the discussion of subjects, whether religious, racial or economic, will enable us to arrive at no useful decision. So, Sir, I am particularly jealous, and I know that you and others in this House share the same view, that the general tone of our parliamentary debates shall be maintained in that spirit of tolerance and good fellowship which exists between members on both sides, for while having differences of opinion we can at least accord to one another the credit of being sincere and honest in the expression of those opinions.

In the Speech from the Throne there are several subjects for discussion, and many of them have already been discussed with more or less freedom during the course of this debate. I desire to touch upon a few of those subjects, and I shall endeavour to keep my remarks within a reasonably brief space of time. Some have claimed,

more particularly representatives of the Progressive party, that agriculture is the outstanding basic industry of Canada. I would say to them with the utmost frankness that I agree with that statement. I would, however, take this opportunity of adding that while admitting that statement with frankness, cheerfulness and pride, I should like them to bear in mind that there are other forms of industry which, while perhaps not of the same magnitude, or not bearing exactly the same relation to the life of the country as a whole, yet do hold a very important place in our economic life. Those other industries cannot be recklessly or lightly dealt with any more than we can deal with the industry of agriculture in a reckless or careless spirit. As individuals and collectively we must constantly keep that fact in mind, otherwise we are in danger of taking a narrow or prejudiced view of this very important subject. Before, however, addressing myself to a brief discussion of our agricultural situation, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) particularly to this point: A number of years ago the late Parliament under the guidance of the then government, brought in a measure granting $10,000,000 to the aid of agriculture. This money was distributed amongst the provinces and spent by them for the development of agriculture particularly along educational lines. It was divided between them. That measure will expire, I believe, this year, and I regret that in the Speech from the Throne there is no reference to its continuance. I should very much like to have seen expressed the intention of the Government to continue this co-operative effort on the part of the federal authorities with the provincial, because in that way the late Government saved a great deal of duplication that undoubtedly will occur again unless the same or a similar principle is applied. Therefore I submit this suggestion to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance for his consideration, and I trust to hear during the course of the session a declaration from the Government favouring it.

Let me turn for a moment to this question of agriculture which must command the attention of Parliament. It seems to me that you take a very distinct step towards the solution of a problem if you admit the problem. The difficulty very often is that we do not admit the problem; we debate whether or not the problem exists. But let us come to the point where we admit the problem exists, and we have taken the first and most important step towards its solution. I admit that others not directly identified with the agricultural industry—I should like to say to my hon. friend that I have all my life been directly connected with it and take a very deep interest in my farm, although it might be considered small compared with some of the immense prairie farms—but as I say, some not directly connected with agriculture may decline to admit that the problem is as acute as is represented. I do admit frankly that it is acute, and from that position I start with my consideration of the problem.

One of the great difficulties to-day is that there has been a reduction of the prices of nearly all farm products to their pre-war basis, while on the other hand the prices of some, though not all, of the commodities which enter into their cost of production have not been reduced in proportion. That is, briefly stated, one of the economic problems with which my hon. friends immediately to my left are faced.

In this connection another question is raised: that of marketing and transportation. Now, I am not going to enter upon a discursive discussion of the various methods of marketing through co-operative organizations, and so on; we will leave that to these organizations to work out. But, Sir, in regard to one or two of the main products of the farm the question of marketing is important and has, indeed, in years gone by engaged the attention of this House. I refer particularly to wheat and cattle. So far as cattle are concerned I shall not go into the matter at length. We have a statement by one hon. gentleman—and here, Sir, I pause to compliment many of the new-comers in the House upon the clear and lucid manner in which they have presented their claims and their arguments—one hon. gentleman stated that it was necessary, when shipping cattle from distant points in Alberta to Winnipeg, to prepay the freight because it was doubtful whether they would bring at the end of the journey sufficient to pay the freight. I believe that is a statement of fact; it cannot but impress us with the seriousness of the problem.

But let me turn for a moment to the question of the marketing of wheat, which, after all, is the biggest item in connection with our farm products. Here an important problem presents itself. Simply stated, it is this: That between the amount received by the grower at the point of production or shipment, and the amount paid

in the ultimate market, there is an undue and unreasonable spread. I am not for the moment going to specify what that spread is, but those interested are convinced—and I agree with them—that the spread is too great. The duty of Parliament is to consider whether this matter is one of sufficient importance to engage its attention, and if it is, to give to that problem due consideration. Permit me briefly to make several suggestions; having done that, I shall come to one of the main points to be considered.

There is, Sir, the question of freight rates; that I shall discuss later in a separate argument. There is the question of leakage in the transmission of the grain from the point of shipment to, we will say, the head of the Lakes. There is shrinkage; there are dockages. I believe there are very unfair dockages; those who were in the last Parliament know my views on that point. I still contend that the shrinkage from the point of shipment to the head of the Lakes is unreasonably great. That, indeed, should engage the attention of the House and particularly, Sir, of the Government.

Now, some suggestions have been made in regard to the marketing of the wheat crop of our prairies. My hon. friends to my left, so far as I have been able to learn from their speeches and from conversation with some of them, stand frankly and freely for a renewal of the old Wheat Board. They say they have studied the problem, and that is their view. One or two with whom I have had conversation—and I believe they voice the opinion of others—tell me they are asking for the Wheat Board not as a permanent institution, but as a temporary measure because of the peculiar crisis with which they are now faced. The policy of those who sit immediately around me and who supported the late Government is also very clear: we felt, as announced by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) before the last election, that a voluntary pool under the control and direction of the Government would be the best method. Be that as it may, Sir, the point I am coming to is this: it is an imminent question; it is a vital question; we are convinced, those of us sitting here, of the soundness of the contention of our hon. friends of the Progressive party that this question must receive immediate consideration. We think that if some decision is not arrived at within the next month,—that will appear to some hon. gentlemen as a large order, but no one knows better than the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) that what I am saying is true—unless there is a decision within a month, the agricultural interests of the prairies may be very seriously affected.

Let us for a moment examine this aspect of the question. I admit frankly that at first I thought the attitude of the western farmers was in the nature of a threat or boycott, but after looking into the matter carefully I was convinced that there were sound economic reasons why farmers situated a considerable distance from, we will say, the Winnipeg market—perhaps at points remote from transportation facilities—should hesitate to put in as large a seeding of wheat as they might do if they had some assurance of assistance in marketing. I see their point; the matter is a very serious one to them. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture was elected to this House and to the portfolio of Agriculture on the distinct pledge, most seriously given to his people, not only in Regina but in practically every riding throughout his district, because he is a representative man and has been for years—he was elected on the definite pledge that the Wheat Board would be brought in so far as his influence and power could bring that about. My hon. friend nods his head to indicate acquiescence in my statement. I do not want to embarrass him, but I put this very plainly to him and to the Government: Speaking for those with whom I am more directly connected, and with the consent of my leader, I say that we are prepared to-morrow to go before the suggested committee of this House and present our views on the subject. We are prepared to go before that committee and listen to and consult with my hon. friends to my left, who have another view to present; and we are prepared to go with a great deal of curiosity and anxiety to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture speak for the Government on that committee. But there should not be one hour's delay. Indeed, Sir, I am prepared and others are prepared to adjourn this debate if necessary so that this committee may be appointed and the work begun. This I am certain of, that not one hour's delay should be incurred. There should be no trifling with this question; it should be discussed and, if possible, a decision arrived at during the next few weeks.

I am not enlarging unduly on the importance of the matter. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. La-

pointe) seems to take a great deal of amusement out of it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was laughing at something else.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend may not be aware of the importance of this question. His friend the Minister of Agriculture should, I suggest, take him to one side and—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Something else was amusing me; I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. STEVENS: I suggest, anyway, that the Minister of Agriculture take him to one side and give him a thorough education on this question.

I say, Sir, that I am not unduly exaggerating the importance of the matter. I repeat with all earnestness that the Government should hasten to appoint the committee that they have in mind so that an early decision may be arrived at as to the method which will be followed.

Let me just supplement these observations with a suggestion as to the facilities we are possessed of as a country. My hon. friends to my left are aware of this without my repeating it, but I will tell the House for the benefit of those who may have overlooked the fact—that the Government of Canada is in control or directly possessed of elevators as follows: At the head of the Lakes we have a Government elevator with a capacity of 3,500,000 bushels; the Grand Trunk Pacific elevator, 7,500,000 bushels; the Canadian Northern elevator, 9,000,000 bushels; or terminal elevators at the head of the Lakes with an aggregate capacity of 20,000,000 bushels. Then we have an elevator at Moosejaw with a capacity of 3,500,000 bushels; Calgary, 2,000,000 bushels; Saskatoon, 3,500,000 bushels; Vancouver, 1,250,000 bushels; Montreal, 5,000,000 bushels; Port Colborne, 4,000,000 bushels. This constitutes a magnificent system of elevator facilities surpassing, I think, that of any other institution handling grain in this country, and one which is well fitted to take up immediately the question of the handling of grain. We believe—and I am going to state it here again briefly—that a voluntary pool coupled up with this system of elevators is the best way in which this question can be dealt with at this time. However, we make this reservation, that we shall be delighted to consult with other hon. gentlemen as to the advisability of inaugurating once again perhaps the Wheat Board which hon. gentlemen to my left have so persistently advocated.

Let me turn now to a very brief consideration of the question of transportation rates. This again is a vital question, not only to my friends on my left in regard to the marketing of their wheat, and in that regard it is vital, but it is vital also, I believe, to every branch of industry in Canada. I have had the privilege during the last few weeks of consulting with a very wide range of public opinion in Canada, and to my surprise many who have given little attention to the question of freight rates in months gone by, are to-day agreeing with those of us in the West who have been insisting for a considerable time that freight rates must come down. Let me state the problem in a very brief and simple manner. We are hauling to-day trains of about 350 tons with a motive power capable of hauling 900 tons or thereabouts. Is it not, Sir, a simple question in economics that if you haul a full train of 900 tons your cost of transportation per ton-mile will be reduced by the difference in the ratio of the amount you are now hauling and 900 tons? That is the problem. The railways say the rates are as low as they can make them. Now I do not wish to interfere with the authority and the jurisdiction of the Railway Board. I and those in this particular section of the House believe that we should always proceed by constitutional methods. I do not agree, for instance, with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) who on the occasion of a complimentary banquet given to him in Regina, I believe, gave utterance to the declaration, somewhat belligerent, I must say, that he was going to have the chairman of the Railway Board fired. My hon. friend is in the Government and it would be very interesting to know just what interchange of opinion there was between him and the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) on the process of firing the chairman of the Railway Board. To talk about firing the chairman of the Railway Board is an utterance wholly unworthy of an hon. member occupying a ministerial position. You know that yourself, Mr. Speaker; it needs no enlargement on my part. There is a way to proceed, and my hon. friend, if he is convinced that the chairman of the Railway Board is utterly derelict in his duty as chairman, might impeach him in the House, but I doubt if any such thought entered his mind within fifteen minutes after he had made that declaration for the purpose of getting con-

siderable applause from those who heard him. There is a constitutional way of proceeding.

The Government, I notice, has referred back to the Railway Commission the appeal that was made to them regarding dairy products and express rates. I agree that that was a wise course to pursue, but it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that while we should not interfere with a court of equity or a court of law, while we should not seek to influence unduly one way or the other a judge on the Bench—and that is virtually what the Railway Commision amounts to when they are trying a case—yet as representatives of the people in this Parliament I think we might very properly consider the question of freight rates, or transportation, when that question is so acute that it affects the economic and industrial life of the country seriously. Undoubtedly it is affecting the economic and industrial life of this country very seriously at this time, and so, without interfering with the jurisdiction and the duties of the chairman of the Railway Board, or suggesting, as the Minister of Agriculture has done, that he should be fired, I think that after due consideration by this House it will be quite competent for us to make suggestions to the board.

For instance, we could suggest that the Railway Board should consider the advisability of reducing the commodity rates. I am not much concerned what the rates are on a bolt of silk valued at about one dollar per ounce, or about the rates on drugs which may be worth one, two or three dollars an ounce, because these things do not enter very much into the economic life of the country, but I am deeply concerned about the tonnage rate on coal, on cement, lumber, grain, coarse grains and wheat, and such things as that. These are commodities that touch the life of every person in the community. These are the commodities which, if the rate is right, the production and the movement of them may be encouraged and developed, whereas, on the other hand, if the rate is increased beyond a certain point, it will stop their production. An instance was cited by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) where when the freight rate was raised last year on lumber, a mill had to shut down because they could not market their lumber on account of the rate. That I know to be true; I know case after case where this was so. We find that when we ship lumber to prairie points like Regina, Saskatoon, Moosejaw, the freight rate is far greater than the total cost of the lumber at point of shipment. This simply illustrates the danger of a policy being adopted, by the Railway Board, if you will, whereby the economic life of the country may be stifled, where it is so interfered with that it does not move with that freedom which is necessary for prosperity, and so I suggest this in connection with the freight rate problem: While not desiring to interfere in any unconstitutional manner with the duties of the Railway Board, I think Parliament might very well deliberate on this problem and give its expressions, through Council or otherwise, to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Then if it is found that that process results in no satisfactory results, we may, and it is within our power to do so, carefully scrutinize the Railway Act of Canada, one of the most important statutes we have. It is possible, Sir, that we would find some way by amendment to the Railway Act of dealing with this question; but the point I am coming at, what I have been dealing with all through my argument regarding freight rates, is, that it is clear to the lay mind of Canada that the freight rates at this time are too high on ordinary commodities.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had virtually completed the few remarks that I desired to make in connection with the question of transportation. I do not see the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) in his seat; but I am reminded that the Prime Minister, in his address in this debate, referring to a query as to the intention of the Government and dealing with this problem in a broader way than I have been discussing it, stated that the House would be called upon to wait until the Minister of Railways made a statement. We shall await, with a great deal of interest, and, I might say, anxiety, for this statement of the Minister of Railways. Aside from the bearing that transportation has, at the present time, upon other problems to which I have already referred, the transportation question or the question of the national railways is, in itself, of very grave importance. We did, however, get a glimpse, I think, into the mind of the Government by the speech of

the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I noted an utterance of his which seemed, to me at least, to conform with the general tendency on the part of the ministry in dealing with this question, where he referred in his argument to the impossibility of incorporating the Grand Trunk in the national railway system. Whether we are justified, in the absence of any statement on the part of the Government, in assuming that they have arrived at the conclusion that it is impossible to co-ordinate the Grand Trunk system with the rest of the national railway system or not, let me say to the Government that we on this side of the House await with interest a definite statement from them on the subject. Before leaving this subject, as I shall do in a moment to pass on to another, I think I would not be fair to my constituents if I did not point out to the House that, in the consideration of this question of railway rates, we, perhaps, suffer more than any other part of the country; that is, we are paying about double the rates of any other part of Canada, on both the Canadian Pacific and the national railway systems. This, in turn, has had a very serious and detrimental effect upon the transportation of grain from the prairies to the Pacific seaboard. Let me add to that this fact that, in spite of the repeated declarations of officials of the Canadian Pacific railway that wheat would never move west, we have handled, through the port of Vancouver this present winter, somewhere in the neighbourhood of ten million bushels of wheat from the Prairie provinces with, I think, distinct benefit to them. Therefore, the present situation being that we are paying approximately double the freight rate that is being paid in other parts of the country, if that is reduced to the rates obtaining in other sections, this trade will, I believe, be stimulated; and the great oriental field which, to-day, is consuming a very large quantity of this grain, will be open to the products of my hon. friends from the prairies. I shall leave that question. We shall have an opportunity to discuss it at length when the problem is presented to us, as we have been promised it will be, by the Minister of Railways.

In the consideration of the difficulties attending the development of agriculture and other problems, I should like to bring to the attention of this House and of the Government a policy which was, shall I say, partially, at least, adopted by the previous government, and which was under consideration by this House at the last session. Indeed, if I remember correctly, the House passed a measure giving effect to what I am about to refer to, namely the establishment of a bureau of standards and the promotion of industrial scientific research. No reference has been made to this in the Speech from the Throne; no information has been given to us by the Government. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) purposes contributing to this debate, it would be very interesting if he would give us some intimation of the policy of the Government along this line. What I desire to say, however, in connection with the matter is this. My hon. friends to my left and some other hon. gentlemen persist in pointing out that Canadian industrial establishments should be able successfully to compete with industrial establishments of other nations of the world. Usually the reference is made to those of the United States and Europe. I should like to point out to them and to the House generally that, in the United States, Germany, Great Britain, and, indeed, other countries, industrial scientific research has been carried to such a degree of perfection that it contributes very materially to the success of the great industrial concerns of those countries in competition with other countries in their particular industries. So, I say to the House that, if we hope so to develop the industries of Canada that we can successfully compete outside of Canada, we must certainly take into consideration this question of establishing a bureau of standards and the promotion of industrial scientific research. I might give a homely illustration of the nature of our competition. For instance, we might say that there is before a given group of individuals the task of removing a very large obstacle on a railway or in any other place. In one place you set to work a man with a pick and shovel. In another you set to work a man or a group of men with a steam shovel. They may both succeed in removing the obstruction, but the group with the steam shovel and up-to-date appliances will certainly remove it with greater facility and more cheaply than the man who is using the primitive instrument. So it is in a more complicated manner in the industrial world. If a woollen industry, steel industry, chemical industry or any other branch of industry has the advantage and co-operation of a highly organized and efficient bureau of

standards, and of an industrial scientific research bureau, it certainly will be better equipped to meet the competition of the world than the industry which has not those advantages.

I desire to give a little attention to another subject which was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and which is of very great interest at this time. I refer to the question of immigration. I ask the House to note the wording of the Speech from the Throne which gives to us some idea of the mind of the Government. In the Speech from the Throne, immigration is referred to in these words:

> A renewal of efforts for bringing new settlers must be made.

From that I take it that the Government is embarking upon some definite action towards bringing in new settlers, if the words mean anything at all. Then they say they will use every reasonable endeavour to attract to the country people of the most desirable class, with particular regard to the settlement of our undeveloped lands. My mind goes back some fifteen or twenty years to a time when a similar effort was made to bring settlers into Canada. By the effort that was made at that time settlers were brought from Central and Eastern Europe, and they settled, or rather hived in colonies, particularly in the western parts of the Dominion. I learn from the press of the past few days that there is a trek of some of these people to Mexico. They are going away from Canada. In other words, the efforts on the part of the government between 1900 and 1911 in regard to the immigration of settlers for our undeveloped lands resulted, to some extent at least, in failure, and the creation, in some sections, of a menace to the community. I therefore say to the Government that if they have in contemplation a policy of bringing in settlers and hiving them in districts according to racial or religious prejudices, they will confer no favour on the country. We want settlers, but settlers who will come to Canada on their individual initiative, settlers who will go into various communities and settle upon new lands, contributing something to the upbuilding of the national life of Canada, and not creating within our bounds a little Russia or a little Poland or a Galicia, or some other distinctive nationality. I have read some despatches, and have heard some rumours in Ottawa, to the effect that there had actually approached the Government some gentlemen who proposed settlements similar to the old Doukhobour and other racial groups of former days. If that is the case, I take this opportunity of warning the Government against embarking upon any such policy.

I would point out in regard to the question of immigration that the United States have restricted immigration from any nation to a certain percentage of the number of that nationality now in the country. In other words, this constitutes almost an exclusion. In their law, however, they recognize a year's residence in Canada as a qualification for admission to the United States. Now, what does that indicate? It indicates that throughout disturbed and stricken Europe and Asia, where the eyes of these people are turned towards the United States, and they find that they cannot enter directly through the portals of that country, they will endeavour to come here and reside in Canada for the year if necessary to qualify them to gain admission to the United States. We want no such movement as that. We do not want Canada to be made a mere stepping stone for immigration to the United States; nor do we desire—this is my opinion, and, I think, the opinion of a large section of the country as well—nor do we desire to have coming into Canada, as suggested in a speech made in Toronto by a gentleman the other day, large numbers of immigrants from industrial centres of Europe. The industrial centres of Canada to-day have, I think, a very satisfactory supply, indeed an over supply, of competent labour. There is no call for cheap labour from the industrial centres of Europe. The class of settler that we do want to have, as I have said, is the uncontrolled individual who will stay on land. Before leaving this question let me bring to the attention of the Government and of the House a resolution passed by the Union of Municipalities at a convention recently held. I shall read only a portion of it:

> The Union regards with serious apprehension the efforts of transportation interests to encourage immigration into Canada of persons of alien birth, more particularly in view of unemployment problems, etc.

The resolution then goes on to ask that the Immigration Act be amended and that further immigration be prohibited of aliens for urban occupations. This important resolution, I think, warrants the attention and consideration of Parliament.

Let me turn to another subject, a subject that has not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I refer to the Bank Act.

I understand that next year is really the time for the amendment of that act. I was of the opinion that it should have been amended this year to conform with the practice of the past, but in that perhaps I am mistaken. Whether that be the case or not, however, I think that the Banking and Commerce Committee might very properly make a careful examination this year into the workings of the Bank Act, that is to say, into some of its evident weaknesses. I am not one of those who subscribe to the statement that our banking system has not proven workable, or that it is an unsuccessful system which is not in the best interests of the people. I am not ready to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) made this afternoon,—statements which seemed to me with great facility and despatch to dispose of this great problem with a complacency that one might well envy, if, indeed, the remarks of the hon. gentleman could bring about a solution of the problem. I believe that our banking system is, in the main, a sound one; it is one of the best systems in the world. Nevertheless, we have to consider the incident of the Merchants Bank during the past few months to realize that there are weaknesses, or, shall I say, loopholes in the Bank Act, and that it is necessary, if not to reconstruct, at least to amend it, so as to render impossible a recurrence of the failure of the Merchants Bank. Perhaps that word is too strong; at all events, let me say the incident of the Merchants Bank. For instance, the Merchants Bank directorate or management must have made false returns to the Department of Finance for several months before the crash came. I do not see how the returns that they did make could approach accuracy in view of the sudden collapse, or partial collapse that confronted us. If it is true, as I surmise,—and I think the evidence strongly supports the assumption—that the Bank made false returns, then this Parliament ought to know it, and I believe that the Banking and Commerce Committee should summon before it the management, the president and any other officials of the Merchants Bank who might throw light on the matter, in order that Parliament might be fully seized of all the steps which led up to this very regrettable incident in the banking life of this country. Furthermore, the Banking Committee could very well make this examination for the purpose of preparing amendments to the Bank Act, when it comes up for general revision next year.

Let me direct the attention of the House to a suggestion or two as to what might properly be done. It seems to me that under our banking system power is too much concentrated in the head office; no bank manager in our towns and cities away from the head office is allowed to make any large loans—for anything above $2,500 he has to report to head office and obtain its sanction. So there is concentrated at the head office an authority and control which is absolute. As I understand the Bank Act, there is at present no audit of the books of a bank. I do not suggest that we should have an inspection of all the bank branches, such as is carried out under the United States system, I do not know that that is necessary, but I am certainly convinced that there should be a periodical audit by officers of the Government of the head office books of our great banks; that is something which we could very properly take into consideration through the Banking and Commerce Committee during this session.

Another problem that I should like to deal with for few moments, is that of unemployment. We have already had considerable discussion of this problem. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) is not in his seat; if he were I would remind him of a declaration he made in Toronto, that this problem had been very seriously neglected by the previous government and would receive his immediate attention with a view to finding a solution for it. That declaration was made a few months ago. Time has elapsed, and we are now met with this statement—which, by the way, the right hon. leader of the Opposition and those who are supporting him may take with a certain degree of satisfaction—that recognizing the continuance of unemployment the Government is going to continue the policy which was laid down by its predecessors in office, which policy the Minister of Labour so roundly condemned in Toronto and other centres. Unquestionably it is a perplexing problem, and challenges the most careful study and attention of this Parliament, and indeed of one and all who are interested in the welfare of our country. It is an economic problem, and it will be neither sufficient nor satisfactory for us to attempt to dispose of it by merely saying, there is world-wide unemployment and therefore we can trust to a future adjustment of world conditions to solve it. I should like to be comforted, if I might use the term, by the

facility with which my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) dealt with this problem, if I could persuade myself—as he apparently does—that the application of certain theories would bring a satisfactory solution. If this were so it would indeed be a great comfort. But I recognize, as the hon. gentleman himself must recognize, that it is an intensely practical problem. I think we might consider the chief cause of the unemployment which prevails to-day, as it has been the chief cause of past periods of unemployment which have occurred in cycles of ten or fifteen years, due to modern mass production, resulting in periodical over supply or surplus of goods.

Now, Sir, that is the real economic problem. But I realize that merely to state that problem is not sufficient; it is not offering a solution. The problem is exceedingly complex. On previous occasions in discussing this problem out of the House I have suggested, and I feel the suggestion is worthy of consideration, that a very careful study ought to be made of the underlying causes. I know that such a study does not bring immediate relief—it does not put a man to work, it does not clothe his children; but this periodical unemployment will occur again just as it has so frequently occurred in the past, and with this growing tendency on the part of industry to intensified mass production, it seems to me the path of wisdom for this Parliament to at least provide for a study of the problem, even if we cannot at the present time go further in the direction of solving it.

I want to dissociate myself absolutely from those who, because of this recurring difficulty, would disrupt the whole economic system by revolutionary means. I have no sympathy whatever with such men. I think it is the duty of every true citizen to challenge that suggestion wherever it is made, either directly or indirectly. In my estimation nothing of a permanent and worthy character has ever been contributed to civilization through the process of disruption and revolution. On the other hand, I do recognize that through the process of evolution, and by a careful study of this problem, step by step doing what we can in the light of our knowledge to-day, we can contribute to the ordered progress of civilization and the happiness and welfare of mankind.

In regard to this subject the suggestion has been repeatedly made, in fact it was made only to-day in this House, that it is the duty of government to supply employment for its citizens. I challenge that statement. I claim, Sir, that it is not the function of government to find employment for individuals. If it is the function of government—and I am not referring to this Government, but to government as an institution—if it is the function of government to supply employment for individuals, then it is the duty of every individual so supplied to go and to do as he may be instructed by such government. You cannot dissociate the two positions. If you lay upon any government the function or duty of finding employment for an individual citizen, then that citizen must put himself docilely under the direction of that government, go where he is directed to go, do what he is told to do, and accept what is given to him. But that is the exact reversal of what humanity has been struggling against from the dawn of history to the present time. And I think it is due to ourselves and to the country that we give very careful study to this problem, for throughout the Dominion from one end to the other demagogues who are living by their wits, gather together a group of people on a Sunday afternoon, stir up their grievances, excite their passions, and then take up a collection upon which they live, proceeding afterwards to another centre to stir up further disorder and discontent. These demagogues, who neither work for their livelihood nor contribute to the upbuilding of the community, but, on the contrary, sow discord and dissatisfaction wherever they get the ear of the people, are going up and down the land preaching this and other doctrines equally subversive of the prosperity and contentment of our citizens, and I think it is about time that those of us who are convinced that such doctrines will not lead us out of our economic difficulties should bluntly and emphatically challenge those who advocate them. So while this is indeed an important problem, we must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into any experiments regarding government assuming full responsibility for unemployment.

I do not wish to give the impression that I am not aware of how serious a matter unemployment is to the individual, and there are occasions—we had them during the war; crises in the history of the country—when governmental action may be necessary. If it is possible for the Government or for Parliament to find some temporary

method of ameliorating the conditions of to-day, by all means let it be employed. But I warn Parliament and I warn the Government against assuming responsibility for finding employment for all who happen to be unemployed.

An exceedingly popular subject of discussion in this House, and one which touches upon the matter to which I have just been referring, is that of the tariff. It is not my intention now to dwell at length upon the tariff question; I believe the proper time to do that is when the Budget is before the House. I do wish, however, to make a few brief references to the subject.

The hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) this afternoon censured the late Government because last season the people of his province were unable to sell their potatoes, and he sought to give the impression that the tariff was the cause of this condition. I do not see just how the tariff could have affected the sale of Prince Edward Island potatoes. As a matter of fact, the late Government by legislative and administrative acts secured the market of the United States to the potato producers of the whole of Canada, particularly of the eastern provinces. But the United States, after experiencing one season of the competition of Canadian-grown potatoes, put a duty of twenty-five cents a bushel, I think it was, on potatoes, thus shutting our product out. Indeed, Sir, the late Government adopted a reciprocal arrangement with the United States respecting wheat, but the United States now impose a duty of thirty-five cents a bushel on wheat. Is that because Canada has a tariff? Is that because those of us who supported the late Government were responsible for maintaining a certain policy in regard to the tariff? Let us be reasonable. Any tariff restrictions imposed by the United States against our potatoes are the result not of any act of the preceding Government, but of the fiscal policy of the United States.

Now, our position on this question is well known; we do not camouflage it in the least. We believe in a tariff for Canada which involves adequate and reasonable protection for Canadian industries from one end of the country to the other,—sufficient to maintain them in a healthy condition. Hon. gentlemen opposite suggest that they are in favour of a revenue tariff. What is a revenue tariff? If they are sincere in this statement, then with every impost of duty on goods imported into this country they will impose concurrent excise taxes upon similar goods produced in Canada. I wonder why my hon. friends opposite persist in deceiving the people in regard to this tariff question. The Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) has frequently given voice to sentiments regarding protection much stronger than anything we have ever affirmed adherence to in recent years: he is in favour of a protective tariff. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) who is now in his seat, is in favour of a protective tariff. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) and many other hon. gentlemen sitting opposite to me—not one of them will deny that he is in favour of a protective tariff for Canada. Why, I could mention a few commodities: tobacco, boots and shoes, automobiles, farm implements, wagons, cottons, —I wonder what we can expect from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the matter of any serious reduction of the duty on cottons. The member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is not in his seat, but in view of the appointment of Sir Charles Gordon to the important office of Canada's representative at the Genoa Conference, I am sure that the hon. member for Marquette will take the first opportunity afforded him publicly to retract what he said during the campaign: that the Dominion Textiles and Canada Cottons were sitting astride the neck of the leader of the Opposition. That was his cry up and down the country. Sir Charles Gordon was one of those who gave generous and loyal support to my hon. friends opposite, and he has received his reward in the appointment to the Genoa Conference. Further let me say, I wonder if we will get any serious reduction in the duty on tea and a few other things, in which some hon. members of the Cabinet may have more or less interest.

The hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael), I think it was, made a statement which might be accepted by those who had not the data, but which I cannot allow to go unchallenged. He said that the collection of the customs tax cost fully fifty per cent of the amount received. Nothing can be gained by making statements that are wholly untrue. I do not suggest that the hon. gentleman deliberately made a statement that was untrue; that would be unparliamentary. But there is such a thing as making a statement in such a manner as to convey to the mind of the public the impression that it is based upon official figures.

An Hon. MEMBER: He said he gave it on good authority.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, I remember that that was included in his remarks: that he gave it on good authority. Statements of that kind may be accepted by the people because of the responsibility of the person who makes them. I say to my hon. friend, and to those who cheered him so loudly, that the records are there and open to examination, and they show that during the last four or five years the average cost of collection of the customs duties of Canada has been less than three per cent. Of course, the incident does not involve one's belief in protection or free trade; I am not disputing that at all, but let us at least, Sir, have something approaching accuracy in the statements which are made in this House; let hon. gentlemen have some respect for the responsibility of the position which they hold.

I hold in my hand a statement which I wish to read to the House, for the purpose of justifying the attitude taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition when he questioned the sincerity of the Government in their suggestion that they were going to bring down tariff amendments. He does not question their intention to make any changes in the tariff, but he does question, and with very good reason, their even approximating the tariff proposals they made to the country in their official programme. This is the report of a speech delivered by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) in November last, just before the election. The despatch reads:

> Someone in the audience asked Mr. Marler if he would stand by the Hon. Mackenzie King on the Liberal tariff platform as laid down in 1919.

Let me pause for a moment. Many of my hon. friends to my left, have said in this debate that they trusted the Government to carry out this platform which they pledged themselves to implement by law.

> Mr. Marler replied that he had expected such a question.

The report continues:

> "That platform, referred to by Mr. Meighen as tending towards free trade was laid down in 1919," said Mr. Marler, "but at that time there were joined to the regular Liberals the Farmers who have since left the party. That platform was never made by Liberals, but by the Farmers, who put it through, but the Liberals did not approve of that particular plank. I will say that if that plank means free trade, or injury of any legitimate industry I am against it."

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. MARLER: Would my hon. friend say what paper he is quoting from?

Mr. STEVENS: I am quoting from a paper which has the unbounded confidence of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) and many other hon. gentlemen opposite, a paper that has been quoted by them against us for many months past—the Montreal Gazette, in its issue of November 2, 1921. Perhaps my hon friend desired in interrupting me to deny the statement. If he did, I will give way to him.

Mr. MARLER: I shall speak in a few moments.

Mr. STEVENS: I am quoting from the Montreal Gazette, and I say this is quite in harmony with the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question.

Perhaps I might be permitted—and I do this with no desire to take advantage of the absence of the leader of the Government; indeed, I hesitate to say anything that might be considered of a controversial nature under the circumstances—to read a statement made by him in a speech delivered on October 28th last in his own constituency. He is reported as follows:

> He wanted it known that should the Liberals get into power, there will be absolutely nothing done to disturb the equilibrium of those industrial concerns which are now getting along with modest profits.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, told the shoe manufacturers of Canada, and I think he was right, that they were not getting sufficient profit. That was the purport of his remarks, that they needed even more protection. Yet boots and shoes, wearing apparel, and foodstuffs of all kinds, indeed the necessaries of life, which is a mighty sweeping statement, were all included in this general reduction, if not the absolute elimination of customs duties contained in the tariff platform of my hon. friends opposite. Then he went on to say:

> As to the Farmer policy of free trade, the Liberal leader contended there is a wide gap between that platform and the policy of the Liberals.

My hon. friends will remember that a day or two ago the leader of the Government told us there was no difference practically between the platform of the Progressive wing—I do not know just what he meant by that—and themselves. He said he could scarcely understand why they should separate themselves from him. Well, here

is a reason given in his own speech, delivered in protectionist Ontario, of course, that there was a wide gap between the Farmers' platform and the policy of the Liberals.

So there was no use—

And I want my hon. friends to the left to get this.

—there was no use putting much faith in the cries of the Agrarians, for while cries might be good vote-getters from one class of citizens alone, they could hardly be productive of many definite results.

I say to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) both of whom have for years and years been leaders of my hon. friends immediately to my left in the West, and who have proclaimed in election contest after contest, before boards of trade, Canadian clubs, and every other class of institution, the doctrines of the three Prairie provinces on the tariff, and declared them widely—I say to them that this is the doctrine which they have to absorb now they are sitting here, this is the doctrine which they have to give expression to, this is the doctrine to which they must now subscribe or leave the ministry, one or the other. But as they have held their seats up to the present time with a degree of tenacity that is admirable, at least, we may assume that they have abandoned their western doctrines, now that they are a couple of thousand miles away from home and have adopted instead the doctrines to which I have just referred.

May I be permitted before I resume my seat to indulge in a pleasant and friendly survey of the immobile faces that I see opposite me on the treasury benches. There is my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham). I wonder why it is that my hon. friend was not given charge of the Railway Department. I recall that it was he who presided over that department prior to 1911, and we were told the other night with considerable emphasis that the Liberal party had led the country through a period of prosperity and were guiltless of any responsibility in railway matters. If my hon. friend came through that period with such eminent success, why was it that he was not given the job of completing and making a success of the national railways? I wonder if back in the mind and the consciousness of the Prime Minister and his chief adviser, the Minister of Justice, there was not a conviction that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia had not after all made such a splendid job of the Railway Department prior to 1911, and that there was some danger in entrusting him with its administration again.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who is not in his seat as far as I can see, comes to this Parliament with a splendid reputation. I must say that I watched his career in Alberta as Premier of that province with interest, and I was frequently impressed with what I felt to be his unselfish efforts to administer the affairs of that province in the interests of the people at large. But he failed to get a seat there, and a great deal of credit has been taken by my hon. friends from the province of Quebec for finding him a seat. Well, so far as they feel that they performed an act of grace, we will give them credit, but I wonder how the Minister of the Interior, brought up for many, many years in an atmosphere of exceedingly low tariff will harmonize his love for his western home with the sentiments of his adopted constituency? When he consults with the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Béland) regarding the wishes of the constituency he represents in Quebec, I wonder how he will reconcile their views and the sentiment that dominates the Cabinet? I think, so far as the tariff is concerned, with the proven convictions he brings with him from the plains, if he has been honest in the past in the expression of his views, it will be interesting to see how my hon. friend works it out. I think there is a saying in Scripture somewhere—

An hon. MEMBER: Be careful.

Mr. STEVENS: —and here I am always very careful, Mr. Speaker, because I have the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) in front of me, an authority on Scripture, and he is liable to trip me up, but outside of him I fear nobody in the House on that subject—but there is something said anyway about a man being unable to serve two masters; he will either love one and hate the other, or hold to the one and despise the other. Now I rather imagine the Minister of Interior is going to twist that scriptural phrase and though he may have loved Alberta and Alberta's tariff policy, as a result of the predicament he is forced into he will probably hold to the tariff policy of his eastern connections and very likely despise his oft-repeated utterances

in the past regarding the western point of view on that subject. He at least is in an unenviable position from which he will find it very hard to extricate himself now.

Then it will be interesting to watch both my hon. friends—the Minister of Interior and the Minister of Agriculture—for instance, harmonizing the new position they find themselves in upon this freight rates question. I do not know—I would be pleased to be corrected if I am wrong—but I do not think there is an hon. gentleman in this House representing a constituency west of the Great Lakes who does not feel that there is due a definite, clear-cut reduction in freight rates—I do not think there is one of them. I do not think that any member could be elected to this House, much less the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of the Interior, from a western constituency if he did not so believe. Indeed I reminded the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon of his pledge in that regard—so determined, so fixed was he, in that doctrine that he was going to fire the chairman of the Railway Board in order to attain his ends. It will be interesting to watch these hon. gentlemen harmonize their new position, their connection with the interests, and the influences with which they are surrounded, with their profound convictions of the best interests of the districts, from which they come, and their oft-repeated pledges to these districts that when they entered the Cabinet and when they entered Parliament they would discharge their obligations to them.

Sir, those of us who had the privilege of sitting in this House in parliaments gone by recall the influence, the grace, and the personality of the great Liberal chieftain who is with us no more. I was very much struck the other afternoon when the Minister of Justice rose in his place and delivered his speech, which for parliamentary style, elegance and thoughtfulness has seldom been equalled, I think, in the House. I felt, Sir, that at last there had entered Parliament one upon whom the mantle of Laurier might justly fall. In referring to this I am serious in extending to my hon. friend (Sir Lomer Gouin) my congratulations on his speech, and on his presence and his influence in the House. He was a little peeved—I think it was the only fly in the ointment—because my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) suggested that he was the "master mind". Mr. Speaker, if my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition failed to make that point clear it was amply justified by the utterances of the Minister of Justice, in his reply to the speech which my right hon. friend delivered, and he demonstrated that indeed he was the master mind. This is not a matter of reproach, it is nothing to be ashamed of; it is nothing, Sir, but a subject for congratulation, and I congratulate him upon it. I cannot fail, however, to refer to one point and it is this: the Minister of Justice protested with, I think, tears in his voice that the one object he had in taking a place in this House was to serve his country. Well, I think we can all claim, to a reasonable extent, the same motive. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that he stands alone in that regard; we all, I think, have a reasonable right to claim that motive. But the reason for the little evidence of petulance—it was scarcely visible but it was there I think—was because the suggestion had been made that my hon. friend was associated with what is known as "the big interests". Sir, is it a crime to be associated with big interests? The leader of the Opposition has been bombarded with abuse from one end of this country to the other as being the creature of the big interests.

9 p.m.

Where did the big interests stand during the last election, which after all is the testing point? Where did they stand? What are the big interests of this country? The biggest interest in this country is the Canadian Pacific Railway company. Were they behind the leader of the Opposition, or were they wholly and unreservedly behind the Minister of Justice and his immediate associates? There is nothing wrong in it; I am not rebuking my hon. friend for it; but I do wish to say this: I resent the opprobrium that has been heaped upon my leader, falsely, as being the creature of the big interests, and I intend to associate my hon. friend with those with whom he has associated himself. What is another big interest, big financially?—the Bank of Montreal. Was the Bank of Montreal—the Bankers' Bank of Canada, the greatest financial institution in the Dominion, the one that encompasses within itself nearly every other financial institution—was it behind the leader of the Opposition? The Minister of Justice is a director of the Bank of Montreal and he knows better than that; he knows where their influence was thrown. He knows perfectly well that their influence was thrown during the last two weeks of the campaign against the leader of the Opposition and to his injury politically. Then my hon. friend is also a direc-

tor of the Cockshutt Plough Company. Why I remember, Sir, in two previous Parliaments we had associated with us Mr. Cockshutt, a member of the Cockshutt family, and how hon. gentlemen opposite—then sitting on this side of the House—used to bait the former member for Brantford. A few of those hon. gentlemen who then sat on this side used to twit Mr. Cockshutt with representing the agricultural implement companies in this House. The Minister of Justice is a director of the Cockshutt Plough Company. It would be interesting to learn of the conferences between him and his colleague immediately behind him for the reduction of the tariff on agricultural implements—most interesting indeed. I do not rebuke my hon. friend at all but we might just as well know where we stand in this House. My hon. friend is a director of the Montreal City and District Savings Bank, of the Royal Trust Company, of the Mount Royal Assurance Company, of the Mutual Life Assurance Company, and last, but not least, a director of La Presse Publishing Company, although I may be wrong in the last statement.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am not a director of La Presse.

Mr. STEVENS: The statement was made to me that my hon. friend was. However, I accept his denial.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: And I am not a director of the Cockshutt company.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend be good enough to tell me when he retired?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I retired during the first days of January.

Mr. STEVENS: All right, perfectly proper. My hon. friend will admit that I have not misstated the case at all. I am not reproving my hon. friend or any other hon. member for holding positions in these companies; but I want to say to hon. members opposite that their chief financial critic, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) made a frightful onslaught upon the leader of the Opposition and some associated with him because they were. My right hon. leader held no position in this or any similar concern. He was a free lance; he was a people's man, if ever there was a people's man. Yet not only do my hon. friends opposite hold important positions in the largest institutions and retain those positions, while sitting in this House, but during the last election they received the generous and undivided support of them. That may be perfectly all right; but yet it ill behooves them to endeavour to drive my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, out of public life by using suggestions of that kind, namely, that he is a creature of the big interests. Therefore, I conclude my remarks by saying that it will be interesting to watch how these diverse interests in the Cabinet, hon. ministers coming to this House, pledged to carry out diverse platforms, will perform that operation on the stage of this Parliament. We are looking forward to declarations, statements, utterances, which have been promised. We are awaiting patiently for the appointment of the committee promised by the Government, which will take up some of these important problems. What I wish to say in conclusion, is that we on this side of the House, although this may be strange to my hon. friends opposite, are standing by the policy, promises and pledges that we made prior to the election. That may not be understandable by my hon. friends opposite in view of a declaration made by their leader, the other day, that statements, pledges, utterances and campaign literature, made or issued prior to an election, should not be taken too seriously.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, had not the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) made a reference to me in his address of last Monday, I question very much if I, as a new member, would have had the temerity this evening to address this House. Before proceeding to any of the questions brought up in the Speech from the Throne, will you allow me, Sir, to offer you my most sincere felicitations upon your having been elevated to the very high position of First Commoner in the land. I venture to add that there are, perhaps, few in the House who view your selection for that high office with greater gratification than I—gratification, because you belong to an old and distinguished family, gratification because you are known for your courtesy and learning, but gratification, most of all, because you have served your country for many years and during all those years of service, you have always kept before you, the highest ideals of British statesmanship.

I am very well aware that, in the course of these debates, you will be called upon to correct me for infractions of the rules of this House which I, through inexperience,

may make from time to time. I am reminded, in that connection, of a question which a younger member of the British House of Commons asked an older member of the same House. He asked the older member how he could learn the rules of the House, and the answer came back in a somewhat laconic manner—"By breaking them." I trust, therefore, if I do break the rules of the House in debate, you will realize that I am attempting to learn them. Whatever corrections may come from your hands, I will deem them, not as corrections or reprimands, but more as coming from the seat of learning to which I have made allusion.

I most willingly join with the other members who have spoken before me, in offering my most sincere congratulations to the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) on the excellent address which he has given to the House. I also join in the same manner in offering my felicitations to the hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri (Mr. Mercier), and I beg to say to him that hearing the French language spoken, always emphasizes to me, coming as I do from the province of Quebec, how fortunate we are to have the beauties of that language and the sterling qualities of that race as a part of the Canadian nation.

I would also like to thank the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) for the very kindly and courteous words of welcome which he addressed to new members of this House. I do not think I can claim for myself this state of youthfulness ascribed by the right hon. gentleman to the newcomers; nor do I think my right hon. friend is very glad to see me here; but, notwithstanding all that, I hope he will allow me to include myself in his words of welcome.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) on her election, and I hope she will live long and have a prosperous political career.

Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me for some time that we are at a crisis in many of our national affairs. We are passing through a period of unparalleled unrest, and to surmount that crisis and that period of unrest, and thence to attain to more normal conditions, will, without a doubt, call for the united efforts of all those who, in this House, are entrusted with the administration of public affairs. That, Sir, seemed to me to be the issue on the eve of the election, and that seems to me, in great part, to be the issue still. It follows from that as a natural sequence, that what we all require to do at the present time is to surmount our difficulties, to maintain in this country stable government, and to bring about and to keep the solvency of the country by means of re-establishing it financially upon sound, economic lines and thus to lay the foundation for our future progress and prosperity. That seems to be the main issue before the country to-day, and I venture to say that that is the broad issue which the Speech from the Throne has placed before the House.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his remarks regarding the Speech from the Throne, emphasized that every shade of opinion would be taken into consideration in the shaping of the policy of the Government, so as to make this nation a united and happy one. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in his closing remarks, also stated clearly that the laws of the land should be made in favour of no one particular interest or group, but with equal justice to everybody, so that the country would become united and happy, and, in this, I am totally in accord with the hon. member for Marquette. But, Sir, how is this unity of purpose to be brought about? The Prime Minister clearly showed that he desires that unity of purpose. The hon. member for Marquette equally showed that he desires that unity of purpose. Can we say the same thing of the leader of the Opposition? I do not think we can. Perhaps, it was a vain hope; but I had hoped that once the people had pronounced on the issues at the last election, he, qualified as he is and with many years of public service to his credit, could likewise join with all in this House in attempting to weld this nation together as a happy and united people.

I am disappointed in this, because I find my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition apparently cannot get the idea, that unity of purpose is essential to the welfare of the Canadian people. Perhaps he says that I am wrong in my opinion of him. I do not think I am. I do not see how I can be when he emphasizes the statement, in regard to the elections in the province of Quebec—and he has done so not only outside of the House but in the House as well—that what was done in that province reached the depths of infamy. He has been saying that the election in that province, from which I come, went against him and his party on account of the anti-conscription issue, and he has also said that the government at the time had a mandate to put that act into effect. Need I

remind my right hon. friend what act it was that gave the government the mandate he speaks of? The issue to which I have reference need not have been mentioned in this House. It served no good purpose and did not promote concord throughout the land, and I would not have mentioned it had not my right hon. friend said that many of us on this side had gained our seats by means of appealing to it. I know for an absolute fact that in my constituency, and in many other constituencies of which I have knowledge, that issue was not even hinted at. I would prefer not to have raised this issue, but when my right hon. friend throws down, from his high altar of Toryism, allegations—I cannot call them facts because they are not facts—regarding the province of Quebec, allegations which I can, will, and must honestly deny, he will find me ready to take up his gauge of battle in defence of that province, not once or twice, but as many times as he desires.

My right hon. friend seems to have been very much worried as to why he did lose the election in the province of Quebec. I dare say my opinion is of little value to him. No doubt what I can tell him as regards the election in that province has already been amply reported to him by his various lieutenants there. But if it is of any interest to him at all for me to give him my opinion for what it is worth, as to why that province in the last election returned sixty-five members to sit on this side of the House, and why it also returned Liberals in two divisions which had never returned Liberals before, perhaps he may allow me to enlighten him. If my right hon. friend will cast his mind back to his speech delivered in London, Ontario, on the 1st of September last, and the speech he made in Portage la Prairie on the 27th of the same month, I think he will recall that on both of those occasions he told the country that the tariff was the only issue before the people. He used these words at Portage la Prairie:

> What we have to decide is this: Are we going to continue this protective system in this country or are we not? That is the question, and that is the whole question.

Strange as it may seem, the people of Quebec did not think that the tariff was the whole question. There were other issues which they desired to have explained. Those issues, in brief, were: Why were the railways being operated with continually growing deficits? Why did we build sixty-three ships for the Canadian Merchant Marine at a cost to the country of $72,000,000, plus interest during construction and plus extras? Why was the public debt increasing at an enormous rate from causes not attributable to the war, thereby necessitating much heavier taxation? What was the government policy as regards immigration?

It is quite true, I admit, that these issues were attempted to be explained by many to the province of Quebec, but they were never explained satisfactorily, and because of the unsatisfactory reasons that were given in regard to them the people of that province voted unanimously against the late government. These were the issues which really came up in that province, and the issue raised by my right hon. friend was not by any means the sole one for the people to decide upon. But I do not desire to boast of the unanimity of the province of Quebec. I do not think the time is opportune for boasting. This House has work to do. But Quebec is unanimous in very many ways. In that province we have not what is commonly known as a minority interest. We all work as one; we are all ready to evolve policies which will be for the benefit, not of Quebec alone, but of the country at large. I think that we in Quebec are imbued with the idea that Parliament should really be a deliberative assembly of one nation, an assembly with one idea, that of the whole people, and not a place where local issues or prejudices ought to prevail. It should be the channel for the expression of the general opinion, resulting in the general benefit of the whole country. That is my opinion of what Parliament should be. That is the idea of Parliament which I have acquired from living in the province of Quebec, and I believe that every member on this side of the House has precisely the same views on the subject. If that is the case—and I believe it is—why the necessity for all these innuendoes in regard to members from the province of Quebec, and from Montreal in particular? Why all this bitter hatred that seems to be bandied from one side of the House to the other? Is that the kind of politics that we are to have? I venture to say that the country is tired of politics of that description. What it requires and will have is a business administration which will have one idea

and one idea alone, and that is the general benefit of the country as a whole.

It is very natural in a country like this that there must be diversified interests. In a body the size of this House there must be various opinions; and it is quite true that the province of Quebec has certain ideas and traditions,—ideas and traditions some of which perhaps might be found applicable to the whole of Canada. But although we from the province of Quebec advocate certain ideas and revere certain traditions, we never say that we desire to impose our will on any other part of Canada. We have been trained in tolerance and we know what constitutional government should be, and being so trained we say that we are ready and willing to consider, with all others throughout Canada, any policy which will be good for the nation as a whole. That is the attitude we take. I would make that point abundantly clear.

My hon. friends who sit to the right of the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) did not always approach the hon. member and his followers with the same honeyed words that certain members among them used during the past few days. The dulcet tones of the gentlemen sitting to the right of the member for Marquette are strangely different this year from what they were last year, if what I have read in the debates is correct, as no doubt it is. I believe I read in those debates that the gentlemen who now sit behind the member for Marquette, were termed servile minions and were called the annex, and a dilapidated annex at that. These were the words that were addressed to those gentlemen only one short year ago. Fortunately the position of the annex is changed. The annex is nearer to your left. But I was rather amused this afternoon to hear similar dulcet tones from the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). These tones were not used last year towards my hon. friend from Marquette. If that hon. gentleman will look up what my hon. friend from Vancouver said on the 19th of May, 1921, when he was discussing the Grain Growers' movement, he will find no dulcet tones in that address, but tones of quite another nature.

Sir, I do not approach my hon. friends who sit around the member for Marquette in that spirit at all. I do not approach them for reasons of political strategy or of political expediency. I am bound to say, and I say it quite openly in this House, that I am very much impressed with their sincerity. I know now a great deal more than I knew before; I know now with what they are contending in the West. Nevertheless I must also be frank with the member for Marquette and those around him, and I will tell him that I disagree to some extent with what he says. Notwithstanding all this, however, I say in a spirit of sincerity and with my heart open to the good of the Canadian nation at large, that no government in any country, least of all in this country, can be carried on acording to hard and inflexible rules. There needs to be co-operation, and with that co-operation I am quite sure we shall get out of our difficulties very quickly.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, if I am not taking up too much time, I should like to discuss briefly the matters which were brought down in the Speech from the Throne. I shall take up only the principal matters, which seem to be the railways, the tariff, immigration, and one or two other questions. No doubt some of you will be sorry to hear the word tariff—and I am among those in that category—but I must deal with the subject because my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has honored me with his attention, and again this afternoon I find I have become quite famous by the quotation from a Montreal newspaper given to you by my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Both of these hon. gentlemen I shall reply to, and I hope my reply will be completely to their dissatisfaction. What I am about to say will be sufficient, I trust, to convince my right hon. friend that I do not say one thing on the hustings and another in the House, or, as he put it very neatly the other day, that the professions and promises I made during the election are, when I am once elected, thrown into the discard and forgotten. I wish to try and convince him that the professions I did make during the campaign are not forgotten but are still adhered to. I had, it is true, a vain hope—for it was a very vain hope, I admit—that I might be able to convince the right hon. leader of the Opposition that my ideas and policies in regard to these various matters were clothed with a sufficient amount of reason to prove that my election in the division I have the honour to represent was not stolen, as I am credibly informed was reported to him. But, assuming that report was sent to him, then my right hon. friend will at least give me credit for saying that, in view of the majority which I secured, if I did steal the election I did not commit petty larceny.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At a great price came the hon. gentleman by that seat.

Mr. MARLER: I do not think we had better talk about things like that in the House. As regards the railway situation, I do not intend to say very much, least of all do I intend to discuss the question as to who was or was not responsible for it. One thing is certain to-day, we have the railways; there is absolutely no mistake about that. The question is: How are we going to prevent a continuance of this enormous expenditure which is sapping the life blood of the country every year? The only way is to put an end to the extravagant and improper manner in which those railways have been operated in the past; that is the first thing to be done. I may be hard to convince on certain subjects, but I cannot be convinced that there ever has been any proper management of the railways in question when we consider that the deficits on fixed charges and operating costs alone were $48,000,000 in 1919, $70,000,000 in 1920, and are estimated for this fiscal year to be $61,000,000, without including replacements and renewals. I have some comparative figures here of operating charges, but they are set down from memory and consequently I do not want to quote them. Our railways, Sir, are like any other run-down business. A run-down business must be built up, proper accounting methods must be introduced, and various departments properly administered, but, most important of all, there must be a competent executive put in charge so that the whole system in all its departments may be co-ordinated. That is what has to be done, and that, I understand, is what the Government propose to do. As I see it, it is all that can be done under the present circumstances.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister and my hon. friend from Marquette very candidly stated a few days since that they knew of certain hon. members on this side of the House who were not in favour of public ownership of railways. I will speak about that with equal candor. I myself am not in favour of public ownership of railways. I made that profession at the time of my election; I still make it. Public ownership has always meant to me inefficiency, irregularity of service, greater cost, greater taxes, mounting up of the public debt. I have never been able to find one instance of the successful operation of a railway under public ownership. I make this declaration, Sir, merely to show my right hon. friend that I do not say one thing on the hustings and another on the floor of the House. But I do pledge myself to assist the Government by every means in my power to make the railways a success in accordance with the policies which they have laid down. But I am apprehensive of success.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? He stated in writing in one of his published manifestoes that he favoured getting rid of the Government railways at the earliest possible moment. Does he adhere to that position?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, I may tell my right hon. friend that I do adhere to that position. But you cannot get rid of the railway at the present time. They are run down; they are not railways at all now; no one would take them. If the railways are built up and whatever government is in power wants to get rid of them, they can get rid of them. I am quite frank with my right hon. friend as to what my views are regarding the railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, then, believes in building them up so that they can be sold.

Mr. MARLER: Not necessarily. The great majority of the people to-day apparently desire public ownership of railways. I am in the minority, but I am entitled to my opinion, just as my right hon. friend is entitled to his. He has always told us that he is in favour of public ownership of railways, public ownership of ships, public ownership of various other things. I am not in favour of it; the majority of the people are. Have I answered the question fairly?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Much better than usual from that side of the House.

Mr. MARLER: I was very much disappointed, Mr. Speaker, not to see in the Speech from the Throne any mention of our merchant marine. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine is a favorite policy of mine; it is a favorite policy of the constituency which I represent. The late representative of the constituency also made it a favorite policy of his. These sixty-three ships, Mr. Speaker, carrying the products of the mine, the forest, the field; flying the Canadian beaver at their topmasts; bearing the name "Canadian" before their various other names, and ploughing the seven seas—that was the description given of the Canadian Government

Merchant Marine. But another description that might now be given is with regard to the present location of many of these ships. We might add to the phrase "ploughing the seven seas", words to indicate that certain of them are now frozen in the Great Lakes. Is my right hon. friend still convinced that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine was a war measure? Is he still convinced that they expand Canadian trade? Is he still convinced that they are a safe and advantageous investment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman wants me to answer, I will. I do not presume he does so. I do not wish to interrupt him unless he does.

Mr. MARLER: The Canadian Government Merchant Marine was a policy barren, bereft and destitute of all reason, a policy which should never have been undertaken by any country at such a time, a policy which last year involved a loss to the country of $8,000,000. We have the ships; what are we going to do with them?

My right hon. friend in his address last Monday quoted a paragraph from the manifesto which I issued to my electors with regard to the tariff. The paragraph, or the part which my right hon. friend read, was correctly quoted, and I find no fault with his quoting it. What does my right hon. friend expect me to do concerning the statement that I made at that time as regards the tariff? Does he expect me to denounce it? If so, I am sorry I have to disappoint him; I have not the slightest intention of denouncing it, in whole or in part. The declaration which I made at the time of the election still stands; why should I denounce it? My right hon. friend says that it contains the principle and practice of protection. Well, if he wants to call his tariff a protective tariff it is no concern of mine. If some other person wants to call his tariff a uniform tariff, it is no concern of mine. If someone else wants to call his tariff a tariff for revenue—well, that sounds a great deal better to me, but the name itself does not captivate me. What kind of tariff, then, do I approve of? Mr. Speaker, a tariff is not a name only; it is not a dogma which cannot be changed. It is a policy which must be based on the requirements of the country; a policy which will as nearly as possible serve the needs of all; a policy which will build up, not one which will destroy. But before all it must be designed for the development of the nation and the needs of the people generally. That is my definition of a tariff which I believe could be put in effect. It is quite immaterial to me what name is given the tariff, because a name means nothing at all. It may be argued that it is impossible to please everybody. I agree to the extent that it is impossible fully to please everybody; but surely it is quite possible to try to please everybody. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen sitting angularly opposite have always gone on the principle that they should try to please only a few as regards the tariff, and that is what I object to in their policy.

When was the last revision of the tariff made, Mr. Speaker? In June, 1919, Sir Thomas White, then Finance Minister, declared that a revision of the tariff was long overdue. On May 18, 1920, the then Finance Minister was of the opinion that there should be a revision. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition also declared in Montreal last year that a revision of the tariff should be made. Revision is perfectly correct. Revision is required in the interests of revenue. It is required in the interests of the consumer; it is required in the interests of the country, because the country does not stand still; conditions alter, and those conditions must be met. To say otherwise would be absurd. In the Speech from the Throne last year there was the following paragraph:

> My advisers are convinced of the necessity for revision of the Customs tariff. In order to secure the most complete information a committee has conducted an extensive and thorough inquiry, and has secured the views of all parties and interests in every province.

But was any revision made? Was anything done with the marvellous report which contained information sought in every province? Was the report itself ever brought down to the House? I never heard of its being brought down; I never heard of any revision being made. I did hear, however, of some additional taxes being imposed. And what happened when the administration was asked to bring down this report?, Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, on February 16, 1921, said, in answer to a request that the report be brought down:

> I am going to ask him if he ever knew of a case where information gathered by ministers of the Crown for their personal information or to serve as a basis for their calculations respecting the schedules of the tariff was presented to the House in the form of a report.

That was the answer which was given in the House last year with regard to this

report. If the report was of any value, Sir, I do not see why it was not brought down. I fail to see the necessity for secrecy as regards any legislation or any attempted legislation in this House. It seems to me that we here in this House are nothing more than a committee of the nation gathered together for the purpose of solving the difficulties of the nation. It we are here for any other purpose, my whole idea of parliament certainly falls to the ground. I do not intend to take up at any greater length the question of the tariff except to refer to one other point.

Those immediately to your left, Mr. Speaker, have been most persistent in attributing to the Prime Minister inconsistency in his tariff views. I might say that the lieutenants of the late government during the last election were most insidious in their statements as to the views of the Prime Minister on the tariff. In Montreal they told the people just enough to make them believe that the Prime Minister had different views in different parts of the country, but not enough, fortunately, to make them vote for hon. gentlemen opposite. I have never doubted the consistency of the Prime Minister in his views on the tariff. He has always distinctly said, and he has said it time and again—he said it in this House only last Monday—that he would take the advice of the outstanding men in the Liberal party, and I am quite certain that he intends to follow that course. We have outstanding men in the Liberal party. We have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who himself made the Laurier-Fielding tariff, and I am certain that that tariff, subject to the revision which will be made by the present Government, will be satisfactory to many members on the other side of the House and the country generally.

My hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) questioned my views on the tariff, and quoted from the Montreal Gazette. The Montreal Gazette quoted certain of my speeches very well indeed, but let us say for the satisfaction of my hon. friend that the speech from which he quoted was reported quite correctly. It therefore behooves me to try and explain a little more fully to my friends immediately opposite what my further views on the making of the tariff may be. It seems to me that my hon. friends immediately opposite realize how we in Eastern Canada every day anxiously look at the papers to see how the western crops are coming on. We await news of the crop almost with bated breath. Why? Because we know that if the western crop is good, business will be better, and that if it is bad, business will be worse. Any thinking man in this country cannot but recognize that agriculture is our basic industry, and that if agriculture is killed the other industries will also suffer; that it is no more to the advantage of these other industries to kill agriculture than it is to the advantage of agriculture to kill industries. On the other hand, my hon. friends of the Progressive party must realize that from the East and the industries of the East comes a considerable amount of capital and purchasing power. Does it not therefore follow that the interests of the East and of the West are bound up together, the one with the other, and that some common ground must be found which will in a measure suit both. Let us look at the situation frankly. Perhaps some ground will be found which, while not completely suiting both, will be fair and just and equitable enough to satisfy everybody. That is the ground we must strive to reach, and if we attain it, we shall bring lasting benefit to both the East and the West. I admit quite frankly that I am against unfair profits. I am against legislation which will make the few rich at the expense of the many, but at the same time I am in favour of building up this country by fair and open legislation.

I should like to say a word or two on immigration, because I look upon it as one of the most important questions before the country to-day. I believe that unless we procure greater population we cannot get over all our difficulties. While saying that I am well aware that the finances of the country call for the utmost economy, but I hope that in the matter of immigration the Finance Minister and the Government will be generous in their expenditure, and realize, as I do, that any amount spent will be returned tenfold. I do not want to be unduly critical as regards the immigration policy in the past, but when we realize the figures placed before this House a few days ago by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), who stated that we should have a million more people in this country than we have to-day, it is perfectly clear that something must be wrong.

There is another point in regard to immigration which I trust the minister in charge of that department will consider. The regulations in force at the present time treat immigrants coming to this country as so much merchandise, instead

of as human beings, thereby entailing a great deal of suffering on the weak; such rules, for instance, as that relating to the non-continuous journey, and the passport regulations. If the present regulations are continued or new regulations are put into effect, they should be made very clear and be made known to the immigrant at the port of embarkation, instead of at the port of debarkation, so that the immigrant before he comes to this country will know exactly what to expect, instead of learning it after he has landed and having to be deported, as has happened in a great many cases. I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette to the effect that we do not want city dwellers, and I agree with him to a great extent. Our cities at the present time are pretty full, but at the same time I think exception should be made in favour of the deserving immigrant.

I have only one word more to say on the question of economy which, very properly, was referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I believe that with very few exceptions we should only expend what we can actually pay for. There are certain works which are for the good of the country, not for special localities. These will require to be undertaken, and the immigration policy of the Government should also be considered in a generous manner.

I apologize for taking up so much time but it seems to me that if we as Canadians would only realize what we have in this country and with sincerity would try and forward the interests of the Dominion we would have co-operation on all sides. With co-operation will certainly come unity of purpose, and with unity of purpose will come happiness and prosperity. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that we as Canadians have two great debts to pay in this country. The first debt we have to pay is to the Canadian nation as a whole, and that debt we can readily pay and discharge if we are only true to our own better judgment. The second debt we have to pay is to those men who went overseas and fought for us in the Great War. This we can pay also if we stand true to British traditions and perhaps make this Canadian nation the greatest in the British Commonwealth.

Mr. JOHN PRITCHARD (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to address this assembly I feel that following the precedents established by former speakers, I ought to compliment you on the high position to which you have been called. This repetition may seem a little monotonous, but because we mean what we say we can scarcely allow the opportunity to pass without paying you this tribute. Judging, Sir, from your career during the last few years in Parliament and your conduct during your occupancy of the Chair for the past few days, hon. members, and especially those of us who are here for the first time may safely accept your instruction and guidance because we feel confident that your interpretation and application of the rules of the House will always be fair and impartial.

I am sure, Sir, as you look over this House the membership must appear to you somewhat unique in two or three different aspects. For the first time a Canadian House of Commons has a lady representative. The frequent references to our fair colleague may be wearisome, but because she comes from our particular part of Ontario and belongs to the Progressive group we feel that a certain amount of honour is reflected upon us in having the first lady representative from Southeast Grey in this Parliament.

Another fact, Sir, that may appeal to you as somewhat unique in view of your past parliamentary experience is that there are several different groups occupying seats in this Chamber, and that there is a larger number than usual of new men, perhaps the great majority of members being men who have not previously served in Parliament. The people may naturally ask whether the change is in the interest of good government. Certainly there is a reason for it. For a long time past the electors of Canada have been watching the proceedings of Parliament with deep interest and especially during the last five or six years. In all likelihood the keenest interest in that regard has been shown in the "dilapidated annex," so called but the leader of the Progressive group (Mr. Crerar) has won the sympathy of the Canadian electorate to a greater degree that any other individual in Parliament. During the controversies in this House, and outside of it in the last few years, the people have been looking on and have wished to see that leader vindicated, and I believe that vindication has come.

While the recent campaign was in progress our opponents declared that we were conducting a campaign for class legislation. Such a charge we entirely resent; we advocate not only what will improve the

farming industry, but will be for the betterment of the Dominion as a whole. We have felt for some time past that the farmers of this country did not have that representation to which they were entitled in order that their case might be justly presented to Parliament. Now that we Progressives are here in greater strength we intend to present our case in our own way, feeble though it may be, but in a manner which we hope will appeal to Parliament. The government who were lately in office have claimed that their policy was in the best interests of Canada. They told us that if we encouraged the manufacturing industries, employment would be found for our labouring men, markets would be created for our products, and prosperity would be brought to the country. What are the actual facts? We find that a country capable of supporting fifty million people has a population of only eight and three quarter millions, that many workers are out of employment, and that no inconsiderable number are almost in destitute circumstances. There is a reason for this and we as farmers have observed it for a number of years past. We have presented our case, but we have not hitherto been listened to. Many men have been willing to tell us about our own industry; but we concluded that we knew as much about our own affairs as anybody else and that the time had come to put that knowledge to some practical use. We believed that if we had efficiently managed the farms of this country, the time had come for us to go one step further, and take a more direct part in legislating upon public affairs, other classes in the community having shown their incapacity to formulate policies in the interest of the country at large.

At the present time we find that the manufacturers, to use a homely expression, cannot stand on their feet without help from the Government or somebody else. We find that the managers of the National railway system are unable to make their railroads go; that they are creating a deficit every year. We find that in order to maintain teachers and persons in certain other professions, we have to give them a fixed rate of pay. The only class of people who are not getting help from the Government are asking for it now. Where are we going to get it from? Everybody is wanting help, but where is it to come from? The situation is something like that of the man who tried to lift himself by the lugs of his boots. It is impossible for everybody to get help and to get it from somebody else, and that is the position in which we are to-day. What is the solution of this problem? We claim, Sir, that we want fair consideration; we are not asking for any special privileges; we are asking for a square deal; we are asking for better markets both to buy and to sell in, and that is all we care about. Even last summer when our butchers were digging holes in the ground and actually burying hides, hides were being shipped into this country, and the same was true in regard to wool. When it was hardly worth while to take the wool off a sheep's back, wool was being imported into this country. On the other hand, what are we paying for the products of leather and the products of wool?

We believe that agriculture should be allowed access to the markets that we want, both to buy and to sell in. We do not want to handicap the manufacturers of our country; we do not wish them to be throttled so that they cannot do business. But, why should any manufacturer receive a guarantee of 10 per cent, allowing him to employ inefficient men, if I might say so, and to give his men wages higher than farmers can afford to pay, and then why should we guarantee him a profit on his business, while the farmer cannot pay as much to his hired help and cannot get as much from the capital invested as if he put his money into Victory bonds, and while he and his family are not making the wages of unskilled labour? There you have the situation.

We talk about bringing immigrants to this country, and the Speech from the Throne dealt with immigration. What in the world are we going to do with the immigrants? At the present time we have not work for all the people who are in this country. You cannot keep immigrants on the land. Can you take from any other country in the world, any man who has commonsense, put him on the land and induce him to stay there? He will not remain. What we have to do is to make conditions such that the fertile fields of this country will produce. We have land enough and this country is capable of producing sufficient to pay off the national debt in a short time.

We have had a good deal of discussion about our railway deficits, but there is a way to overcome them. We must give our railways something to do; and in order to do that, we must get our fertile fields tilled by making agriculture profit-

able, just as we have endeavoured to make manufacturing industries profitable. In that way, we shall have no trouble in getting men upon the land and in keeping our own sons, the men who have been reared in this country, on the land.

Our friends will not forget to tell us what they have done for agriculture in the way of education. I have been a kind of a farmer for forty-five or fifty years, and I have not been a failure altogether; but we have listened to a certain kind of advice until we are tired. I have said to the leading agriculturists at the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph: "Why do you not put men on the land to show us how to do the work?" Have they done that? Why does this Government not put men on the land to show us how to do the work? The other day, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), and the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) were speaking, I could not help wishing this Government would give them a million acres of good land somewhere in Canada; I do not care whether it be in Ontario or the Northwest; make them a present of it and make them take these unemployed men out of Toronto and put them on the land to make a living, and see how they will get on. I am convinced that even if you gave them the land for nothing, they could not make a living on it. Yet, we are expected to go on the land and make a living, and they want to put more people on the land to produce and to make this country prosperous.

We have also the problem of the returned man whom we are trying to settle on the land. It is lamentable that these men, who have done so much for our country and who have now returned, are being placed on land where it is impossible for them to make ends meet. Something should be done by this Parliament at this session for these men. It seems too bad that these men, who have gone to the front and who, during all those years of prosperity in this country, have worked for a mere pittance, are, now that they have come back, being placed on the land. What for? To assume the responsibility of paying off the debt which this country has had to shoulder by reason of the war. They saved our country in the one case, and now you ask them to go to work and save it again. On the other hand, a number of men have invested money in Victory bonds that are nontaxable, and they are secure in the receipt of a fair rate of interest.

I feel that we have a big problem in Canada to overcome. I am not a pessimist; I feel that, even during this session of Parliament, something is going to be done to give the farmers of this Dominion a little encouragement. We are capable of overcoming great obstacles. We Canadian people have come of a stock which knows no defeat. The pioneers of this country were of that calibre; the men who went to France were of that calibre, and in this House we have men also of that calibre. We will overcome the difficulties and we will pay the debt of this country. We are not wreckers, as has been charged; nor are we out to obtain everything that we feel we ought to have for ourselves with nothing for the other fellow; we are not local in our demands; we are not selfish in our requests; but what we ask, we ask, not only for ourselves, but for the interest and benefit of the whole people of the Dominion of Canada. If you make the agricultural section of this country prosperous, you will have no difficulty about the national debt; you will have no trouble about ensuring the prosperity of the country; but something must be done to benefit the agricultural industry.

I was asked to allow my name to be placed on the list of speakers who would take part in this debate. My name was shoved back and back, until now my address has been nearly all given by other speakers, and I do not feel it is wise to rehash what has already been said. I am not going to do that, and I am not going to occupy many more minutes of the time of the House. If we take hold of the problems that lie before us, whether it be the railways, the immigration problem, the national debt, or the tariff, I believe we are going to arrive at some conclusion that will be in the best interests of the country as a whole.

I am very glad that we have a representative number of farmers in this assembly to-day who are able to present our case as it ought to be presented. As others have said, we are not out for class legislation, as has been charged, but for something that will benefit the whole country. There was something I did not like about the addresses of certain hon. gentlemen from Toronto as well as British Columbia. They advocated something for their own localities. I like to hear a man speak, as one hon. member on the other side has spoken, advocating what will be in the interests of the people as a whole. That is what we want; we do not ask for

anything which we consider not to be in the interest of all the people.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford): As one of the new members, Mr. Speaker, I feel it requires some resolution to deliver an address to such an assembly as this; but I have always heard, and I believe it is the reputation of this House, that hon. members are generally tolerant of, and in fact indulgent to, new members, and this perhaps gives one a degree of confidence. The greatest orator, perhaps, who ever spoke our language, or at any rate one of the greatest, John Bright, said that the basis of eloquence was not rhetoric but sincerity, and being sincere in what little I have to say, if my speech is not as ornamental as has been the case with some of more oratorical experience, I hope I shall at least be heard because of the sincerity of the cause I advocate.

I have listened with much attention to many speeches. Some of them unfortunately, I could not hear throughout, but I heard a good many things that were very interesting and eloquent. I was particularly interested in the addresses made by the members of the Progressive party. They come from a part of Canada that I have never seen, and I am sure that the frame of mind which they have displayed in the House is very complimentary to that part of the great Dominion which they represent. I have no doubt that the people who sent them to the House have every reason to be proud of them, not merely from the way in which they express themselves—clear, straightforward, frank and easily understood—but from the intelligence, the learning and the research that is evident in some of their speeches. There was one hon. gentleman from the West, if I mistake not, who told us that he and his leader were of the Labour party. That gentleman gave us a very learned and interesting address on various forms of government, an address that showed erudition and research. I must say, however, that I was a little disappointed at one thing that he said. He alluded to the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House as being supporters of the great interests. Now, I do not read anything in history that substantiates that statement. He referred to that book which was written by the hon. the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Mackenzie King), namely "Industry and Humanity," but if he had studied it at all carefully he would never have supposed that its author would lead a party that would be at the beck and call of the great interests. I venture to say that if the Prime Minister of this country had never done anything else to make himself famous than to have written that book his name would be emblazoned on the scroll of fame, because it is considered to be the greatest contribution, on the much vexed question of capital and industry, that has come from the pen of any writer. Hence I was somewhat disappointed to hear my hon. friend express the opinion that the author of such a work, a man so intensely sincere as the Prime Minister, could be the leader of a party such as he described, a party at the beck and call of the great interests. I have another difference with him, and I shall state it most respectfully. As he reads history—and he evidently has read a great deal of it—and as I read it, our philosophy leads us to rather different conclusions, because as I have studied the history of this country, and as I have read that of Great Britain, the Liberal party of Canada, now led by the Prime Minister, has never been the party of special privileges and great interests here; nor has the Liberal party of Great Britain ever befriended privilege and big interests. On the other hand, it has always been the party to fight special privilege; and the manifold freedom that we have to-day and which is the boast of our race, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of Parliament and, in fact, our whole political system, has grown from the success and progress of Liberal principles either in this country or in the old land. It can therefore never be said with truth that the Liberal party is the party of special interests. I do not think I could find a better general definition of the underlying principles of the Liberal party than is to be found in the closing words of the eloquent speech of the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). You will remember how he concluded his speech. He said that he reechoed the sentiment of the Prime Minister in the hope that we might, in this country, enjoy unity, prosperity and so forth; and he added that in order to enjoy these we must have laws founded upon justice and equality, laws that would ensure equal rights to all and special privileges to none. That statement is, to me, a definition of the general principles that underlie Liberalism. I think we all look to have laws that give special privileges to none and equal justice to all. The same sentiment has been repeated tonight and at other times by hon. members, and I think we may take it for granted that that is the only

true foundation on which to base the prosperity, happiness and unity of this country; and the hon. member for Marquette is to be complimented upon having enunciated such a sound principle, but, as I said before, I think it is the underlying principle of the Liberal party.

While I should like, Sir, to again pay those compliments that have been already paid you, it is quite unnecessary I think to repeat them. Hon. members are supposed to have intelligence, they are supposed to have some power of expressing themselves, they are supposed to have love of country at heart, and they are supposed to have a conscientious sense of justice. Therefore, we can compliment ourselves instead of you, Sir, that one who is supreme in those qualities should have been elevated to the position of Speaker, because your record for the last twenty-five years is a part of the history of Canada.

Now, Sir, every member is going to represent the interest of his constituency to the best of his ability. It is his bounden duty to do so. But in doing so, no one, I take it, should at any time forget that there is above that local interest the greater interest of our common country, to which at times the interest of his own constituency or even of his own province must give way a little, and that, I believe, is what influences every hon. member.

But, as I say, each hon. member naturally wishes to make the interest of his constituents felt in this House, and I quite admired the member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) for the way in which he referred at such generous length to the affairs of his constituents. He told us a great deal about Toronto that was very interesting indeed, much about its street car service and other utilities, and really when he expatiated upon their benefits I could not help but think that there might some day come a disappointment which I should regret, and which I am afraid possibly he might regret, too, that when he left this vale of tears and ascended to that Eternal City, whose bulwarks we are told glow with jasper, and entered the New Jerusalem he would be apt to look out of the car that took him there and say, "Alas! this is not Toronto." I have always admired the patriotism of Toronto people, only I think it is well that they should bear in mind that Toronto is not the whole Dominion, nor is Toronto even all of the province of Ontario, although taking the remarks of hon. members from that part of the country one perhaps may have been led to believe that they at least thought so.

I should not have taken up the time of the House in this debate except that the right hon. member for Grenville, the leader of the Opposition, did me the honour to refer to me personally in his opening remarks, and I have such a respect for him that I should not like him to think that through indifference I did not make such explanation to him as I was able; indeed, it would seem on my part ungracious were I not to acknowledge his mention of me. But it is not so much on my own part personally as because his reference involved my constituency that I think it well to explain, and also because it involved the hon. Prime Minister, the leader of the party to which I pin my political faith and allegiance, and shall do so until I see reason to change. I believe the statement made by the right hon. member for Grenville had been previously made by a paper known in Toronto as the Mail and Empire, but known to those who do not swallow all that it tells them, because they have learned to distrust it, as the Malignant Vampire. In that paper it was said two or three times that the member for Brantford was elected because he advocated an increased duty on agricultural implements. It was rather a foolish statement to make and one that reflected not so much upon me, if that was my judgment, as upon the judgment of a constituency that is composed of agriculturists as well as manufacturers. I should not like hon. members who belong to the Progressive party and come from the West, I should not like men whose business is farming, whatever part of Canada they come from, to think that that was the attitude of the manufacturers of agricultural implements in Brantford. Brantford is known all over this country as the home of such implements. I think wherever lumber is used the Brantford sawmills are known, that Brantford windmills, Brantford gasoline engines, Brantford ploughs and all the other kinds of kindred machinery are known and used on the farm. But why was the statement made in the Mail and Empire and reiterated by the right hon. member for Grenville? It was made with a motive, and a great detective has said that the surest way to discover the perpetrator of a crime is to look for the motive. Now, the motive, it appears to me, is in the first place to create a certain amount of

distrust and suspicion in the minds of the members of the Progressive party against the member for Brantford, so that his word would have no weight with them, and in the second place to create a certain amount of distrust and suspicion against the hon. Prime Minister, because he was represented as having made statements in the West which his support of me in Brantford would make him appear as occupying a double position.

Now, I am not afraid of anything I said during that election contest, for nothing whatever was said that could not be repeated. In fact, I think what was read by the right hon. member for Grenville was part of an election address that was printed and of course is in existence somewhere. But I would ask you to follow me carefully for a moment while I explain to you exactly what was said and what he found fault with. I do not say this through any ingratitude to the right hon. gentleman, because had he not come there perhaps I would not have been in this House to-night. But he came to my constituency, and he did not come with that urbanity of manner and that suavity of voice which is so much in evidence with him in this House; he came there with a brow contracted and in tones of thunder, like Saul of old, was breathing out threatenings and persecutions. He was met at the station by a band and a guard of honour and escorted to the armouries, where he set to work to demolish things. In the first place he demolished the leader of the Progressive party and his policy absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. RAYMOND: In the second place, he attacked the hon. leader of the Liberal party and endeavoured to demolish him and his party. Then he was kind enough to devote his attention to me. All he said with reference to the government of the country was that he was in favour of a protective policy, and that that was the only issue before the country. As you are aware, it was said throughout the length and breadth of this country—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I rise to a point of order. What the hon. gentleman states has been so often repeated that I think I owe it to the House to make a statement regarding it. I did not make that statement in Brantford or anywhere else. I accepted all the issues raised by my foes on each and every platform on which I spoke. What I said in Brantford regarding the hon. gentleman, and said here, I quoted from the manifesto issued by himself; I did not quote from the Mail and Empire or any other newspaper whatsoever.

Mr. RAYMOND: That is not exactly the point I raised, Mr. Speaker. It was rather this, that when the right hon. member for Grenville came to Brantford he found fault with the attitude I took, and I should like to explain it to him now. Possibly he never really understood that attitude, I should like to explain to him just what it was. He came to Brantford, as I say, and told the people of that city that the great issue before the country was protection; that if they wanted to avoid unemployment; if they wanted to avoid soup kitchens and all that kind of thing, they would have to support the policy of protection. That was the argument all over the country; I do not think the right hon. gentleman will deny it. At all events, it was his argument in Brantford. Well, we hapened to have some three thousand men or so out of work at that time, there being no employment for them in the agricultural implement factories. I remember on that occasion the right hon. gentleman was asked: How about tractors? What protection have we upon them? I do not remember the answer he gave; I do know, however, that it was not satisfactory to those who were interested in seeing the tractor industry go on, because some $20,000,000 worth of tractors had been imported into Canada which otherwise would have been made here. Now, when the duty was taken off tractors it may have been a wise measure; I am not saying it was not. But I do say that when the right hon. gentleman came to Brantford and claimed that protection was the only issue before the country at that time—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I rise to a point of order. I have already corrected the hon. gentleman, and I ask him not to repeat this statement as having been made by me. I have said that I did not make it.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend has not raised any point of order. He may only interrupt by consent of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit that when the hon. gentleman attributes to me a statement which I did not make and which I have already denied, I have the right, on a point of order. to correct him.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not a point of order; it does not as such come within the rules of the House. The right hon. gentlemna may ask permission to correct the hon. member who has the floor, but he can only do so with his consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I differ wholly from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. RAYMOND: Let me approach the matter from another point of view. I had read the manifesto published by the right hon. member for Grenville. I read it in several newspapers of October 5, I think it was, but it was published throughout the length and breadth of this country. It was a rather lengthy document and had evidently been prepared with a great deal of care. It was published more than a month after he had made that speech in London on the first of September, when he said than an election was pending. There was just one paragraph in that manifesto to which I would like to draw his attention and the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker. It was this—I cannot repeat it word for word, but I am sure I have the sense of it: That system cannot be defended, nor can it continue, which strips from some industries the benefit of protection and leaves other industries enjoying the benefit of it. I rather agree with that. That statement from the right hon. gentleman seemed to be in accord with the idea of having laws that are fair and equal and give special privileges to none. But the constituency that I represent happens to have been subjected very often to the effects of the tariff reduction that was practised by the late administration. When the duty was reduced from 20 per cent to an average of 14 per cent it was the industries in Brantford principally that were affected. Consequently, when I saw it stated in the manifesto that such a policy could not be defended nor could it continue, I agree that it could not be defended in the name of justice, and I believe that there was too great a sense of justice in that constituency to let it continue.

The assertion that the attitude taken by the present Prime Minister in Brantford was inconsistent with his attitude in the West is not fair and cannot be supported by good grounds. Nowadays when a man rises to speak from a public platform his words are taken down and eagerly scanned by critics of both parties. If any duplicity or double dealing or fencing or camouflage could have been shown in the case of the present Prime Minister's Brantford speech, there were plenty of men on the side of the right hon. leader of the Opposition at that time to point out the discrepancies. But none were pointed out. The Prime Minister when he came to the city of Brantford made a statement that was clear, honest, frank, straightforward, and the people believed him; they had every confidence in him. My memory takes me back over forty years and brings back to me the speeches of great leaders of thought and opinion in this country. I remember the effect of speeches of leaders like Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and also, of course, the utterances of the right hon. member for Grenville, then Prime Minister, when he visited Brantford. But never in the course of my recollection, which, as I say is quite clear over a period of forty years, do I recall an instance when a whole city was so completely converted as the people of Brantford were by the speech of the then leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister. It was generally admitted that he made a clear statement of his case; that it was constructive statesmanship; that it was not destructive criticism of the Progressive party or anybody else. He said what he would do if he were returned to power, and those who know him and who know the gentlemen whom he has called upon to assist him in the administration, have confidence that we have at the helm a man who will lead this country through the terrible crisis which has come upon it.

Now, that was how the election went through in our part of the country. As I say, I had little hope when I was nominated, but when the right hon. member for Grenville came to the constituency it seemed as if my friends were a little more hopeful. When the present Prime Minister came, the current of success seemed fairly to have set upon our side.

I do not think I should let go unchallenged in this House the statement that the manufacturers of Brantford would have endorsed the man who supported an increased tariff on agricultural implements; if I did I should do an injustice to the people I represent, and that is the last thing I want to do. I want to do my duty by my constituents. I know them well, and they know me; I know them to be honest, and they know me to be sincere. It is not right to say that the manufacturers of agricultural implements of various kinds in my constituency are seeking an increased duty or seeking to acquire

a monopoly of the business that they have carried on for so many years. On the contrary they were desirous that dissension should not be sown as between them and their customers—who are, as I say, scattered from one end of Canada to the other. We who are familiar with business conditions know that the bond of business often becomes the bond of friendship,—indeed, it is second only to the bond of friendship. Whatever enjoyment they have had by way of tariff protection in the past they naturally do not want to lose. I can tell you that no manufacturer of the city of Brantford ever approached me and asked me to seek an increased duty on anything that is made in that city. But that they should at least enjoy what they have can fairly be argued, that that system cannot be defended which strips protection from some industries and leaves others in the enjoyment of it. We have had the tractor industry stripped of protection, the binder twine industry, the cream separator industry, all of which goods are made in our city. Then the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and my right hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Meighen) and others claim that we had a general reduction on agricultural implements from twenty per cent down to fourteen and a fraction per cent. Brantford had therefore been made the goat, as I say. They had been made to suffer; they had been made to lose this advantage of protection while others had been allowed to enjoy it.

Mr. SALES: Is there not more binder twine made in Brantford now that the industry has been stripped of protection than ever before?

Mr. RAYMOND: The hon. gentleman asks me a very fair and reasonable question, and I think I can give him a very fair and reasonable answer. There was a small duty on binder twine at one time, and before that duty was taken off there were several binder twine factories in this country, but when the duty was taken off they gradually went out of business, and I believe the only one left in this country today is the one at Brantford, and perhaps one in Welland. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend exact figures as to the output of the factory in Brantford, but the fact remains that these other factories all went out of business in this country. The combine which controls twine manufacture on the other side of the line did not see fit to drive the Brantford factory out of business, and so it has remained. They could drive that factory out if they thought it advisable to do so, and in that case, with no factory in Brantford, our farmers from one end of Canada to the other would have to submit to the price dictated by the combine in the United States.

Mr. SALES: Is it not a fact that the Brantford factory has doubled its production and increased its plant in the past few years? My point is that more binder twine is made in Brantford now than ever before.

Mr. RAYMOND: That is quite correct, because the others have gone out of business. The Brantford concern has increased its output and its plant. To go back, in Brantford we had that disadvantage, and in my election address I pointed it out, and it is that clause in my election address which has been alluded to by the leader of the Opposition. He told me I should not be in Brantford, but out West fighting the free traders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. RAYMOND: He now says "Hear, hear." He also seemed to think it was an act of presumption on my part to venture to contest the riding at all against his friend who had formerly represented it. I was at a loss to quite understand the position he took in that matter. He made a statement at a public meeting at which about three thousand people were present that for me to run on the platform I did as a supporter of the Prime Minister was a deed of the blackest political infamy.

Mr. McKENZIE: Surely not.

Mr. RAYMOND: He used those words, "a deed of the blackest political infamy." Now it is not in the hands of anybody, even if he is the Prime Minister or the whole Government of this country, to say whom a constituency shall send to Parliament. I say that that would be absolutely reversing the whole of our democratic institutions. Any man, whether he be the Prime Minister of this country or anybody else, who will come and tell the free people of any electoral district in this country whom they should send to Parliament, or whom they should not send, is arrogating to himself something that belongs to no man in this country, because under our constitution it is for the people themselves to select their representative.

It has been tried time and again in the Old Country, and invariably the will of the people in the selection of their candidates is what regulates their parliamentary representation. Those words were so terrible to me—I have never had worse applied to me in my short existence on this terrestial sphere—that I began to think a little. I began to ask myself what I would consider a deed of the blackest political infamy. Well, I suppose we all have different ideas of politics and the science of government, and I am sure those ideas have been enunciated from all points of view in this House, but what made me take my first active interest in politics I think was this: I believed that at the very root and foundation of our liberty was the freedom of our parliamentary representation, that a man's vote should be free, and if you follow through the various successes of the Liberal party you will see that it was to obtain that liberty and preserve that right, to give to each constituency the absolute right to send whom it pleased to parliament, that our battles were fought. We look upon that as our greatest liberty; it is the foundation of our whole parliamentary system; it is the foundation of our freedom; it is the foundation upon which the power of the British Empire has been carried through the world; it is a right that has been bought for us by the blood of our ancestors, and therefore as a work of man I revere it as something sacred, this liberty of the people with regard to the franchise and the selection of their representation in parliament. Then if that be so, if you agree with me, can you think of any deed of blacker political infamy than an act that would take away from the men of this country, men who were out fighting in the field and shedding their blood in our defence, fighting our battles abroad for the freedom we prize so much—can you think of a deed of blacker political infamy or anything more malignant than that their franchise should be taken away from them and cast to the winds? Can you think of anything blacker or more iniquitous on the statute book of any free country than the War Time Elections Act of a few years ago? That, Sir, was my idea of a deed of the blackest political infamy, and I believe it would be the opinion of the people of this country. At all events, I say it with pride, it was the opinion of the electors of the constituency of Brantford. They resented that act, and that is why I am here.

[Mr. Raymond.]

With regard to the attitude of the manufacturers of Brantford I would just like to say this: If the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Marquette, that our laws should be on the basis of equal justice to all with special privileges to none, is endorsed by his followers or by the majority of them, I can freely and frankly and fairly appeal to them to agree with my position upon the tariff. In brief it is this—I do not intend to take more time in stating it than is necessary—I think we must admit that the tariff is a tax. We on this side claim it is a tax, but placed for the purpose of giving revenue; it is so put that it gives such incidental protection as is possible to our manufacturers. However, regard it how you will, any tariff is a tax. Well then, granting that it is a tax, should it be possible that one section of the community should escape the tax while other sections of the community have to bear their taxation? In other words in the case of implements, tools, etc., used by the farmers, would it be fair to ask that they should come in free to this country while the tools that are used by mechanics—moulders, carpenters, masons and others—in other industries come in taxed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RAYMOND: It seems to me that if a tariff is a tax, and I take it that it is, it would hardly be fair that one section of the community should ask to be freed from that tax. I think that is a reasonable conclusion; I do not see why they should. I do not think they can point to any direction in which they pay more taxes than anyone else. I remember in the opening address, during the same election to which I have already alluded, the right hon. member for Grenville made a statement as to the amount paid by farmers in direct taxation for, if my memory serves me right, the months of April, May, June and July. The statement was that out of $67,000,000 paid into the Treasury of Canada less than two-thirds per cent was paid by the farmers of the country. Now that being so, it shows that they are not unduly taxed in that direction; that being so, is it fair that they should escape the tariff tax? I do not think it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RAYMOND. Some hon. members may laugh because perhaps it suits their purpose; but looking at it freely and fairly —taking their leader's word for it that there should be equal justice for all and special privileges for none—are they not

seeking special privileges, are they not trying to escape taxation by asking for free implements and so forth for the farmers?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RAYMOND: Well, it seems to me that it is a very reasonable contention at all events. There is another ground on which I would ask you to view our manufacturers of agricultural implements—I do it because they are the principal industry of the city in which I live, and the city which I represent, and that is this: It has truly been said that agriculture is the basic industry of Canada, that it employs more men and more capital than any other industry, and we will all agree with that proposition. But granting that it is the most important industry—and I hope every member of the Progressive party will agree with me that it is—is it not most important that the tools or implements for that industry should be manufactured close by and in this country? If they were made in a foreign country—as they would be to a large extent if we had no duty in this country—we would not be entirely independent. In the case of war we would be absolutely dependent upon our neighbours to the south; my hon. friends would be absolutely dependent upon them for their agricultural implements that are so necessary for their industry—. I think that is a fair proposition. And if you read the history of manufacturing in England during the war you will find that the steels, dye stuffs and chemicals for certain industries had to be made in Germany to such an extent, that in England now they have called those industries key industries and have put a duty on them of 33⅓ per cent because they say they cannot be a compact, rounded out, self contained nation while they are dependent on foreign nations for anything that is so essential to their national existence. I think that is a fair proposition. It seems to me it is worth while considering and that it is in the interest of the farmers of this country—from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver—that Canadian implements—because Canadian implements are as good, I think, as any that are made in the world—should not be treated in a way that would drive the industry out of this country. The manufacturers do not seek for higher protection; they have now the lowest protection, I think, of anything under the tariff; but it is only a fair request they make when they ask that that protection should not be taken from them; and, as I say, it is very important indeed to the farming industry itself that the tools required shall be made close at hand.

There is rather a simple legend—too simple perhaps for some of the members of this House but not, I hope, for those of a plain and practical turn of mind such as myself. It has reference to the building of the Temple in Jerusalem, and Solomon was giving a prize to the one who had contributed most to the success of the structure. The workers in gold set forth their claim to receive the prize; the stone masons and the carvers and sculptors of stone set forth their claim; likewise the joiners and carpenters; but a man, with horny hands and brawny chest, and wearing a leather apron, stood up and claimed the prize. They asked him on what ground he did so and he said he was a blacksmith. He claimed the prize because he made the tools for all the rest, without his help they would not have been able to do what they did and would have been helpless. Now I ask my honest and fair-minded friends opposite if they do not consider that the manufacturers of implements stand towards their great industry in the very same position? I think they do. But the hour is late and I will not detain the House by any further remarks to-night.

On the motion of Mr. Raymond the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at eleven p.m.

Tuesday, March 21, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 2, to incorporate British Empire Assurance Company.—Mr. Sinclair (Oxford).

Bill No. 3, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 4, to incorporate Canada's Sons. —Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Knox.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. MacKelvie.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, March 20.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford) (resuming): When the House rose last night I was endeavouring to make clear my position and that of the Liberal manufacturers with regard to the tariff. I tried to prove that the tariff, being really a tax, should be administered with equal justice to all and with special privileges to none. I also pointed out that while it is justly claimed that the basic industries of Canada are agriculture, fishing, lumbering and mining, nevertheless they are dependent for their very existence and operation upon certain other industries that provide the tools and implements that enable them to carry on business, and that we must in consequence regard the industries producing these tools and implements as key industries. Now, the importance of key industries to a country was manifested during the late war in the case of Great Britain. It was found, as I said last night, that their system was defective in some respects, in regard to articles that were absolutely necessary to the independent carrying on of the business of the country and the prosecution of the war, such as dyestuffs, chemicals, steel, etc. While we all hope that it is an eventuality that we shall never witness, yet it is within the bounds of possibility, that this country might some day be at war, and, unthinkable though it seems, at war even with our neighbours to the south of us. I trust with all my heart that this will never be the case, but, as I say, it is possible. And in that event, it seems to me, it would be right for those who believe in the development of a Canadian nationality to see to it that it shall be a nationality absolutely self-contained and independent. To the argument that agriculture, fishing, lumbering and mining are basic industries, it is a natural corollary that those who provide the tools and machinery to carry on these businesses are engaged in key industries, and these key industries, in the general interests of the country, should be maintained, not slaughtered. I think that that is the attitude of the Liberal manufacturers, at all events, in this country. They only ask for a fair field and no favour. If we are to have all tariff restrictions stripped away they will have to stand upon the same basis as any one else; but, Sir, it seems a reasonable contention that until the day comes when this can justly be done, these industries should not be deprived of the benefits of tariff protection while other industries enjoy those benefits. We have been told that such a system is indefensible and could not continue; we have that statement from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and it is one in which I concur. Now, the trade question has been discussed for so many years that I do not intend to deal with it at any length to-day. Briefly stated, however, we have two extremely opposite policies before us. One is the policy of high protection, which is not the policy of the Liberal party, who believe in the middle course of a revenue tariff. The other is a policy— only, I believe, a theoretical policy— of free trade. I do not think that free trade is in the field of practical politics. So far as theory goes, it may be absolutely demonstrable, and I would not be prepared to enter into any argument as to whether entire free trade would or would not be better for Canada. I do contend, though, that if we are to have free trade it should be absolutely general and universal. But, as I say, I think it is rather a theory and is not within the realm of practical politics. It is not well, in theories, to get too far from earth; we have to come down to the fact that a great revenue has to be raised at the present time, and we must realize that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is faced with the greatest task that any Minister of Finance of Canada, in the whole history of the country, has ever had to cope with. He will have to use every avenue of taxation, and I take it for granted that the tariff will be one upon which he will place some dependence. Free trade, therefore, is not in my opinion a practicable policy. There is an old story which is perhaps rather stale, but even so I may be pardoned for repeating it, because it is apropos. Hon. members may remember that Senator Everett asked the question of President Wilson: "How long, Mr. President, do you think a man's legs ought to be?" "Well," replied Mr. Wilson, "Really that is a question, Mr. Senator, to which I have never given much attention; but I presume that they ought to be long enough to reach the ground." I would commend the wisdom of that story to those who argue theoretically upon free trade. We have to come down to the ground; we must face the question of raising the revenues of the

country, and that is not possible to-day by means of free trade, whatever may be done in the future. Another opportunity will come, I take it, for further discussion upon this subject, if such discussion be necessary, and I shall be able to state the views of my constituents. Representing, as I do, a manufacturing city, I placed before the people my policy with regard to the tariff, and I am proud to say that not only by the manufacturers, but by the rural population of the constituency as well, it was received with approval. That policy, briefly, was this: That to build up this country what we want is a tariff policy that will protect raw material and foster production; that when labour is applied to that raw material, through each process, a certain amount of protection should be guaranteed that labour; and so on until we have the finished article, with a reasonable amount of protection incidentally afforded, thus giving at the same time a slight protection to the manufacturer and an assured revenue to the country.

Now, the tariff question is indissolubly connected with another question which is agitating the public mind from one end of Canada to the other, and that is the question of transportation. In my opinion the two are closely linked together. If we wish to find the right solution of the question of transportation and of lowered freight rates and the general success of our railway system, we must not lose sight of the tariff in connection therewith. Transportation has had a great deal to do with the success of every country, and as we look back we find that those countries that neglected transportation have made no progress, while those that gave attention to this important problem have made a name in history and have tended to a great state of development.

From the earliest days as soon as the land was settled on the far eastern border the first anxiety of the settlers was for transportation. They spent immense sums of money and a vast amount of labour on road building, afterwards on railway building—the story is known to us all. They even laid railroads with wooden rails of pine faced with hardwood that they might last longer. And so in spite of great hardships and in spite of the necessity—which was a hard one in those days—of making a living, they devoted a great deal of time, energy and money to the construction, first of roads, then of railroads, and finally of canals. It was not until 1837 that we had the first locomotive in this country. Time does not permit me to trace the history of our transportation from that day to this, because it is patent to the minds of us all what took place,—how Canadian energy, ingenuity and perseverance was devoted to the building of railroads and canals. As a result we produced the greatest civil engineers in the world, and accomplished some of the greatest engineering feats that have ever been carried through successfully. I need only quote one that in its early days was considered one of the wonders of the world, though we think nothing of it to-day—the old Welland canal that locked ships up some three hundred and twenty feet. Then came the railroad era and the building of the great Canadian Pacific railway and other roads. I will not take the time of the House in recounting that phase of construction in detail, but we know the undertakings were tremendous, and that it was only by having men of great courage and skill that they were carried through to success. We have those railway systems in the hands of the Government to-day, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific railway. Some ask: Shall we carry these national railways on, or shall we drop them? It seems to me that there can be but one thought upon that question. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Pritchard) uttered my sentiments when he said that he thought the Canadian people had courage, energy and intelligence enough to undertake the enterprise of running their own railroads. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they should do so.

We are met with the problem of the proper management of this national railway system, of, if you like, its consolidation or co-ordination, to make it pay and be a practical asset to the country. We have got the roads, we have got the rolling stock. Are we deficient in business management? Is it not possible in this great country to find men who can manage these roads, and manage them successfully? I think if we look back over the accomplishments of Canadians you will agree with me that it is a task that at all events we ought not to flinch from handling until, in the words of the Prime Minister, we have given public ownership a fair trial. A man has been appointed as administrator of our railroads, a man who has the confidence of the country and is known for his shrewd business ability, his firmness, and his personal rectitude, and we have every confidence that he and the other members of the Government will

tackle this problem in such a way that they will ultimately make our national railway system the success that we all hope it will be. If we look at what has been accomplished by our banking and financial institutions we can have nothing but a feeling of pride in the ability of our countrymen, and if that same ability be applied to the running of our national railroads, I do not see why they should not be made equally successful. That is my feeling now, that we should not flinch from the undertaking of trying to manage these railroads to the best advantage of the country

In their management the old question comes up that has been referred to in this debate—whether our traffic should run east and west, or north and south. The late Professor Goldwin Smith was quoted as having said that he thought it should run north and south. Now, if he were quoted upon a question of history, of Greek philosophy, or any other scholastic subject, I would listen with the greatest respect to his opinion. But this is a matter of practical politics. I do not know of anything in Professor Goldwin Smith's life that should make us pay regard to his opinion on the subject of transportation. When we remember that the first settlement commenced on the banks of the St. Lawrence and flowed east and west, and that afterwards when the railroads were built they were built along the same lines, until to-day we have them running from the Atlantic to the Pacific, there is not much use in talking of our railroad traffic running north and south.

But I take it, in this connection—and this is where I think the tariff and the railroad question interlock and should be considered together—that there are many cases where with a reasonable tariff imposed upon certain goods that would otherwise be imported from the United States, the carriage of those goods would bring traffic to our railroads, and the tariff in that sense would help our national railroads, and of course the more freight traffic they carry the cheaper the basis upon which they will be able to make their rates. We all know that if it were possible to-day to reduce freight rates to a minimum, many of the difficulties of the farmers in the West would be entirely removed. I for one have confidence that the Government will undertake the solution of our railway problem with that good old-fashioned courage for which Canadians are noted. I do not think we have a government of flinchers; I think they are going to undertake this problem in such a way as we have seen Canadians undertake other problems. Surely, we will never forget some of the difficulties that our soldiers overcame. When they had to take a position that was considered impregnable, that was manned by a foe who was considered, and had counted himself, invincible, and when the capture of that position had been once attempted and the attempt had failed, and the task was finally given to our soldiers, they made no rash rush to capture their objective within the first few days, but for weeks and months they studied the situation and planned and perfected every detail of the attack, rehearsed every operation behind the lines, and when the time came—I think it was the 9th of April —they advanced and took that Vimy Ridge whose name is now emblazoned upon the escutcheon of our country. We want the same kind of co-ordination of effort that achieved that success, and I believe we shall get it from the Government. We have not had any intimation of what they are going to do, and that is all the better. There was no intimation of what General Byng was going to do, but when the attack came it was absolutely successful. I look forward in the confident hope that when the Government lays its railroad policy before the country it will sweep forward to success with the certainty with which our gallant boys swept forward when they took Vimy Ridge.

I listened with delight and attention to the very eloquent address delivered by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). It was refreshing and interesting, and with many of the points that he made I felt that I could agree. I did not like, however, his reference to the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). He said that that gentleman was a director of the Bank of Montreal and of the Royal Trust Company, and had been a director of the Cockshutt Plough Company and others too numerous to mention. Now, if that had been stated in the obituary of a prominent Canadian it would have been counted to his credit and looked upon as indicating that he had the confidence of his fellow citizens to that degree. Why, then, should it be to a man's discredit that these things should be mentioned while he is still alive? The reference to this party as the party of the big interests is, as I endeavoured to show last evening, a mistaken one. But it would equally be a mistake to assume that there is no room

within the Liberal party for all the interests of Canada—the banking interests, the manufacturing interests, the farming interests, the labour interests. What the Liberals object to is the use by the government of powers granted to them by the people in such a way as to confer unfair privilege or bring unfair profit to any interest, big or little. When that happens, then we feel that both the government and the interest concerned are at fault. But I say there is nothing in the principles of the Liberal party to prevent its having the allegiance of any part of the people of Canada. Let me make my position clear in this respect: I am now referring to occasions where the government uses its power to favour certain interests. For instance, it may occur if a government issues hundreds of millions of Victory Bonds exempt from taxation for the benefit of plutocrats, or if the government accept from certain wealthy companies promissory notes for taxes—these are matters which could be explained in detail by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). Clearly, such acts would be bending to the great interests. But any man who occupies a high and responsible commercial position can see that the true interest of his business is with the Liberal party, because that party has not picked out men because of their race or because of their creed. It makes no difference what town or city or province a man comes from. If he is a true Canadian; if he loves his country and has its interests at heart; if he endorses the principle so well laid down by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and ably seconded by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) —equal justice to all and unfair privileges to none—I say that man can be a Liberal. But in the end, Mr. Speaker, the basis upon which any of us will be judged will not be race or blood or creed; it will be the principles that we hold in our hearts and which make up our personality, the personality of our political party and of the country of which we are citizens.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to join those other speakers who have congratulated you upon your elevation to the position of first commoner of the land. Knowing you as I do; knowing your broad culture, your wide parliamentary experience, your knowledge of history and of the traditions of this Parliament, and your general desire for fair play, I feel quite sure that you will fill that position with credit to yourself, to your party, and to the House of Commons.

Then, Sir, I should like also, in a word, —for I am the first returned man who has spoken in this debate, so far as I know—to welcome to this country, the new Governor General. I had the honour of first knowing Lord Byng in France, and my last remembrance of him was at a review of my battalion some time in August, 1917, behind the lines. I can only express the hope—and I am sure it will be fulfilled— that he will as Governor General of Canada live up to the high standard which he attained as the leader of the troops in France, and that he will gain the affection of the whole of the Canadian people to the same extent as he gained the affection of the Canadian troops overseas.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, with a good deal of interest to previous speakers, particularly, for an hour and a half last evening and to-day, to the address of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). So far as the charge that was made against him was concerned, that he had taken a stand for higher protection in Brantford, Talleyrand's expression that "Language is given us to conceal our thoughts" might well be used. He went round and round that charge and over and under it; he went through it in various directions, but he did not deny it. Perhaps it is only right and honest on his part that he should not deny it, because I hold in my hand some of the statements which he made during the election. They are too long to read in full, but if I quote a couple of paragraphs it may bring back to the minds of hon. gentlemen to my left the almost passionate appeals he made to them to believe that he was nearly a free trader. One of the statements signed by him and made to the electors of Brantford was as follows:

> The thousands of unemployed workmen in Brantford at the present time must realize that their unhappy condition is owing to the action of the Government, which reduced the duty on agricultural implements, and maintained free trade in binder-twine, cream separators and tractors.

That is signed "W. G. Raymond,"—the hon. member who has just taken his seat. But here is another statement which he made a little later in the election, I presume, published in a newspaper, with his picture, and addressed to the electors of the riding of Brantford. I shall read just two paragraphs of it. The heading is "Brantford's Interests Sacrificed," and it reads:

The fact is, this average reduction from 26 per cent to 21 per cent, claimed as such an advantage by Mr. Meighen, has been made at the expense of Brantford's industries. For instance, the duty on agricultural implements, binders, etc., etc., was reduced by the present Government from 17½ to 12½ per cent. Was this done in the interests of Brantford workingmen? Tractors were made free; cream separators and binder twine also kept on the free list. Millions of dollars were sent to the United States for the purchase of these articles, every dollar of which that was paid for labour might otherwise have been spent in Brantford, and every dollar that was spent in the United States for these articles helped to swell the balance of trade against us.

A little further on he says:

A revenue tariff—

By the way, that expression "revenue tariff" is rather amusing. There is only one kind of revenue tariff I know of, that is, a tariff which is put upon goods that are non-competing in a country—and I think my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) will agree with me—or put upon goods that are competing, but with corresponding excise duties upon similar goods made in that country.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not wish my hon. friend to be under any delusion. I do not agree with him in that respect.

Mr. MANION: I should be very glad to give my hon. friend a chance to explain what he does mean by "revenue tariff." Evidently he does not wish to do so. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) does not agree with that. Now suppose you put a tax, say a tax of five per cent, on goods coming into this country and competing with goods made here, and you do not put on a corresponding tax on the goods made within this country, is not that a protective tariff? I should be glad to have my hon. friend from Marquette answer that question. Certainly it is a protective tariff, to the extent of five per cent; and if the tax were ten per cent it would be a protective tariff to the extent of ten per cent. So I think we should have terms that really mean what they say. I think most economic authorities agree that a revenue tariff is a tariff that is not protective to any degree. Let me now give the quotation from the member for Brantford:

A revenue tariff judiciously applied would have been the means of keeping trade in Canada and bringing work to our Brantford factories. Mr. Meighen wanted to give a sop to the Agrarian free traders of the West so he sacrificed Brantford's interests.

Then he goes on:

Brantford was made the goat and has to suffer in order that Premier Meighen may boast

[Mr. Manion.]

as he did in the armories on the night of October 24, that he has reduced the Fielding Tariff from an average of 26 per cent to an average of 21 per cent. Surely this is protection that does not protect.

I think that anybody who listens to these words—and they are signed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Raymond)—must realize that that hon. gentleman is rather a peculiar type of free trader. I remember well, and most of my hon. friends on the other side will remember likewise, that the gentleman who preceded him in this House, Mr. Cockshutt, used to be termed—I remember using the term once myself—the high priest of protection, and the only reason my hon. friend got elected in the place of Mr. Cockshutt was that he out-high priested the high priest. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Brantford—I have no quarrel with his attitude; in fact, we would welcome him over here only that he is too high a protectionist for this party—is only an instance of the many different tariff policies which are held on that side of the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who unfortunately is not in his seat, is at least a moderate protectionist, if not a high protectionist. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who also is not in his seat, is a moderate protectionist, as I am a moderate protectionist. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), who I also regret is not in his seat, is a free trader, as is also my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). I warn my hon. friends to my left that if they search through the whole party sitting opposite they cannot discover there any other free traders than the hon. member for Brome and the hon. member for Gloucester.

Mr. CRERAR: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell).

Mr. MANION: There may be some exceptions, but they must be new members of the House. They were not here in the last parliament. The Minister of Justice stated the other day—and I have no quarrel with him either on this question—that he had stood for the last twenty-five years on the Laurier-Fielding tariff policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is where I stand, and that is where my leader stood in the last election. The Laurier-Fielding tariff, so far as I am aware, and I have given some study to the question, is exactly the same tariff policy that Sir John A. Macdonald introduced in 1878, except for slight modifications in detail. It is exactly the same tariff policy

that we carried on, with slight differences in detail—differences that made a change to the extent of about five per cent in lowering the tariff. The only way the Minister of Justice can get back to the Laurier-Fielding tariff is to raise the present tariff, revise it upwards, as my hon. friend from Marquette suggested might be in their minds, to the extent of five per cent. That is the only way he can get back to the Laurier-Fielding tariff, and particularly as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has just suggested to me, in the matter of farm implements.

One hon. gentleman on this side of the House last night asked the hon. member for Brantford regarding the history of the binder twine industry. I happen to have the history of that industry, and as my hon. friend from Brantford did not give it, I am going to give it to the House now. Previous to 1898 we had twenty-five plants in this country manufacturing binder twine, and there was a tariff of from ten to twelve-and-a-half per cent on binder twine imported into this country. In 1898 binder twine was put upon the free list, and what happened to those twenty-five industries? Twelve of them went into liquidation, seven quit business, three were burnt down and were not rebuilt, and three remained, of which one is the plant in the town of Brantford. The binder twine industry was used during the last election as a proof of the fact that we may have free trade in this country or anywhere else without injuring the industrial life of the country. Well, if you wipe out only twenty-two out of twenty-five plants, I venture to say you are doing some slight injury to that industry at any rate.

I do not intend to spend very much time on post mortems of either speeches or elections, but I do think that sometimes it is wise to remind our opponents particularly of the sins they have committed in order to prevent them falling into the ways of sin on some future occasion. During the last election not only were different tariff stands taken by different members of the party opposite, from the hon. member for Brantford to the hon. member for Brome, but various stands were also taken by the leaders of the party opposite. I shall not deal with that because I think the people know it very well.

Then there were charges such as this. In the city of Port Arthur in a speech made by the present Prime Minister—and may I at this stage in my first reference to him express my very sincere sympathy in the sad affliction which takes him from the House at this time—he said that the leader of the Opposition was committing the horrible crime of appointing friends to the Senate. Well, since the election of the Prime Minister, I have not noticed that he has appointed any member of this party, or even of the Agrarian group to the Senate.

Then there was the charge of usurpation. I am only touching on these charges; I am not going to deal with them at any length. But there is this to remember: There may be room for dispute as to whether we should have gone to the country sooner than we did, but I hold under my hand the manifesto of Sir Robert Borden in 1917. In that manifesto there are twelve planks, and not one of them mentioned in any way that the Government would be only for the war or that there would be an election immediately afterwards. Only two of those planks deal with the war at all.

An hon. MEMBER: It was promised on the hustings.

Mr. MANION: It may have been promised on the hustings. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has stated that he promised it on the hustings but it was not stated in my constituency, and I venture to say it was not stated in ninety-five per cent of the constituencies of this country. But laying that aside, the charge of usurpation is based upon the fact that when Sir Robert Borden stepped out, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was elected by his followers to the premiership. Now, there sits opposite to me to the left of the Prime Minister the Minister of Justice. That hon. gentleman was the Premier of the province of Quebec for many years, and a good premier, I admit. When he retired from the premiership of that province his followers met and appointed Mr. Taschereau to take his place, just as we met and appointed the present leader of the Opposition to take the place of Sir Robert Borden. Again, in the province of Ontario, Mr. Drury was not even elected in the general elections. He was pulled in afterwards. A seat was found for him, and he was chosen by his followers to be the leader of the Farmer group in that province. Would you mind telling me, Mr. Speaker, when it became a virtue for the Liberals of the province of Quebec and the Farmers of Ontario to perform an act, and a crime for this party to perform the same act?

Then there is the old charge of loss of representative government. The only

reason I touch upon these charges at all is not that I believe they are worth mentioning, but because they have been brought up and reiterated by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite. In this country we have never had, so far as I know, anything else but representative government. Representative government simply means that the representatives of the people meet in Parliament and carry on the government of the people. That being so, we have never had anything but responsible government in this country, so far as I know, since Confederation; because if the Government had not been backed by the Parliament of Canada it could not have carried on. The Government of Canada was responsible to the Parliament of Canada and the Parliament to the people. In other words we have never had anything else but representative and responsible Government in this country.

May I touch on one other point in the speech of the hon. gentleman who leads the Government at the present time. In that speech he belittled my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) for what he did at the Prime Ministers' Conference in London. I am going to read to the House one small paragraph from the Manchester Guardian, the most outstanding Liberal organ in the British Empire—certainly in the British Isles—as to the stand of my right hon. friend in London. This is what that great newspaper said of my right hon. friend:

> Premier Meighen has made to the important but insular counsels of Britain at the crucial moment a detached, dispassionate contribution that the history of the world will note as helpful to peace and understanding. He has gone back to face a domestic situation which takes no account of the way he has spoken for his country in the momentous world questions dealt with by the Imperial Conference.
>
> This is a familiar experience to all statesmen, but it is a fate which statesmen a hundred years hence, even across the Atlantic, will not suffer for.

I can only hope sincerely that when the present leader of the Government goes, if he does go, to represent this Government and the people of Canada in England, the Liberal Manchester Guardian will speak in as high terms of him as it spoke of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition.

After all the abuse that was heaped upon the late government during the elections—in such speeches, for example, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) delivered the other day—what has the new Government done to show that the old government was in the wrong, or was carrying on wrongly? I do not know, Sir, of anything found to be wrong. I do not know of one change of policy made by this Government. Take for example the subjects of labour and unemployment. I notice by the press that the present Minister of Labour is most generous and free in giving advice to the labour people all over Canada. I hardly take up a paper nowadays that I do not find from it that he has sent some telegram giving quite strong advice to the Labour Unions as to how they should act; but I do not find that he has changed the policy of Senator Robertson, the late Minister of Labour, so far as unemployment is concerned, and it is worth pointing out a fact of that kind. In fact the policy that has been carried on by the present Government, so far as unemployment is concerned, is exactly the policy which was initiated by Senator Robertson and the government which preceded the present Administration.

Now, Sir, I wish to say just this—that I am not ashamed, so far as I am concerned of the stand which I took in the recent election in support of the leader of the Opposition. It has been stated—sometimes in the House, sometimes out of it—that we were ashamed of the record of the late government. Sir, I have nothing to be ashamed of in having supported that government from 1917 to 1921. I shall barely name without discussing them, a few things which I consider are to the credit of the government applicable to the period between 1917 and 1921.

In the first place, there was the carrying on of the war, so far as the Government of Canada could carry on war. I do not need to discuss it; the result of the war, so far as Canada is concerned, proves that the Government of the Dominion did their part as the people of Canada and the boys from Canada did theirs.

Then, in regard to the re-establishment of the soldiers after the war; the fact that $458,000,000 was spent upon the re-establishment of our soldiers before the recent election, and that that figure is one and one-half times the amount of the whole national debt of Canada before the war—the expenditure of that vast amount of money for the purpose proves, and investigation proves it also, that the Government and the people of Canada treated the returned soldiers of this country and their dependents better than any other country in the world treated their returned soldiers and their dependents in this war or in any other war.

I do not wish to be misunderstood as saying that everything has been done that should have been done. I do not wish to be misunderstood as saying there is nothing more to do; there is much to do. Some mistakes have happened, some things have been left undone; but I repeat, Sir, that the treatment of our returned soldiers and their dependents by the Government of Canada between 1917 and 1921 was unsurpassed in the history of the world.

Then there was the wiping out of patronage. I remember that on our own side of the House that did not always meet with approval; and I understand the question of patronage is meeting with a great deal of discussion on the other side of the House at the present time.

Then there was the giving of the vote to women. And finally there was the financial position of the country after the war was over. The financial position of Canada at the end of the war was better than the financial position of any country in the world, with the possible exception of the United States to the south of us that went into the war three years after we did. I made it my business this morning to look up the national debt of the United States and I found it was twenty-five billions of dollars, with ours at a little over two billions of dollars. You will find therefore that the national debt per capita of the United States is about $225 and our national debt per capita is $250. Then, if you recall that the United States went into the contest three years later than we did, you will realize that the financial position of Canada was a very good one compared with that of the United States.

Then, Sir, during those four years no charge of graft was ever made against any Minister of the Government that held office between 1917 and 1921, although hundreds of millions of dollars of money were handled by those ministers.

These are only a few of the outstanding things that I mention from a large number that might be enumerated, but I do not wish to take up the time of Parliament. I wish to say this to the House: Because a party has been defeated, and badly defeated as we have been—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: I am glad I am saying something which meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite. Because a party meets with defeat, that does not prove that the Government which represented it was a bad government; it proves that the people wanted a change and they got it. They will probably realize that a little later on. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote just one sentence to prove that argument. In the life of that great statesman Sir Wilfrid Laurier by Professor Skelton, which I had the very great pleasure of reading the other day—because we on this side of the House have probably as much admiration for Sir Wilfrid Laurier as my hon. friends opposite—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: Some of us have at any rate. In his Life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier Professor Skelton speaks of the defeat of the Liberal party in 1878, when Alexander Mackenzie had been Prime Minister for the Liberals, and he quotes that statesman as saying:

> The recent verdict has shaken my confidence in the general soundness of public opinion, and has given cause to fear that an upright administration of public affairs will not be appreciated by the masses of the people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Opposition might very well use the same words at the present time. I should also like to point out this: That the party of the hon. gentleman who leads the Government should hesitate to be too boastful about the victory they have won, because, while I admit we received a very severe defeat, I submit that the Liberal party won one of the most anæmic victories that party has ever won. For, if you look down the two sides of this House at the present time you will find that there are practically as many members in the two parties now occupying this side of the House as there are in the Liberal party. So I think my hon. friends opposite should go rather softly when they speak of their success in the last election.

My hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) made a speech the other day which I listened to with a great deal of pleasure. He delivered a very constructive speech and I think a very fine one. Of course there are some conclusions he reaches with which we in this corner of the House do not agree, and with which my hon. friends opposite apparently do not agree, either. One or two of them I wish to refer to later, but there is one that I shall take up now. My hon. friend in that speech made some references to immigration. He pointed out that the solving of the problems of this country required a very good immigration policy and said that we required the right type of immigrants, people who would

settle on the land. With this sentiment I absolutely agree. But my hon. friend attributed the fact that during the last ten years there has been such an exodus from this country to the United States to the protective policy which prevailed in this country. In blaming the protective policy for that exodus I do not agree with him. I am quite sure that many hon. gentlemen opposite will not agree with him, and I am going, in order to show the difference of opinion which prevails, to quote a gentleman who stood very high in the ranks of the Liberal party for many years as an authority on immigration, Sir Clifford Sifton. While we may disagree with Sir Clifford Sifton in many things—some of us; all of us, perhaps—at the same time I do not think that anybody would dispute that he is an authority on the question of immigration to Canada. I am now going to quote from a report in the Toronto Globe of March 2nd, of a speech made by him. The Globe comments thus:

> Sir Clifford is the best posted man in Canada to-day on the question of immigration.

Now as to what Sir Clifford himself says:

> Reviewing what had been done in the past, Sir Clifford stated that there had been much publicity given to the statement that Canada had lost 1,800,000 immigrants during the past ten years. For this loss various causes were ascribed. Some people had blamed Mr. Meighen, some had blamed the Conservative Government, and others placed the onus on the working of the tariff. Despite all these alleged reasons, the speaker declared, it was his firm conviction these people would have been lost to Canada whatever Government had been in power, and tariff or no tariff. The cause of the exodus from Canada was an inevitable drift to the south of that class of immigrant who could not "make good" in Canada, and who sought a "sunnier clime and a warmer sky", and of old people who could not stand the rigors of a Canadian winter. Of the great majority of this 1,800,000 whom the Dominion had lost during the last decade, Canada, Sir Clifford believed, was well rid of them. It was not by the method of shovelling millions of people into Canada, irrespective of their fitness for settlement on the land, that the question of immigration would be solved.

Then, Sir, the matter of climate is also, I think, very important in regard to the fact that immigrants leave this country, and also in regard to the fact that many people who leave their native lands to go to new countries do not come to Canada. There is another reason besides climate which has always struck me—for, like other men in this House, I have given the question some thought at different times and have wondered why it is that the United States has been built up so much more rapidly than Canada. That other reason is this: Most of the people who come to this country come from monarchical countries. They come from countries where not only is there monarchical rule—a rule more or less autocratic—but from countries where the militaristic system is very highly developed; and when they leave those countries they make up their minds to go to some country where there is no monarchical rule and where the militaristic system is not in existence. Immigrants being as a rule uneducated people—because well-to-do and educated people do not leave their native land—they have decided that Canada, being part of the monarchy of Great Britain is probably autocratic in government and militaristic. Of course it is not so, but they do not know that; and to my mind a great many people who go to the United States go there because they feel they are going to a Republican country, going to a country which believes that all men are born free and equal, and therefore they think they will have a better chance of succeeding. As a matter of fact it has been admitted, I think, by all students of the question that the democracy in our country is at least as high, if not higher, than the democracy in the United States, but the people in Europe do not know that.

Now, Sir, I am going to touch upon a few of the problems which confront us. I do not know that the Speech from the Throne mentioned the debt of this country, but it is a fact that one of the problems of Canada at the present time is the large national debt which we have. The debt is so immense that it is weighing heavily upon the people. True, the debt in England is three times as large per capita as is ours, but at the same time we have a very heavy debt in Canada. Then there is the railway problem, I link these two up for a purpose. The railway problem is due to the fact that in this country railways have been overbuilt. There has been a great deal of discussion on all sides as to which political party was the cause of the over building. Well, Sir, if you will look back at the history of the railways you will discover a few facts that stand prominently out. For example, in 1903 we had but one transcontinental railway in this country, and that was the Canadian Pacific.

4 p.m. But Charles M. Hays proposed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier that we should have a second

one, at least that we should have the Grand Trunk Pacific—and, after politics probably had intervened to a certain extent, that proposition was changed to a National Transcontinental and a Grand Trunk Pacific. If the proposition had stopped there, and we had had two transcontinental railways, the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Pacific, then probably we would not have had a problem such as we have to-day. But that proposition was gone on with, with the consent of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party, and with the consent of Charles M. Hays. Unfortunately, however, in 1911, before the Laurier party went out of power, they passed legislation in this House guaranteeing $35,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann to extend their lines from Port Arthur to Montreal. That made a third transcontinental. The Conservative party, no doubt, have made some mistakes in handling railway problems, as some others in this country have made mistakes, but I think my hon. friends on the other side of the House, in view of those two historical facts which cannot be denied, should hesitate to attribute to the Conservative party the large part of the blame for the railway growth which we have in this country. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), referring to this question, said that there were no railway experts on this side of the House. He forgot to mention there were none on the other side either, but did not forget to tell us there were none on our side. I would like to point out to him that the one man who was largely responsible for the railway muddle in this country was Charles M. Hays, at that time, I think, the chairman of the board of directors of the Grand Trunk Railway, who was looked upon as a real authority in railway matters of this country. He was one of the experts called in and he permitted the muddle to take place. This shows that experts do not always cure diseases, or prevent diseases from occurring.

There is only one cure, to my mind, for these two problems, the financial problem of this country and the railway problem, and that cure is the immigration of people into this country, the immigration of the proper type of settler and the building up of population on the right basis. If you can bring in the right kind of settler, men who will settle on the land and will thus develop the natural resources of the country, it will help to solve this problem. It might be worth remembering that in 1914, before the war began, up to March 31st, 402,000 immigrants came into this country. During the war immigration went down to 48,000 for one year. But, at any rate, the immigration to this country is again picking up. Last year, 148,000 people came in, so that it is again on the up-grade, and if we can improve the immigration and increase the population of this country, we will have adopted the only means of solving the immense problem of finance and the railway muddle in which this country finds itself at the present time.

There is another question which was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the question of the further development of the natural resources of this country. On different occasions in this House I have taken up time speaking on that question, pointing out the great natural resources of Canada in a more or less undeveloped state, in coal, iron, fisheries, pulpwood, timber and water powers, and have shown the possibilities of a greater development than has taken place in the past. I remember that last year, after I had spoken, my hon. friend, the leader of the present Government, said that he considered that was one of the most important questions to be dealt with by any Government in this country. To my mind he will get the applause and the gratitude of the people if he and his party can work out some scheme whereby a greater development of the natural resources will take place.

There was another question which was not referred to in the Speech from the Throne, but was mentioned by some of the speakers who have addressed the House. That was the question of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal system. I know it will not be dealt with at this session, at least I do not expect that it will be dealt with, but it is an important question. Julius Barnes, of the United States Wheat Board, who is considered the best authority on the wheat question in the United States, and one of the best authorities in the world, said the building of that canal would save the farmers of the Western States and Western Canada anywhere from five to ten cents on every bushel of grain produced in the Northwest of Canada, and in the western part of United States. If that were true, if it saved five cents even, on the 300,000,000 bushel crop in the country, it would mean a saving to the farmers of Western Canada of $15,000,000 per annum. Sir, by the building of that canal,

if it is decided after a thorough investigation that it is wise to go on with it—and I think it will be so decided—we will make our Great Lakes the Mediterranean of this country, because it is worth remembering that through the Soo canal four times as much freight passes as goes through the Suez canal. Then there is the immense amount of electrical energy which may be developed, amounting to some four million horse power, which would be developed if the canal were constructed. I shall not go into the question further than to mention it and commend it to the Government for proper consideration and study.

Then, Sir, comes a question which is usually dodged in Parliament but which, unfortunately, is not so often sidetracked on the hustings, and that is the problem presented by the differences of race and creed in this country. It is looked upon by some people as a problem that causes a great deal of trouble in Canada. It does, and, until there is a spirit of tolerance, it will continue to do so. There are in this country perhaps 40 per cent of the population who are Catholics, while the rest are Protestants, and there are some two and a half or three million people who speak the French language. These facts are seized upon by some people who desire to make capital out of them to serve their own purposes. If you look across the ocean to the little country of Switzerland you will find that there they speak three languages and subscribe to two religions. In the south they speak Italian, in the north German, and in the west French, and yet with three official languages and two religions that country was described by the late lamented Viscount Bryce, in that wonderful work, written by him shortly before his death, "Modern Democracies," as the highest form of democracy in the world today. So that the fact that there are spoken three languages and practised two religions in Switzerland does not occasion them any particular trouble; and if we look at the matter in the right light there is no reason on earth why there should be any difficulty because of our differences of religion and language in Canada. We have two official languages and Switzerland has three, all equally official; and if there is no trouble in that country there ought to be none here. Unfortunately, however, there are extremists in Canada. I am glad to say that from the Lakes west, extremists are rare, but unhappily in some of the provinces there are such people on both sides of this question, men who make it their business to set in antagonism the French-speaking and the English-speaking people. Unfortunately, also, I regret to say that an attempt has been made by some hon. members on the other side—very few, I am glad to add,—to label my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as a hater and enemy of the province of Quebec. I regret to say it in his absence, but I fear that in the speech of even the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) the other day, there was some suggestion of this very idea. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would be in the House, because I fully intended making the statement I now make and I had hoped that he would refute it and declare that he had not wished to have his language so construed. Sir, bigotry is one of the meanest qualities which any man can possess. Oliver Wendell Holmes once truly said that the mind of the bigot is like the pupil of the eye: the more light you throw upon it the more it contracts. Well, bigotry is at the bottom of some of the attempts that are made to label my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) as a hater and an antagonist of the province of Quebec; but politics is at the bottom of a good deal more of it. No word has been traced to the right hon. gentleman by which he has shown himself an enemy of that province, and I consider the unjust attempt to sully his reputation in this regard as a despicable type of political warfare. Mr. Speaker, no one in the House who knows me will accuse me of being in any way an enemy of the province of Quebec and its people. I know their many good qualities and I admire them, and I trust I may be forgiven a personal reference to myself for a moment in view of this fact. I am a Roman Catholic of Irish extraction; my wife is a Roman Catholic of French extraction; and my three little boys all speak the beautiful language of Corneille and Racine with as much facility and ease as they speak English, and I am proud of the fact,—a fact that is due to their mother. Notwithstanding these personal facts, however, I may say that I represent in this House a constituency which is seventy-five to eighty per cent Protestant, among whom are a very great many Orangemen. There are in that constituency twenty or twenty-five per cent of Catholic people as against the percentage of Protestants I have mentioned. If it had not been for the broad-minded tolerance on the part of the people whom I represent I could not be returned to this Parliament, and I think that this splendid

example of tolerance and broad-mindedness should be a lesson to the whole country. I sincerely hope, therefore, without going further into the question, that in future no hon. gentlemen, either in this House or out of it, unless they can substantiate the charge—and I know they cannot—will accuse my hon. leader of enmity to the province of Quebec. If my right hon. friend were an enemy to that province—for that matter, if he were an enemy to any great section of the country,—I would not follow him for fifteen minutes, because I do not think that any man who harbours an aversion for any great section of the people could be worthy of being the leader of a great party in this country.

Now, Sir, I am going to touch upon another question before concluding my remarks, a question that was referred to in the Speech from the Throne; I refer to the matter of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Some remarks were made in a general way in the Speech, and I have no criticism to make of them; it was stated that the plans would be carried on as they had been in the past and would be amplified wherever possible. That, at any rate, was the effect of the statement. Well, I believe that there are a few things in connection with this matter that can be improved upon by this Parliament. For example, there are questions in relation to pensions which can be improved upon in favour of the returned soldier and his dependents. I have in my office at the present moment a letter from a widow in England who used to live in Port Arthur. She knew my name and wrote me in regard to this matter. She was receiving a pension on account of the death of her only son at the front, but it was discovered that she owned two or three little cottages from which she received rent, and because of this fact her pension was cut off. She claims that the cottages a great part of the time have not been rented. I have had the question investigated by the Pensions Commission—and I may say that I am not criticising them, because they are acting in accordance with the regulations laid down for them. They report that they cannot see that she is entitled to the pension. I presume they are right, according to the rules, but I suggest that a case like this, and many others akin to it, should be dealt with rather in a spirit of sympathy and charity than acording to the strict letter of the law; and if the rules are such as to bear with unreasonable severity on people they should be changed by the House. The object should be to do justice by every mother who gave her son in the cause of liberty. Then there is another class of people who think that they have not been receiving justice. Fortunately they are only a few, but I know of one case particularly: Suppose a man wished to get out of the army, suppose he was exceedingly anxious to get out, and signed a declaration that he was a hundred per cent. fit. And now, perhaps two or three years afterwards, he comes forward and says that he had some disease while in the army, tuberculosis, perhaps, or asthma, or some other ailment which might have been chronic. But his signed declaration that at the time of his leaving the army he was one hundred per cent fit now bars him from a pension except under very exceptional circumstances. I think that this is another rule that might be modified so as to afford a little more leeway to the Pension Commissioners in order that they may give a chance to such a man. Then there is the matter of housing for returned soldiers. The committee on returned soldiers last year put in a report on this question, in which there appeared this paragraph:

> After many and lengthy discussions, your Committee agrees that the Government would be well advised to consider favourably an extension of its original project for the purpose of erecting houses for ex-service men.

I know very well many cases to-day where if that plan could be worked out without too great a cost it would be a substantial blessing to the returned man. Because, Sir, I submit that no man went to the front and served there for any length of time—and I make no exception to this statement—who has not suffered financially and probably physically by his service in the ranks. Practically every man who went over there made financial sacrifices; most of them made physical sacrifices as I know from my own medical and personal experience. No man came back from the front after having served in the lines under all the horrors of war without being lessened in his physical capacity. There is too much inclination—and I say this without meaning to cause any ill-feeling—on the part of many who did not serve overseas to forget the services of these boys to whom we promised everything we owned in the world if they would fight for our freedom at the front. Therefore I think if by some legislation we can stretch the statute enacted a year or two ago to give returned men an opportunity to build

houses for themselves we will be doing only justice to them.

I was struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer, (Mr. Speakman) who succeeded that brilliant orator, Dr. Michael Clark, who was an ornament to this House. The hon. member pointed out that owing to the deflation in the values of land and farm products returned soldiers who took up land have to-day lost much of the possibility of success; and, if I remember rightly, he proposed that one-third be taken off the original value of the land secured by them through the Soldiers Settlement Board.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I made no proposal of any specific figure, but I did support the definite principle of re-valuation to bring land values in line with present values.

Mr. MANION: That is what I referred to, and I think I quoted my hon. friend correctly. I think the suggestion is very reasonable if the facts are as stated by him, and I have no doubt that he has examined them. I know that in my own section of the country, where many men went overseas, a number of them who later took up land are in dire straits. That is a matter, I think, which will have to be dealt with by this Parliament, and probably during this session.

Now, Sir, I am going to deal briefly with the tariff question before I conclude my remarks. I do not intend to deal at any great length with some of the statements made by hon. members because, after all, the debate on the Budget is the proper time to deal with the tariff exhaustively. Unfortunately, in tariff matters as in matters of race and creed, there are extremists. There are those who believe in a high customs tariff, like my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Raymond) for example, and there are those from the prairies who take the other extreme view of absolutely no tariff for protection. My hon. friend the leader of the Progressive party has stated that he does not consider the protectionist principle suitable for this country. He used much stronger language than that during the election, because I remember one of his statements, which I quoted freely during the campaign:

> The principle of protection is condemned at the bar of decent public opinion on moral grounds alone.

I consider that probably we may bring into this discussion all the arguments of economics and of fact without importing the moral argument, although I remember well reading an argument between Gladstone and some one else in which he introduced the moral argument. As a matter of fact I do not think there are any moral arguments to be brought against the protectionist principle, as all countries have at times been protectionist. But I should like to point out to my hon. friends, particularly to those in this section of the House, a fact that might be worthy of consideration. The hon. member who leads the Progressive party took the stand, and quite rightly, that the Fordney tariff had injured the great agricultural interests in this country. I agree with him. In my own constituency there are a number of cattle-raisers—I have a large farming population in my riding, and I must confess that they made their presence felt at the polls. Those cattle-raisers were very much injured by the Fordney tariff, as were also all others engaged in agriculture in this country. As a remedy the hon. leader of the Progressive party suggested that we endeavour to come to an arrangement with the United States whereby they will lower that tariff and give an opportunity to our agriculturalists to sell more of their products in the United States than they sold during the past year. I have no quarrel with him in regard to that suggestion, but I wish to point out to him that the only way you can negotiate or bargain with another country is under a protective tariff system. If you adopt a free trade system you cannot so negotiate or bargain; you have thrown away your only weapon. Germany before the war, as everybody knows, was rapidly gaining upon Great Britain in the markets of the world, and in many of the markets near both of them had surpassed her rival; in fact before the war Germany had ousted the British traders to the extent that the Germans surpassed them in the amount of goods sold in many markets. In Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium and Holland on the west of Germany, and in Russia, Roumania, Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria on the east,—ten important countries—Germany, before the war, had surpassed British trade. How had she done it? By that very method of bargaining and negotiating with these other countries through a protective tariff. Germany negotiated in 1903 or 1904 a treaty with Russia, and under that treaty she rapidly ousted Britain from the Russian markets.

So I think it is worth the time of my hon. friends from the West to remember

that we can only negotiate with the United States to modify the Fordney tariff under a protective system. It is also worth remembering that although Britain adopted free trade in 1846 none of the other great countries of the world have considered it wise to follow her example—a fact which would make every reasonable man hesitate to condemn those who do not agree with them in regard to tariff policy, because, as I think the late Joseph Chamberlain once said, he did not consider that all the brains of the world were confined to the British Isles; he thought that some other countries of the world had views upon this question, views worthy of consideration.

I think I am right in saying that the excessive railway rates at present in force are of more importance to the farmers of the West than is the tariff. I do not know whether that meets with the approval of my hon. friends, the Progressives, or not, but I believe that is the fact. At any rate the excessive railway rates are a very great burden and should direct the attention of these hon. members to the thought that there are other things which need revision besides the tariff. It is well to remember that this country is really divided into five main sections; First, we have the Maritime provinces with interests, aspirations, and desires different from those entertained in other sections; west of the Maritime provinces you find Quebec and Ontario, and with all their quibbling about race and creed—although perhaps there is not so much bickering as we sometimes think—they have absolutely the same interest in industrial, agriculture and trade matters; then going to the western part of Ontario we reach the section which I have the honour to represent, more or less undeveloped, the section from North Bay to the Manitoba border or, say, to Winnipeg, with vast natural resources of iron and other minerals, and the people having their ideas, aspirations and desires as have the other sections; then you come to the Prairie provinces, where wheat growing is the main occupation and all the aspirations of the people centre around the tariff as affecting their principal product; Lastly we cross the Rocky Mountains and get into British Columbia whose views have been so well expressed by hon. members from that province who have preceded me, but views differing from the views of the people in the Prairie provinces. There you have five distinct sections. I will admit that agriculture is the most important industry in this country, but manufacturing is also an important industry. Many of us cannot be farmers; many of us do not wish to grow wheat or live on farms. Many of us in the eastern sections of Canada—Ontario and Quebec—desire a different kind of life from that of the man on the prairies. Taking into consideration, then, the different ideas and interests of the different sections of this country, it would be well for my hon. friends from the Prairie provinces to remember that this question cannot be settled if only one section is taken into account. It is a question which must be settled by having regard to the best interests of the whole country—the greatest good to the greatest number. Indeed, some sections may have to make sacrifices. My hon. friends to my left, for example, may say that they are expected to make all the sacrifices; on the other hand, the hon. member for Brantford contends that Brantford has been making all the sacrifices. Some industrial men think that they are making all the sacrifices. Now, I am not a high protectionist. In fact, I am a doctor of medicine; I am not interested directly either in farming or in manufacturing, but I am trying to look at this question from the broad, national point of view, and I submit that it cannot be settled by proceeding in the interests of only one portion of the country. The manufacturer of the East must make sacrifices, and so far as I am concerned I would go a long way towards seeing that he does. The farmer of the West cannot have it all his own way. After all, as somebody said a few minutes ago, Toronto is not the whole of Canada, but neither are the Prairie provinces. No one of these sections is the whole of Canada.

In conclusion, I wish to say that as regards the tariff question, as in the case of race, creed, and other differences—largely due to the immense area of our country and its relatively small population—we must have less selfish class interest, less sectionalism, and more unity, a greater national desire to build up our country. If we do not have that, we shall not attain the object which we must all have in mind, that of building up on the northern half of this continent a great Canadian nation.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, although quite a number of hon. members have since the beginning of this debate showered upon you their congratulations in language much better than I have at my command, nevertheless, I cannot refrain from expressing,

with that sincerity which is, perhaps my only virtue, my appreciation of your elevation to the post of Canada's First Commoner. The high offices which you have occupied on different occasions when many years younger than you are to-day, the duties of which you discharged with such credit to the party to which you belong and to the country generally, have only served to increase your qualifications for the position which you now adorn. We shall regret the absence of your eloquence in many of the debates, but we hope that the time will come when you will again assist us, as you have so ably done in the past, in the discussions which take place on the floor of Parliament.

I wish to extend my congratulations to the mover of the Address (Mr. McMurray). On his first coming into the House he has certainly indicated his possession of breadth of intellect, and has expressed his ideals and ambitions in language characteristic of the firmness and vitality of the western mind. The seconder of the Address also (Mr. Mercier) expressed elevated ideals in a manner designed to uphold the honour of the Mercier family.

It is my pleasant duty also, Mr. Speaker, to extend most sincerely and respectfully my congratulations to the only lady member of the House, the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). She may be sure that she will command the respect of the House and of the country as the first lady commoner in Canada. I trust that her example will be followed by many of her sex in the next Parliament and that, gifted with equally admirable qualities and noble virtues, they may adorn this, the sanctuary of the Canadian nation, and exert their influence to permeate the precincts of Parliament with the beneficent influence of mutual Christian feeling.

I cannot refrain from extending through you, Mr. Speaker, my heartiest congratulations to the new Governor General of Canada, Lord Byng of Vimy. He has won the sympathy of every subject of the British Empire and of the world at large; he was with the Canadian army in the most trying days of the great war. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that among the many Canadian soldiers who went on to victory under his guidance and direction there were a number of Acadians from my own constituency as well as from other parts of the Maritime provinces. I wish that His Excellency may know that every one of those Acadian soldiers—and I know that the same applies to all others who served from different parts of the Empire—regard him as their idol.

My chief object in rising to-day, Mr. Speaker, is to support the statement of ideals placed before the House and the country by hon. members from Nova Scotia —the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). In passing, I may say that all the old members of the House are pleased to see these hon. gentlemen again in Parliament; we are sure that their presence will result in benefit to the country at large. It was with a great deal of pleasure that I heard the hon. member for Cumberland place before the House the problems of the Maritime provinces. Without the construction of the Intercolonial railway there would have been no Confederation; the Maritime provinces would still be trading and bargaining with other countries—though, perhaps, to their greater economic and financial advantage. It was the will of Providence that gave us our open harbours on the Atlantic, for without them and the Intercolonial there could have been no real progress in commerce and industry for this country, and it would have remained for Ontario and Quebec to be at the whim, to use the words of Sir George Etienne Cartier, of the officials of the customs department of the United States. Perhaps also there would not have been those pleasant relations that now exist with our neighbours to the south. But with these open ports on the Atlantic placed there, to use the language of Joseph Howe, by the will of Providence, not merely the Maritime provinces but the whole of Canada benefits, and will continue to progress and increase in population and in wealth until we become one of the greatest countries in the world in trade and in human effort. The Intercolonial railway must, however, be operated in the interests of the Maritime provinces. It has been said by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate that the Intercolonial railway was built with a view to protecting the whole British Empire against the possible annexation of this country to the United States. The road was built not so much for the purpose of establishing the shortest trade route, but in order to give Canada a through railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We in the Maritime provinces wish the Intercolonial railway to remain an entity. The chief idea of the people of the Mari-

time provinces when coming into Confederation and the chief ambition of the people of the West when the Maritime provinces were brought into Confederation, was that the people of the East might have the advantage of being able to send their products to Canadian points instead of sending them, as they had formerly done, to the United States. It was to be of mutual benefit to the East and the West. But it is only by keeping this road under the direct administration of the Dominion of Canada that we can expect it to fulfill the mission for which it was built, and to give the people of the Maritime provinces that prosperity which they have a right to expect from trade with the Canadian West.

The administration of the Intercolonial was transferred by the previous Government to a Board of Directors acting independently of the Minister of Railways. That was done by Order in Council. Now, the construction of the Intercolonial as I have said, is a part of the pact of Confederation, and you cannot change that pact by Orders in Council; you cannot change it even by act of this Parliament; you can only change it by the unanimous will and consent of every province of Canada, and so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, we are against any possible change in the constitution in that respect, even by request of a majority of this Parliament. The Intercolonial railway must remain there as long as the Constitution of this country remains; it must remain there for the happiness and prosperity of the Maritime provinces. This does not mean that we in our section of the country entertain any narrow feelings. In no other part of the country, perhaps, will you find so deep-rooted a desire for the happiness of every section of Canada. Joseph Howe one day said that Canada may yet become the centre of the British Empire and the seat of government be located in the centre of Canada, perhaps at Regina. That was only an illustration of the great desire the people of the Maritime provinces have for the progress of this great garden of ours —for our country extending for thousands of miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific is a garden from one end to the other; you cannot put your foot on any part of the territory of Canada without trampling on some resource, either in the forests or on the prairies that will be developed and bring prosperity to future generations. We have all these considerations in mind, and it is because we wish the whole of Canada to be happy and prosperous and to attain to a greater future that we wish to keep perhaps this only privilege which may bring happiness to every man and woman in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. Speaker, you know what the consequences have been of the transfer by Order in Council by the late Government of the administration of the Intercolonial railway to a Board of Directors sitting in Toronto. The Intercolonial railway has been placed in the same position as the other roads that have been brought under the control of that board; the result has been the excessive freight rates of which we have heard so much of late. Even two years ago when the Government placed the Intercolonial under the administration of this board, composed in the main of representatives of the Mackenzie and Mann system, I rose in this House and warned the Minister of Railways, the Prime Minister, and the Government of the day, against an increase in the freight rates on the railways. At the time I explained in as clear and forceful a manner as I could the result which would ensue to the industries of the country if, under the conditions which prevailed, the freight rates were to be increased merely to make good the deficiencies of a corporation which had not been able to show the same measure of success as other private corporations operating a similar mileage of railroad in Canada. I warned the Minister of Railways of that day that the existing freight rates were sufficient for the proper and successful operation of our railroads; and I pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, operating a similar mileage, had during the year 1920 been able to show a surplus of $32,000,000 after meeting all charges, while the government-owned railways, covering a similar mileage and operated from Toronto, had experienced a deficit of $47,000,000. I declared at the time that this deficit was due to defective administration; and I uttered the warning that if an increase of rates were granted by the Railway Commission disastrous results to trade throughout the country would follow. I am now in a position to say that had my warning been heeded by the government of the day, Canada would have been spared great disasters which have had the effect of stifling industry from one end of the country to the other.

On another occasion I implored the administration to put an end to the heavy rates which were crippling industry equally

in the West and in the East. So great was the resulting paralysis of trade due to increased rates that the export of lumber from the Maritime provinces to the United States ports was blocked. On the Pacific coast the lumber industry suffered to an equal extent; and even the luscious apple of British Columbia was debarred from access to the Prairie provinces by these onerous freight rates. In the mines of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick operations were greatly impeded, and other Canadian products were prevented from reaching their natural markets. In the matter, for example, of iron ore it is easy to realize how expensive the frequent handling becomes and how greatly the ultimate cost is enhanced. Then the ore goes into the hands of the manufacturer, and is converted into agricultural implements, and, of course, you have to pay something for that operation; then it goes to the farmers of the West. All these operations increase the cost of production, until it is hardly worth while for the farmer to purchase the implement. The country at large has been suffering for some eighteen months from unemployment, caused by the maladministration of our railways, the direct cause being the increase of rates which has stopped the trade on the railways. The railway companies have had to dismiss their men, when business fell off. They had the equipment and employees ready for a big trade when the rates were increased. They had heavy trains, sufficient to carry thousands of tons of material at the same price as it had been carried previously. Subsequently they had to cut down the trains and haul about half the number of cars, at practically the same expense as would have been incurred if they had a big trade. This is the result of this increase of rates.

They have given as an excuse for the increase of rates the fact that they had to increase the wages of the working men on the railway, because the United States had raised it also under some international agreement. I make bold to say, even with all the admiration I have for the manner in which the Canadian Pacific have always conducted their business, that the managers of the road were not equal to the occasion. When they raised the wages they looked for a greater traffic, and a more extensive trade, but they should have known that they could not obtain it, and that imposing high freight rates would have the reverse effect, and the result would be a paralysis of trade. They have suffered also. They have come back, not with a surplus of $32,000,000, but of $18,000,000. The Canadian Pacific have lost more than the amount of additional wages they had to pay.

I regret that our hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) is absent to-day, owing to the visit of Providence upon his brother, whose death has certainly caused him great sorrow, and I sympathize with him. If he were here to-day I would say to him: Give every possible consideration to the request made by the Maritime provinces, so that their future prosperity may not be hampered by want of railway connections with other parts of Canada. I have confidence that he and his associates in the Government of Canada will certainly see that those freight rates are reduced. I have heard my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Baxter) also complaining of the excessive rates. I heard my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) protesting against the freight rates. The thing I greatly regret is that my hon. friend from Vancouver did not protest two or three years ago. These rates were imposed at the request of the Government of the day, whom the railway were supporting at the time. The supporters of that Government will say, however, that those rates were imposed by the Railway Commission. It is true they were imposed by the Railway Commission, but the Government was not bound to accept the award of the Railway Commission. They could have suspended it until the next session of Parliament, and could then have brought the matter before Parliament, which, after all, is a final tribunal. It is well known that the Railway Commission has no jurisdiction over the rates of the Intercolonial from Halifax or Sydney to Montreal. I believe I express faithfully the opinion of the chairman of the Railway Commission who stated that as far as the Intercolonial railway was concerned, he had no authority over these rates. The government of the day accepted the order for an increase to please Mr. Hanna and his associates in the Board of Administration of the National Railways in Toronto.

This is not the first time that I have advocated in this House that the administration of the Intercolonial railway should be under a separate head. Canada is provided with an immense mileage of national railways. We must do the best we can to operate these lines to the best advan-

tage of the people. I do not say that these railways should be given back to private corporations. I am one of the few, perhaps, who have been not only desirous of having under the control of the State, not only the Intercolonial but the whole Transcontinental in order that it might be operated to the best advantage of the people. Administration by corporations means profit for the corporation at the expense of the public. Administration by the government is not designed for profit; after paying expenses, the people receive a profit in the way of low rates. Many members on both sides of the House, have boasted of their aspirations for national roads. We had only begun to look seriously into the question of operation by government when the government had to take over the railroads, which had gone into bankruptcy on account of the railway policy of Canada. I am in favour of operation of a certain portion of our roads by the State and I have contended at different times in this House that we should have not only the Intercolonial railway in the Maritime provinces, but also two or three more units, portions or divisions, of the National railway, where the local traffic would be more under the supervision of local men, where it could be operated with more promptitude and to better advantage in the way of freight rates. Freight rates should be arranged with a view to the greatest possible development of our natural resources, and the cheapest possible transmission of manufactured products through the country. This proposition should more particularly appeal
5 p.m. to a country like Canada, with a territory of four or five thousand miles in length. We cannot expect to have a prosperous condition in Canada, if we are to have rates by mileage from one end of the country to the other, and that has been practically the effect of the last increase in rates. In France or Great Britain, where a large percentage of the production could be transported from one end of the country to the other in a few hours, the proposition is a different one. At the most rapid rate possible, it will take a freight train eight or ten days to travel across Canada. The product which has left Halifax must be carried to its destination in the West. Lumber shipped from British Columbia must go right through until it reaches the prairies to find a market. It is only by the establishment of divisions that you can possibly reach a degree of perfection of operation, which one single central administration is not able to do in a country like Canada. I suggest again that we should have another division in Montreal or Toronto, in order to provide for transportation further west up to the head of the Great Lakes. We might have divisions in Winnipeg and Vancouver on the Pacific coast, so that all the products of the different portions of Canada may reach the different parts of the country where they are needed. It is the only possible way to make a profit on the railway and create an expansion of trade. And the divisions of which I have spoken should have their centre in Ottawa, not Toronto.

Our friends on the other side of the House are clamouring for national operation of railways. I am with them to a certain extent. We have to administer the railways, in a manner acceptable to the masses of the people. If we fail today in government operation, it will certainly be a great detriment to the people. We cannot continue to repeat the deficits of seventy millions or a hundred millions of dollars which have occurred during the last two or three years. It is only by the best possible method of operation that we can wipe out these deficits, which threaten to ruin the people of Canada. In the United States of America during the war the railways were placed under the administration of the government. Those who were at the head of the administration were anxious to make the operation a success. If the railways of the United States had remained under the control of the government, divisions would have been established, to the great benefit of the whole country at large.

The railways should be given a fair trial under government ownership, and if they proved a success and contributed to the prosperity of the country then they could remain permanently the property of the Canadian people. At all events I have complete confidence in the new Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), and, with his experience and success in business, government ownership of railways in Canada ought to be successful, if it can be successful anywhere.

It is my belief that no statesman has more enjoyed the confidence of the people than our present admirable leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), who is proving from day to day, as occasion offers, that he will be a worthy successor to that greatest of all Canadian statesmen whom we still lament, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. With the present Prime Minister at the head of affairs, and

with his two eminently qualified lieutenants, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—a man, I might say, of world fame—and the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who, as an administrator, has won an enviable reputation for himself, we have three men who, I think, are equal in mentality and patriotic vision to any triumvirate of the Roman Empire. With such statesmen directing the affairs of the country the people may well be optimistic. The confidence the people have in these three leaders and their able colleagues was shown in the result of the election on December 6. I was sorry the other day to hear the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) echoing the remarks of other hon. gentlemen who have charged the Liberal party with responsibility for the present unfortunate state of affairs in connection with our railways. Some one, I believe, has said that the present deficit was the child of the Liberal party, which that party left at the door of the Conservative Government in 1911. Well, Sir, whatever political offspring the Liberal party handed over to the care of the Conservative government were in healthy condition, and if they are now unhealthy it is due to the carelessness and neglect of the late Conservative governments that held power from 1911. The Liberal Government has been found fault with for the construction of the Transcontinental. I have always contended, and I still contend, that the Transcontinental from Winnipeg to Moncton is one of the greatest public utilities that we have ever had in this country. It was built in order to bring what I may call the granary of the British Empire closer in touch with the ports leading to the markets of Europe. It was solidly constructed, and I am confident that it has entirely justified its construction. In view of the geographical conditions of the country I think it will be admitted that the Transcontinental Railway from Winnipeg to Moncton was absolutely necessary. Ever since its construction the farmers of the Prairie provinces have been able to ship their products a great deal more cheaply than they could have done without that railway. But the Conservative government was content to complacently allow that immense volume of traffic to flow to American ports instead of to our own ports. I have on many occasions called the attention of the House to this discrimination in favour of American ports, and I am sorry to see my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) assuming the sins of the Conservative party which he was not responsible for committing. I would have thought that he would not care to be responsible for the blunders of others. I hope that the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) will do all in his power to consolidate the railroads of the Maritime provinces into that complete and well co-ordinated unit which I and my colleagues for those provinces are anxious to see, and that he will also realize the advantage of establishing other units in the best interests of the administration of our national railway system.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Manion) referred to my views on the tariff question—a question which I had not intended to touch upon to-day. I need only say that I am still a free trader in principle, both in theory and in practice, as far as it is possible to apply free trade to our national conditions. I rejoice that that principle was recognized in 1910-11 when the Liberal administration proposed a measure of reciprocity with the United States. It was the largest measure of free trade—concession for concession—which Canada could ever hope to get from the country to the south of us, and had our people approved the proposal they would have derived the greatest possible benefit from its operation. Unfortunately they decided otherwise, due mainly to the campaign tactics adopted by the Conservative party, with the result that we have to-day the Progressive movement, so bitterly bewailed by our Conservative friends. But they should remember that that movement in the Western provinces owed its origin to the resentment of the prairie farmers at the loss of that prosperity which they would have enjoyed under reciprocity with the United States. To-day we have in this House the Progressive party, and with its help the Liberal party defeated the late Conservative government at the last election and retired them to Opposition for many years to come. It is a pleasure to see the father of that reciprocity measure again directing the financial affairs of the nation, and undoubtedly his name will go down in our history as a statesman who had the greatest economic vision of any of his contemporaries.

Speaking last year to my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition, I advised him at the time of his appointment to the leadership of his party to go to the country, otherwise he would lose ground and, if he delayed too long, would

certainly fail to return to power, and would find himself in this House with only a small band of supporters. I proved a true prophet on that occasion. However, he will now be able to exercise his natural talent in fault-finding, and I wish him many years of health and strength that he may contribute as leader of the Opposition to giving the country good government through placing us on this side of the House upon our guard against a repetition of the errors which characterized his conduct of affairs.

One of the most vital questions now engaging our attention is that of the restoration of their natural resources to the Western provinces. I may not be in agreement with some of my colleagues from the Maritime provinces, and what I am going to say will be upon my personal responsibility, not as a member of the party. My view is that it is only by contributing to the happiness of the people in every province that we may become a united, happy, and prosperous nation. The happiness of the people of British Columbia and the Prairie provinces is as important to me as the happiness of my people in the Maritime provinces. Of what advantage would it be for us to have a few million dollars more in our treasury and at the same time to forfeit the goodwill of the people of the West? And of what advantage would it be to the people of the West to trade with the United States instead of with the rest of Canada if their domestic and community life were uncomfortable and unhappy? We know that when the western part of our country was divided into provinces, a portion of the natural resources was retained by the Dominion. But these natural resources were retained as a paternal consideration, not because it was thought that they would never be restored to the provinces. It was thought that the administration of these resources would require a large population and large expenditure, and that the provinces could not bear the burden in the early stages of their development. I was a member of the House when, in 1905, the natural resources of the newly-created western provinces were retained under Dominion authority, and I then expressed the hope that their population and general development would ultimately become such as to justify the return of their natural resources to the provincial authority. Perhaps we did not anticipate the rapid development which was to take place in the West and which has excited the admiration of the people not only of Canada but of other countries as well. In less than a score of years a wonderful development has taken place; education has been encouraged; school houses and universities have been established—and all these things have resulted in great benefits not only to the people of the western provinces but to Canada as a whole. The men of the West have worked energetically, day and night when necessary, to provide for their families and promote the general interests of the communities in which they live. The women of the West have grown not only beautiful, but patriotic and industrious, contributing their efforts to those of their husbands and children for the common good of the country. Western people are known as ambitious people, and the development of the natural resources is a noble ambition to cherish. The westerner has sought to make his family happy, and on the happiness of the family is based in a large measure the welfare of the country as a whole. The women of the Prairie provinces have exerted great influence in the matter of bringing about temperance legislation. My hon friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will bear witness to that; he was a member of a provincial government which put through a measure of temperance, largely at the request of the women of his province; and the same is true of other provinces.

As I say, there are two great aspects in a consideration of the question of restoring to the provinces their natural resources. Large subsidies have been paid to the provinces which have not been given the control of their natural resources, and, in the East, of course, there is a feeling that if these natural resources revert to the provinces we are entitled to compensation. But as I say, of what advantage will it be to the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Quebec to say: You shall not get your natural resources until you pay us a large sum of money? Might not the Prairie provinces in retaliation say to any in the East who suggested refusing the West access to our ports: We will not send you our products for export; we will export through the United States? And of what advantage would it be to the people of the Prairie provinces to say: We will not give up the subsidies, because in connection with the administration of these natural resources we have sustained loss? I have a sympathetic feeling for the people of the Prairie provinces, because I have travelled

among them and I know them. What I say in regard to this matter is the expression of conclusions at which I have arrived, based largely on knowledge obtained through my contact with western people. So I say, why not compromise at once? Let the people of the Prairie provinces and their governments say: We will relinquish the subsidy, which we accepted as only a temporary measure until we would have the benefit of the administration of our own resources. And let the people of the East say: We are satisfied; what is a few million dollars as compared with harmony within the nation?

Mr. Speaker, I have submitted these remarks as suggestions of my own and without implicating any of my fellow members on this side of the House, not even any representative from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. I have made these suggestions because I feel that if we do not arrive at a harmonious settlement it will be many long years before a monetary settlement can be arrived at. I believe it would be for the benefit of all that the Prairie provinces should be given a full measure of freedom in developing their own resources; and if that is done, and if they progress as they have done in the last score of years, I say that Canada will become a country that will command the respect not only of the United States but of Europe as well.

Mr. ARTHUR LUCIEN BEAUBIEN (Provencher) (Translation): Allow me, Mr. Speaker, at the outset to join with those who have preceded me in this debate and no doubt with others from all parts of Canada in offering you my congratulations on your election to the post of First Commoner. Being a new member, I have not had like many other previous speakers, the advantage of personally appreciating the interest and zeal you have shown in the study of the questions submitted to this House, and bearing on the administration of the affairs of Canada. Your zeal seconded by a great love of your country, by eminent qualities, by serious studies of problems to be solved both in and out of this Dominion and by a long parliamentary experience had prominently placed you in the foremost rank of this House. It therefore was no surprise to anyone to hear the Prime Minister forecast your election to the exalted post you now so gracefully occupy. I wish to compliment the mover of the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne and also the one who so eloquently and cleverly seconded the motion. If we may judge from their debut, we may certainly foretell that these two gentlemen will render valuable service to Parliament and, as a proof of my sincerity in congratulating them, I express the hope that from this new generation will rise a great number of men endowed with the same eloquence and talents, who will spread from ocean to ocean what we believe to be a sound doctrine, the policy of the Progressive party. The Speech from the Throne referred to many aspects of this policy. The most important of which touched on the price of farm products. The foundation of happiness and prosperity in this country is interwoven with the happiness and prosperity of the farming class. It is through the strenuous efforts of the farmer that the products which sustain industry and commerce are brought forth from the land. If the supply from this source decreases we are confronted with industrial depression and the calamities of unemployment mentioned in the Speech from the Throne follow; business is at a standstill, financial institutions are anxious and tottering, and misery—ill adviser—visits many homes, uneasiness is felt everywhere, the world is upset, the whole social structure menaced with destruction totter at the very bottom of its foundation. The Progressive party is well suited for the hour. It is here to ask the Government to ameliorate by well adapted laws the most unfortunate lot of the farmer and thereby strengthen the foundation on which rests all social classes.

The Speech from the Throne seems to presage that laws will be enacted with that aim in view. Those whose object is to reduce the cost of transportation, the lowering of the tariff which will help in cutting down the cost of production, the expansion of our commerce, a greater outlet for our products, the establishment of a commission for the purchase of wheat, the removal of a great number of unnecessary middlemen between the producer and the consumer, the immigration of bona-fide settlers who will help to increase the production of our country, more facilities in obtaining farm-hands, all these measures will receive our hearty approval, because they will become a powerful lever, from the bottom upwards towards raising to a state of happiness all social classes.

The Progressive party is not selfish and does not restrict its work to ensuring prosperity of the farmer alone, exclusive of

all others. If it asks a greater measure of justice for the farming class, the reason is that on its welfare depends the welfare of others. One might be led to believe that the farmer is not so badly off as he says, that he is dealt with justice and that he has no more to put up with than others. Let us examine his condition. At dawn of day, and even sometimes before, he is to be found at work and his labours never cease until long after sunset. Where is to be found the labourers who would accept sixteen hours of work a day? No complaint would ever come from the farmer if he could obtain like his fellow-citizens of other classes a dependable return for each hour's work. But for the last two years the farmer's revenue does not suffice to cover his expenses, and he knows that if his hard labour does not receive a just compensation, it is because too many middlemen speculators or profiteers want to reap a portion of the results of his strenuous work, either through the sale of the implements he needs for farming or through the handling of his products before they reach the consumer. All we ask for the farmers, is a just remuneration for their work.

The Speech from the Throne contains a reference to our national railway system in terms rather vague and indefinite. For many years past, the Government has registered a considerable deficit on these railways and we are somewhat astonished to learn that after years of experiment by the late government and of study and criticism on the part of the Opposition at that time, which has now assumed power, no solution has so far been found to remedy this state of things.

According to the Speech from the Throne we must have a through inquiry. It is time to act and we therefore expected to hear in that speech a well defined policy.

The Progressive party's programme is very clear on that point and is in striking contrast with that of the Government. We want state ownership of railways as it is carried on in the best organized states of the old continent. Thus allowing the profits, which will eventually be realized from these railways, to become a source of revenue not to the wealthy shareholders but to the people. I do not wish to close these brief remarks without proclaiming myself with pride a follower of the leader of the Progressive party. No one has made a deeper study of our economic conditions and no one desires more the happiness and prosperity of all parts of the country. There is no greater patriot nor one more worthy of the people's confidence. The day is not very remote when this confidence will spread from coast to coast and will result in a victory which will assure national prosperity.

Mr. EDOUARD CHARLES ST. PERE (Hochelaga) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before going into the subject of the few remarks which I intend to make in reference to the Speech from the Throne, let me first congratulate you upon your election to the speakership of the House of Commons. You presided over my first political effort and, by a happy coincidence, you preside to-day on the occasion of my first attempt in this House, to take part, the best I can in the patriotic debates of the Canadian Parliament.

I do not wish to go any further without first extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. I must add, using an old stereotyped phrase dear to our profession, that they have proved once more, "Qu 'aux âmes bien nées la valeur n'attend pas le nombre des années."

Mr. Speaker, it would be to depart now from our French tradition of politeness, if I forgot to offer our colleague from South-east Grey (Miss Macphail) my most sincere congratulations upon her election to this House.

I have followed closely the different speeches which were made upon the address and I believe, contrary to the claim of a number of our friends on the Opposition benches, that the Speech from the Throne comprised on the whole very important questions which necessitate the immediate consideration of this House. The Government admits that Canada has successfully passed through the economic crisis which the war forced upon us, and notwithstanding what our opponents may still say, I shall repeat with the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) that it is since the advent of the Liberal party to power, that the Canadian people have recovered hope and see that a sound administration has succeeded to one but too oblivious of the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the tariff is one of the questions which has a foremost interest in this House. It was much debated during the course of the last electoral campaign and since it is made a primordial question, as member for Hochelaga—even though I am at present but a novice in politics—I am

in duty bound to pause a moment, without however entering into all the details of this important subject. Our friends on the Opposition benches seemed to lay stress on the fact that the present Government had not adopted, or rather was not adopting a definite policy on the tariff, so far as conveyed by the Speech from the Throne. In reading over attentively the speeches made by these gentlemen in the course of the last few years, I have yet to find, amongst the governments that have preceded the present one, a Prime Minister who, with regard to this question of tariff or on many other questions had adopted a definite policy. It is, according to my humble opinion, an economic principle that a country must adapt its tariff policy to the modalities of the policy followed by its neighbours and in a more generalized form to that adopted by the great world powers. Briefly, I believe that on this tariff question as well as on many others, we must be up-to-date and that we must not entirely refer to the past to adopt a policy on the subject. Times change and it is by a careful revision well calculated to fit in broadly with the needs of our Dominion that we must consider this question. Personally, being of French Canadian extraction, I am first of all a Canadian and it is my opinion that, in its widest accepted sense, the Canadian must not be provincial but must be first and above all Canadian. From the beginning of this debate, Mr. Speaker, we have also been witnessing a discussion on immigration. The latter is deemed in certain spheres absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the Western provinces, a means to draw greater returns for our railway system; on the whole, according to some, it would be the remedy which would set on a firm basis our country's economic system. Our Western friends seem to insist that it should be recruited mainly in the farming class. That is a very good suggestion; however, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to limit immigration to that class only, seeing that Canada must be and, I believe, is a land of freedom to which all classes of people, I mean the good classes—and I especially lay stress, Mr. Speaker, on the word "good"—must have access. But I shall here make a distinction. If we must open wide the doors of our country, let this immigration be selective at the port of emigration so that the refuse of old Europe be not dumped upon our shores. I feel morally convinced that it will be absolutely necessary that this immigration be not too great so as to avoid, in times of economic depression such as we are experiencing, that the problem of unemployment do not become more difficult through over population.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was discussing the question of unemployment which was so prominently brought forward all over the country in the course of the last electoral campaign. To-day it outlines itself again under a very keen aspect. I am not in the habit of playing to the gallery, however, belonging to that great political party which has always been the party of the masses, the one which has always so strongly proclaimed "miseror super turbam". I therefore deem it my duty to ask this House to take a special interest on this question. I am the representative of an electoral division made up on the whole of seven eighths of artisans and I feel that these people have given convincing and sufficient proof of their attachment to the Liberal cause and of their approval of its policy by electing your humble servant by a majority of 17,000 votes at the last general election. I therefore request that relief be sought as soon as possible for this abnormal condition and I have no fear of contradiction in stating in this House that the Liberal party was the first to take up that question; the hon. Leader of the Government has given proof of his solicitude when he proposed to the different municipalities and provincial governments of Canada to help them in relieving unemployment by offering to contribute effectively in the furtherance of public enterprises. The Canadian artisan does not cater to that class of writers on political economy who believe that the State should provide for him. He does not wish to beg officially from any one; however he demands that the government concede, through just and most effective legislation, the facilities of earning his daily bread and that of his family, moreover the means of giving to his children that intellectual food so indispensable, to-day, to the prosperity of nations: education.

I therefore believe and I have reason to hope that this Government will even go

further than the programme which it has already prepared towards relieving unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question to be considered and I will venture to say the one most to the fore is that which relates to our railways. Some are partisans of private ownership of our system of railways, others demand State ownership. Opinions are well divided on the subject. I do not pretend to be at my age—and I am comparatively young—an expert on matters of railway management, but I represent in the city of Montreal an electoral division consisting of a great number of employees of our railway system, and at the risk of displeasing a number of our friends on the other side of the House, I feel that I am in a position to state that a number of these employees have admitted to me in their typical way that the present managers of the Government railways "were not railroad men".

The present Government has decided to give a fair trial to the public ownership of railways. Many in this House have spoken of co-ordination. Mr. Speaker, since so much is said in favour of co-ordination, it will not be considered an evidence of jingoism on my part to take up the matter. May I suggest in behalf of my constituents, in behalf of the French-Canadian people of the county of Hochelaga, that, when this co-ordination, this re-organization is being done, it be required from the employees of these national railways, at any rate from those who are supposed to serve the people in my province, that they be perfectly conversant with the two languages recognized as the official languages of this country. There exists at present an evident and well known fact, and that is, our national railways have large annual deficits which have to be met out of the public Treasury. This is a well known thing, and I hope that, thanks to the excellent method to be adopted by the Government in its re-organization of this system, Canada may soon know that not only are our national railway systems well re-organized internally, but that they will soon prove profitable to the country.

Much has been said in this House about redistribution. If I only wished to be selfish on this subject, I should immediately declare myself in favour of this project so much insisted upon but, should the Government ever think it advisable to redistribute the different counties in Canada, I should ask them, before they do so, to render justice to certain parts in my province where the census was not properly taken under the last administration. And this I would ask not only for my own province, but with the breadth of view which shall always be my aim, I am ready to endorse any such request, whatever may be the district it comes from.

A reduction of railway rates has also been discussed. In the United States as well as in Canada, economists, business men, financiers, all agree on the subject. On this point again I feel confident that, owing to the present Prime Minister being a student in economics, this question will be solved to the entire satisfaction of our national interests.

Mr. Speaker, our kind friends of the Progressive party have stated their demands at length. They insist principally on the re-establishment of the Wheat Board. The people of the province of Quebec, which is composed largely of agriculturists, is of course, greatly interested in these demands; I shall therefore request the devoted followers of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) to throw more light on the nature of this Board, why they want it to be restored as soon as possible. What ever may be said, the province of Quebec is anxious for knowledge, and I may affirm, without boastnig, that the people of this province are well educated and take great interest in all important public matters. I therefore ask our kind friends of the Progressive party, and I do not doubt that they will be eagerly listened to by all who, on this side of the House, are not posted as to the activities and the importance of this institution for which they clamour so persistently.

Mr. Speaker, you undoubtedly expect that I should express my various impressions now that I have been sitting in this House for a few days, I must first admit that I have been deeply moved by all the imposing ceremonial of the opening of Parliament; I saw such a display of brilliancy that I have been wondering if we were truly a colony and did deserve to be called a Dominion.

Our country, have we said and repeated, must practise a sound political economy. I have been told that expenses have already been reduced in the Militia Department. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I rejoice at the news; not that I condemn all military expenditure; but, being a journalist, upon perusal of the "Canadian Almanack", it struck me that too many brigadier--generals are receiving salaries from seven to nine thousand dollars annually, while our labourers are on the brink of starvation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said, and I think that this afternoon, the hon. member for

Fort William and Rainy River (Mr Manion) gave us to understand that the present Government had done very little to remedy the present abnormal business situation in which the country has been left by the preceding Government. I agree with him to a certain extent, but think he should make a distinction.

The present Government somehow resembles the medical man who is suddenly summoned following a drowning accident. The country had been left in such a pitiful condition by our friends of the Opposition that, whatever the medical science of the Liberal party, the latter have been endeavouring, since the elections, to practise artifiicial respiration on this half-suffocated administration. The country, I am sure, will learn with pleasure that the present doctor reports progress.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed something else in the House of Commons. I have spent the greater part of my ife amongst English-speaking friends, and I should never have expected that so many in this House would rise and claim peace, good will and harmony between races; I had thought that it was a well understood fact, and I may truly say that in my native province, I do not know and have never known any ill-feeling, any misunderstanding between the races. It is to be hoped that, for the general welfare of the country, the wish expressed by our friends of the Opposition and of the Progressive party will be realized; it is to be hoped, in the interest of the country at large, that there will be no personal, no racial question, because matters of vital interest will be at stake. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River told us this afternoon that his children speak French. I must tell him that, in my own province children of French-speaking parents speak English as well as French; in several of our schools, children are taught to sing in English "The Maple Leaf forever".

In concluding, I repeat it is most desirable that the wish for a better understanding uttered on all sides should materialize. Let us not only preach, but also practise the fine maxims which our friends have given expression to in this connection; and, since we now belong to the League of Nations, let us first practise at home the virtues of charity, of good cheer and helpfulness. Then our representatives at the League of Nations, Mr. Speaker, will be in a position to preach the brotherhood of nations.

[Mr. St. Père.]

Mr. E. B. RYCKMAN (East Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I humbly bespeak your kind indulgence and that of hon. members on this my first attempt to address the House. I desire, in the first place, to associate myself with the many happy and hearty felicitations which have flowed to you, in a full tide, from all parts of the Chamber. I have had, as you may not be aware, Sir, opportunities of knowing the high standard of man—in point of ability, experience, dignity and renown—that we have in the present occupant of the Chair of this House. I think, however, Mr. Speaker, there is one fact, and a most important one, that has not yet been offered to the House, and which should have been mentioned in connection with your elevation to the high position that you occupy. It is a great satisfaction to us to know that we have occupying the Chair a man of dignity and of Parliamentary lore, one who will justly decide in all matters that come up for decision as between opposing parties in this House; but we have here the largest legislative chamber of the land, filled from time to time with distinguished men, and fair women who are visitors to it, and to me—I say it earnestly—it is a great source of gratification that we have presiding over our deliberations the handsomest and the most imposing figure in this whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where is Tommy Church?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I did not intend to take any part in this debate, I had thought that the untutored children of the House should be seen and for the most part not heard; but it seems, from what has fallen from other speakers, that there is a necessity which impels me to make a few remarks and I promise hon. members that I shall not detain them long.

In the subjects which have been adumbrated in the Speech from the Throne there are a number of matters which are to come up for deliberation and decision later on. The only criticism that I have to make in that connection is that in the Speech there was very little that was explicit, and in the speeches that we have heard from members of the Government or their followers there has not been any attempt to give us any more information, if I except one speech which was made by a certain hon. and learned member. I do not know, Sir, that any votes are changed by what may take place in the debate on the Address; I do not know that any opinions

are altered. I do know, however, that the meeting of Parliament is a costly business, and I do know that when the clocks of this Chamber, and there are three of them, are ticking out the seconds of time they are also ticking in measures of dollars and cents. And if I may be permitted to offer an observation I would say that I think the factor of expense in connection with this House may be taken as three; when we consider that there are three clocks in the Chamber and all through ink bottles, mucilage pots and other requisites supplied to members, I observe the factor of three. I do not know that anyone can say that I am especially niggardly; I do not know that anyone will suggest that I want to practise an economy that I would not ask any one else to practise; but it does seem to me, as an observation that perhaps may not be lost sight of, that it would be well now when we have this new, clean, economical Government in power that there shall be an effort made to practise that economy which must be generally observed throughout the country. I intend, therefore, to trespass as little as I can upon the time and add as little as I can to the expense of this House.

I have been greatly interested in the illuminating and interesting addresses that we have heard from all quarters of the Chamber. One hon. member made a remark which seemed to strike me as appropriate—that seeing so many of us were here as strangers we should declare our environment, because a man, whether he will or not, is largely controlled by the environment in which he finds himself. Well, Mr. Speaker, I come from the little heard of and much admired city of Toronto. Let me say that I am proud to be a representative of that city. I am proud that we have one united band from Toronto. In that respect we are on all fours with the province of Quebec; and as the representation of the province of Quebec in this Parliament, under the British North America Act, is limited to sixty-five members and as we from the growing city of Toronto are nine and soon to become, I hope, ninety-nine, it will not be long before the province of Quebec and the city of Toronto in their respective units will go hand in hand. I represent in particular the constituency of East Toronto. It is a constituency of about 50,000 voters and contains 200 manufacturing establishments more or less and of more or less importance. As I say we are a happy band of nine. I might say—since his name has been mentioned since I have risen to my feet—that the Dean of our Brotherhood is the member for North Toronto, ex-Mayor Thomas Church, or as he is more familiarly known, Tommy Church. Some members of the House have been pleased to cast some aspersions upon him but just let me say this, and say it as quickly as I can: I have not been particularly associated with him but I know of him and I know what he has done for the city of Toronto. I know that he has been elected mayor seven times; I know that his majority on the last occasion was practically as great as he ever had before and would have been greater if it had not been for the fact that everybody knew he would be elected. I know that the reason he was held in such high esteem by his fellow citizens of Toronto was two-fold: first, that the man was absolutely honest, and second that he had no other idea than service. In the next place, let me tell hon. gentlemen that he retired, I suppose, because he got tired of the position, and for no other reason. He could have been elected seven times more, for the reasons I have stated. That is one instance. Then there is another incident—and I know this for a fact; I put it to my hon. friends from the city of Montreal, who know something about the cost of elections, and I can say something myself upon that point. Before one of these elections a man approached the member for North Toronto and offered him $500 towards his election expenses, a perfectly proper transaction under the circumstances. I had nothing to do with it, and I am not seeking to justify anything in which this gentleman was concerned. He said to this man, "Never mind, old man, keep your money, I do not want it." We have the further fact, Toronto did its duty in sending soldiers to the front. Never did a body of soldiers leave Toronto without the "Godspeed" of the member for North Toronto. There never was a train load of soldiers in health, maimed or wounded who returned to Toronto, no matter what hour of the day or night, who were not greeted by the Mayor of Toronto. Now, when I find an hon. gentleman who says there is no infamy in offering himself as the candidate of a party which has professed before all the world, and pledged itself to carry out, a certain line of policy, the exact opposite of the policy to which the hon. gentleman is pledged, and to which he pledged himself anew last night, throwing stones at the hon. member for North Toronto, I say, Mr. Speaker, let him gather

his sticks and stones and continue to throw them.

I believe in a protective tariff. I am a man of good faith. I desire nothing but what is in the interests of this country, and I am satisfied that the people whom I represent desire nothing but what may be for the good of all. Strongly as I desire a customs tariff, I am just as strongly opposed to any privileged class. I believe that the tariff which this country has had benefits the farmer, the merchant and the manufacturer, and I can only say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to that immense sum of seventeen hundred million dollars, or more than one-half the total indebtedness of this Canada, of excess purchases abroad in the last five years, if the manufacturers, the merchants and the farmers had saved of that sum what they could for the benefit of Canada, we would not have found so great a state of depression as we have now, nor such untoward circumstances among the farmers, and the manufacturers of this country. I do not intend to argue this case now.

The matter of exchange troubles me very, very much. To be sure, it is not now at about 20 per cent, as it once stood. I believe, however, it is on the upward swing again and that it is in the interests of all parties in this House, especially of my hon. friends the Progressives, that this should not be so. What in the world would happen to the value of the Canadian dollar, in which we naturally feel immense pride, if the purchases that are made now outside of this country were increased to a very substantial amount?

I have an easy way, although I will admit that it is not an absolute and conclusive way, of testing this question of tariff for myself. All the nations of the world that have any pretence whatever to commercial status have a protective tariff. Not one single commercial nation of importance on earth has anything else but a customs tariff. Many of those nations have a tariff that is higher than ours. Many of those nations since the war, in order to benefit themselves, and build up, as they in their wisdom think, their national prosperity, have increased their tariffs, and the only place that I know of where there is any body of opinion that is against the maintenance of a customs tariff is in a section of the United States and of Canada. I cannot believe, for one moment, that all the world is wrong, and that this body of opinion is right. It is the safest course when you are in doubt—and I believe many of my hon. friends are in doubt—to do as others do. I admit it is not absolutely conclusive, but I cannot help thinking of something that occurred here a few years ago. There was a case before the Supreme Court of Canada. Sir Henry Strong, a man of marked peculiarities, but yet a most eminent jurist, was the presiding judge. Opposing counsel was arguing a branch of his case, when he was interrupted by the Chief Justice who said "Stop a moment, stop a moment, Mr. T"—who is living to-day — "Don't pursue that branch of your argument further. Your argument must be unsound, Mr. T. If I had a mind that wanted to think that way, I would not let it do so, because the Law Lords in England have unanimously decided the other way." Before my hon. friends the Progressives impose upon this House their will as to free trade or as to a low tariff, I want to ask this House, what nation upon this globe has a tariff such as they propose?

Mr. CRERAR: Great Britain has.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I venture to say to my hon. friend from Marquette that I was in Great Britain last year when the new law was adopted. It came into force on Saturday, October 1, last. What does that act provide? That act puts a duty of 33⅓ per cent on every article that is in the schedules to the act. My hon. friend from Marquette will find the Ford automobile, that is used by the farmers throughout the West, upon the tariff list. I want to tell my hon. friend that there are, as I understand it, over 6,000 articles of commerce in the schedule of that act which are subject to a tax of 33⅓ per cent. Nay, more, Mr. Speaker, Great Britain has always been held up as a free trade country, and peculiarly a country which could enjoy free trade. Why? Because she wanted to bear the commerce of the world to and from all ports of the world, but she now has a protective tariff and there is the readiest way in Great Britain of getting your goods subject to the tariff of 33⅓ per cent. You simply make out your case before the Board of Trade and you are given that protection. I should be sorry, Mr. Speaker, to see this Canada of ours robbed of that protection which I know all other nations of the world demand for their subjects. And so long as that great and economically wise nation to the south of us sells its goods to the patriotic sons

of this country, and says to them: "Your goods shall not pass our border unless you pay tribute to us"; so long as their tariff is maintained against us and our Motherland—we ought to say to them that we shall mete out to them the same measure as they mete out to us. I want to make it clear that I and those I represent will stand strongly for a countervailing customs tariff for our own protection. One hon. member has mentioned "horse sense". Well, that is my "horse sense"—and my patriotic sense as well, in regard to this question.

I believe in upholding the dignity of this country. Canada may be comparatively small now, but the time will not be long before we shall take our place economically amongst the great nations of the world. But we shall never do that by means of a free trade policy; we can do it only by maintaining our self-respect in matters commercial and in those that touch the welfare of the country. I am willing to do everything in my power to ameliorate the conditions of any class of the community; and let no one doubt my word when I say that the farmers have my special consideration. If it is a question of freight rates, I am with them all the way; but if it is a matter of doing something which is not for the benefit of all, then I invoke the very words that they have used themselves, when they have declared that they want nothing which is in the nature of special privileges. The present conditions are peculiar; there is no doubt about that. But are my hon. friends the Progressives and their constituents suffering alone? Is there no one else who is suffering? Is there no other class that is weighed down by misfortune at the present time? Mr. Speaker, I am strongly of opinion, and I take it from what my hon. friends themselves have said, that if their conditions, untoward as they are, are carefully weighed and the balance struck it will be found that, on this day of grace on which I am attempting to address this House, the conditions of the manufacturers of the country are worse than those of the farmers. I do not expect any enthusiastic reception of that statement, but I may state the situation nevertheless. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) spoke on this subject in a very illuminating way; he said that the conditions were bad in the extreme. He instanced a case which I commend to the whole House. He told us that he knew of one man, whom I understood to be a friend of his, a farmer, who, on a capital investment of $140,000 had lost $21,000 in two years, and he gave that to this honourable House as the evidence of the "appalling" conditions in which the farmers were placed. I can tell him of manufacturers who, with a capital investment relative to that amount, have lost amazingly more; and there are those manufacturers who if they found that the measure of their loss was $21,000 on $140,000 in two years, without interest on their money and nothing for their labour, would to-morrow declare a national holiday of thanksgiving because their loss was so small.

Mr. McCONICA: Are not your friends the manufacturers now protected by a tariff?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would say that the majority of them are; and please God, in view of the information that was given to this House by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), they are going to be protected. And the farmers are going to be protected; and the duties that are now levied not only on the goods that the farmers need, but on the goods that they sell, will, I trust, be maintained.

An hon. MEMBER: How will you protect the farmer?

Mr. RYCKMAN: How are you going to protect the farmer? My answer is that the farmer's condition—I will not put it any stronger—is no worse than that of any other class. I believe that the condition of the farmer will be made better by such a tariff as has been suggested to us by the Minister of Justice, the Laurier-Fielding tariff. That is my view, I hold it sincerely, and I am prepared to give reasons for it. However, I do not wish to debate this particular question. We shall have abundant time before the session is over to go into all the details bearing upon it. If the hardships which my hon. friends complain of were peculiar to themselves, that might be a consideration that would call for immediate redress. But that is not the case. The general manager of one of our well known banks has said that if any manufacturer gave him a financial statement for the year 1921 showing that he had made a profit, that was the statement he would scrutinize, because he believed to begin with, that such a statement could not be true. There are therefore, Mr. Speaker, others who are in the same deplorable position in which the Progressives and their constituents find themselves. And is it not natural? Is there any other country in the world where the condition

of the farmers is any better than it is in Canada?

I spent four months last year in England and Scotland and hon. members may be interested to learn that some of the farmers there were declaring they would not raise any more grain crops because of the then state of the market—which was worse, I believe, than it is now—they could not afford to do so. Do not let our farmers, whose condition I sincerely deplore, remain under the impression that the deflation in the prices of farm products is pinching them alone.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said: Find the farmers prosperous and you find the manufacturers, the merchants, and all other classes in the community prosperous. I am not disposed to dissent from that statement, but I am not sure, to put it no stronger, that the hon. member has got the various classes in their right economic order. The prairie farmers might find their fields "whitening unto the harvest," our friends in Prince Edward Island might find their potato hills bursting with a bountiful crop, but unless there was the market provided by the merchants, the manufacturers, and the professional men of the country to pay for that abundant harvest, I submit we would have hard times. I can assure the House beyond a question of doubt that when certain manufacturers, whose cost systems told them the truth, were aware that every single day their wheels turned they were making a loss, they kept their men on that they and their families might be supplied with bread, for those manufacturers were determined that the depressing line of the unemployed, so fearful to see, should not be lengthened if they could help it.

The hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) remarked on what part of the customs tariff levied on imports reached the treasury and was available to meet our national expenditure. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that one hon. member of the Progressive party, a clergyman, in addressing audiences throughout his riding specially emphasized the fact that one-half of all the money received in customs duties was absorbed in the expense of collection. That statement, of course, was very effective. I heard that another hon. member addressed his constituents to the same effect. Thus we know of at least three hon. members, each in different provinces, making this mischievous statement. I do not suggest for a moment that they knew it was utterly untrue, but the damage was done. But I am satisfied that this pernicious statement with a loading of about nine hundred and fifty per cent above the facts, went broadcast throughout the country. When it was made in the House I knew it was incorrect, and I thought it would be challenged, but there it appears on the pages of Hansard, and if those pages come into the hands of any one who does not see the contradiction, because it was not made until a couple of days later, the damage will be still greater. Therefore, I submit for the consideration of my Progressive friends that wherever that statement has been made, wherever it has done its deadly work—and I do not wish to use too hard an expression—it is in the interests of good government that it should be forever killed.

9 p.m.

I have enjoyed this debate exceedingly, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to claim any undue merit for my regular attendance, but I have been in my seat during the greater part of the debate. What has fallen from the lips of hon. members has always been illuminating, informative, or entertaining. I find satisfaction in disagreeing with some speakers. I find satisfaction in agreeing with others. But one hon. member gave me the greatest satisfaction, although he was also the dispenser of keen disappointment and distress. I will explain what I mean. I did not return from abroad until October and had no intention of participating in the election campaign, but later on I was asked, under special circumstances, to accept the Conservative nomination for the constituency which I have the honour now to represent. When the platform that had been propounded by the Liberal party, accompanied by the pledge to put it into effect at the earliest opportunity, was read at my nomination meeting, a contra-statement was made that that platform would give place to the Laurier-Fielding tariff. I could not believe that at the time, because I relied upon the honourable men who had pledged their word to put this platform into effect as the platform of the Liberal party if returned to power. During the campaign I asked a well-known manufacturer for the privilege of addressing his employees during the noon hour. He replied, "I am not going to allow you to address them, and, furthermore I am not going to vote for you. You think you are going to have this tariff that is given us in the Liberal platform. Well, I have just returned from Montreal, and I may tell you we are not

going to have anything of the kind." If necessary I can give the name of that manufacturer, and as I had a witness with me I can substantiate the statement made. Although that manufacturer said: "We are going to have the Laurier-Fielding tariff," still in my ignorance and confidence I continued during my campaign to discuss the respective tariff platforms of the Conservative, Liberal, and Progressive parties. I heard it constantly stated during the campaign: "Do not concern yourself about the Liberal tariff policy; you will not be troubled about it if the Liberals are the largest group returned and have the making of the tariff." I came to this House, therefore, in some doubt as to what was going to happen, particularly in view of the solemn declaration of the Liberal convention, accompanied by a pledge to put that declaration into effect. I observed my honoured leader wrap up the Liberal party in their platform and their pledge as in a shroud and hand it to the undertaker. Surely, I thought, this is mistaken tactics. You are defying the Liberal party to put their platform into effect. You are reading what has been said in the province of Quebec. You are giving the stand that has been taken by some members of the party with regard to the fiscal policy of the country, and you are defying them to carry out their pledges. I thought that was a mistake. I said in my own mind: Why not let them escape from their platform and their pledge if they want to do so, because if they did fail to carry out their promise it would be in the interests of the country? Why not let them? Why gird at them so that they will carry it into effect? Mr. Speaker, I believe that the putting into effect of that platform as the policy of this country would bring about the crisis to which my right hon. leader referred as well as the crisis to which the Minister of Justice referred. I do not think, however, that such a deplorable crisis would bring about just the results pictured by the Minister of Justice.

Following the speech of my leader, I listened to the hon. First Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). He made use of his little simile, and he told us that we should not take campaign pledges seriously—which was new light for me. He also said that he had stated his intention of surrounding himself with leading members of the party and of accepting their advice as to what he should do with regard to carrying out the Liberal platform. He read the speech that he made during the Liberal convention after that platform had been laid down, and he had been chosen as leader of the Liberal party. I ask hon. members to refer to page 49 of Hansard, where the Prime Minister quotes the speech he made on that occasion, and ask themselves whether any high school boy or girl could attach to what he said during the course of that speech—it is found on page 199 of the proceedings of the Liberal convention--any other meaning than that which his words obviously implied, —"press on from this moment * * * for greater righteousness * * * till we have reached the goal where the principles and policies laid down on this historic occasion will have become, through legislation, part of the law of our land". Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. First Minister was playing with the issue,—as was the case before the 6th of December. I thought we should find out how this matter stands when the legislation is brought down, and not before; that if we were not to know where we stood in relation to the tariff until the tariff proposals were presented, we would at least know then. But to my great joy—and I cannot too much emphasize my feelings in this respect—the Minister of Justice, in his very notable speech and in language which no one could misunderstand—in terms lucid and convincing—said: "My views have never changed during the lest twenty-five years. For fifteen years I have followed, approved, endorsed the Laurier-Fielding tariff. I have advocated that tariff in the province of Quebec; I have advocated it in the city of Quebec. At a gathering held in that city the right hon. leader of the Opposition was present and applauded my declaration with regard to the tariff. I am in favour of the Laurier-Fielding tariff".

My hat was in the air, Mr. Speaker, I came to this House in some doubt and apprehension with regard to the future fiscal policy of this country. But, knowing as I do what the Laurier-Fielding tariff is, I am no longer in uncertainty with regard to the tariff question. My hat is in the air; if I had three hats they would all be in the air, one hanging on each of the clocks in the Chamber, to emphasize the triumphant nature of my feelings upon learning that from this time forth we are to have the Laurier-Fielding tariff as the tariff policy of this country. Do not misunderstand me; I am not forgetting that the Minister of Justice said "with such modifications as exigencies might demand". But I rejoice

in the intimation—and I believe this country rejoices in it—that we are to have the Laurier-Fielding tariff.

What was the policy of our party in the last election? What did we say was the most important issue, the one with which we were most deeply concerned? We said that a proper tariff policy was essential to the well-being of the nation; that we should have such a customs tariff as we have had. Regardless of varying political conditions I say that the principle of the tariffs we have had from 1896 up to the present time is satisfactory to the party which I have the honour to support in this House.

Then who won the election in that event? What policy prevailed? Was it the policy of the Liberal party propounded in convention after the deliberations of the thousand or more who, I am told, were gathered there? No, Mr. Speaker, it was the policy demanded by the people of this country that we must have in this Canada of ours, for the benefit of farmers, merchants, manufacturers, the professional classes and of all who enjoy the privilege of living in this country, a protective tariff. That question reminds me of that other one, who won the war? In the United States —and I have had a very considerable amount of business with the United States government in the last three years—it is claimed openly by executive officers that the war was won by that nation which, as a matter of fact, after having propounded and put into effect a policy of neutrality, delayed for over two years until April, 1917, before coming into the war. Yet they say that they won the war. Well, let them claim that, and let any party which announced that it was in favour of the Laurier-Fielding tariff, and that it would put it into effect, claim that it won the election, but, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the election was won by those people throughout the country who believed, as the Conservative party did, that a protective tariff was necessary for Canada. Am I sure yet that we have the Laurier-Fielding tariff? Yes, I think I am. The Minister of Justice has said so, and he is beyond question an important member of the administration. I am also aware of what is the effect of British parliamentary practice in a case of this kind, and that if any other members of the administration should insist now that we must have something other than the Laurier-Fielding tariff, then in accordance with parliamentary practice we must have the resignation

of the Minister of Justice. I have therefore unalloyed satisfaction in the effect of his declaration.

If some may say, "Oh, but your leader was unhorsed," I admit that, but if our leader was unhorsed, we will leave our friends of the other side to play with their broken toys and their broken pledges, because we on this side had a definite policy which we believed would make for the prosperity of this country.

I was greatly disappointed with another part of the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. In my opinion he has been the first in this Parliament to set province against province. His speech is about five-and-a-half columns long in Hansard; I have read it very, very carefully, and nobody can tell me after reading that speech that it was prepared with any other idea in view than the winging of the two arrows which are launched in its last paragraphs. My hon. friend, in solemn tones of injured innocence, appealed to this House. He said that there had been a crisis, that he had not said any more than the right hon. leader of the Opposition had said, that his aim was to serve the country, that the crisis had been averted by the return of the Liberal party to power, that we should recognize that, and that we had an opportunity to learn now that we were in opposition. Then comes the statement that the attitude taken by my right hon. leader was inspired by bitterness against the province of Quebec. Now I submit to the members of this House that there was not one line, one word, or one syllable, uttered by my right hon. leader that was charged in any degree with bitterness against the province of Quebec. Then, in his next paragraph, the Minister of Justice refers to the allegation that he was the master of this administration, and after supporting that allegation by making a statement as to the tariff policy of this country—that declaration did not come from the First Minister, from whom it might very properly have come, nor from the Minister of Finance, in whose department it was, but from the Minister of Justice—he says that my right hon. leader desired "to accentuate the unfortunate differences which have existed between certain provinces."

Mr. Speaker, this is an old, old game, and a wretched game it is. I do not believe that the Minister of Justice desired to set any such ball rolling, because, while he may have done what was done with intention, I do not believe he had any idea that what he said would be taken in the way

it has been, or that it would have the results that have flowed from it. What do we find? The word the Minister of Justice used was "bitterness." That is immediately translated into "hatred" by the newspapers, but I shall refer to that later on. Out of a clear sky, without any provocation whatever, we have the allegation that province is being set against province, and that it is the desire of the leader of an important party in this House to accentuate the differences that exist between the provinces. I say that it is an old, old game. The kick-off was with the Minister of Justice. Then the ball was passed to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). What did he say? He said, "Beneath the surface there is an indication of a desire on the part of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition to resuscitate the old sectional feeling," and the matter is enlarged upon there. I submit that my hon. friend had no justification for including that in his remarks. It was wholly amongst the disjecta membra of his address, and he might just as well, and I say it with all respect, have said, "Hon. members, onions do not agree with my digestion," but from a full heart, anxious to keep the ball rolling, he says, "Beneath the surface"—and all things that are beneath the surface are not above board and honourable—"beneath the surface there is an indication of a desire on the part of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition to resuscitate the old sectional feeling."

Why is this matter introduced into this debate? Why does it come from the Government side? Why is it impressed upon us, why does it become important and why has it been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite ever since the incident in question? The member for one of the Montreal constituencies, in a perfectly frank speech—and I took pleasure in the sincerity of his remarks—referring to this matter asked: Why all this bitter hatred? I submit it is for a malign purpose—to solidify the people of the province of Quebec against my right hon. leader. It has a pernicious effect, it is wholly undesirable, there is no occasion for it and how is expression to be given to the much desired spirit of unity after such an unwarranted attack? How did this movement begin? One of the newspapers translated the incident: "Hatred of Quebec inspires Meighen's attack, Sir Lomer says."

This appeared with different transpositions in different newspapers, but conveying the same meaning. Sir Lomer Gouin, a most important figure in the province of Quebec, is now the Minister of Justice. All honour and respect to him; he has attained his high position through the good will of his countrymen. But what do we find? An attack is made by him which is translated and given currency in the province of Quebec the result of which can only be construed—if they take the Minister of Justice at his word and the public of Quebec do that—as an attack made upon my leader. Now, Mr. Speaker, to say there has been such an attack is most unjust. Let me put the matter this way: Suppose the situation were reversed, that an unsupported and unjustified attack had been made by Sir Lomer Gouin upon the leader of the Opposition, and that the story came out in the newspapers of Ontario headed "Hatred of Ontario inspires Sir Lomer Gouin's attack, the right hon. Arthur Meighen says." What would have been the effect throughout Ontario? Would such a precedure as that tend to develop amity and good will? Would it tend to enlarge the esteem in which the Minister of Justice is at present held in the province of Ontario? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would not. I want to see—and this is my humble contribution to the debate—banished once and for all from this House, and banished from the newspapers that report the proceedings of this House, this serpent of discord and all its slimy trails.

I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker, with all the earnestness that I can command: The members of this hon. House should decide that any imputation against a province, or any imputation against the members of a province as a whole, should be forever forbidden and never allowed to occur. Sir, I was born in the province of Quebec. My mother was born in that province, I have lived there myself and an important section of my family still lives in Quebec and enjoys the blessings which obtain there. I have important interests in that province, and there is no blessing that could come to Quebec that I would for one moment withhold. If you will allow me a personal allusion I can never forget the feeling akin to worship which enters my soul when I am in the presence of the mighty St. Lawrence. Such is the spirit which seems to breathe over all its waters that I can well understand how the ancients worshipped their river gods. I regard the province of Quebec with all affection and would deny it no reasonable demand. I moved to the city of Toronto and have lived there for nearly thirty-five years. I know

the fair-mindedness of its people. I know there is no section which would seek to deny the province of Quebec anything it is entitled to. There might be a few persons of altered mentality who might desire to say something derogatory of the province of Quebec or of any other province but there is no section of the community in which I live, or of the province of Ontario as I know it, that would for one moment withhold from the province of Quebec anything that it is entitled to. On the other hand, I believe there is no important section of public opinion in the province of Quebec that would withhold from the province of Ontario what it is entitled to.

But what do we find? We come to Ottawa and at first we find everything agreeable but before long within the precincts of this House we hear enunciated this idea of hatred. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of members of this House, if they wish to serve the cause of their common Canadian patriotism, to see that an end is put to that kind of thing. As far as my race is concerned I am five generations Canadian. As regards my religion I will admit that I ought to have more of it but I am of a different creed from that declared by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) this afternoon. If there are policies or principles or individuals to be attacked here let them be attacked and if they cannot defend themselves or give as good as they receive, let them suffer the consequences but surely attacks should not be made upon any part of the common patriotism of this country. Sir Wilfrid Laurier declared that love is better than hate. He sat for years in this House and knew the spirit that at times invaded it and in these words he has left his condemnation of that very spirit. I am willing to co-operate with other members of the House in doing my level best to see that the spirit complained of shall be forever exorcised.

There are rules of the House which are in the interest of decorum and the maintenance of the amenities of debate which require that no aspersion shall be cast by one member upon his fellow members. If a member offends in this particular, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we put him in a room by himself. This is merely an idea that I have in my own heart, and I say that no member should be permitted to speak disrespectfully of any province, or the people of any province as a whole. I submit if there was some amendment to the Rules of the House carrying into effect that idea, the legislation of this Fourteenth parliament would advance the interests of this country beyond anything that we now imagine.

As far as I am concerned, let me say that I have no other interest than that of my country, Canada. My constituency is East Toronto. I know that it is a legal fiction that when a member is elected for a constituency he becomes, ipso facto, a representative of the whole country, and that he is not allowed to advance something which means the benefit of his own constituency or his own province, if it does not run on all fours with the betterment of the whole country. With that feeling, I want to say that I intend to attend the sessions of this House. I have no other occupation at the present time, and no business that calls me specially away from here prevents me giving my full attention to the sessions of this House. If any member of the House thinks that I, in my humble capacity, can do anything to advance the interests of any portion of this Dominion, or to improve the condition of the people of any part of Canada, I say right now as emphatically as I can, that I am at the service of that hon. gentleman. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this unity, this prosperity which we are sure Canada is entitled to, and which the future will give it, can only be obtained if we, once and for all, really strive to become a united band, with no other object than the advancement of our country.

Mr. E. J. SEXSMITH (Lennox and Addington): I wish, Mr. Speaker, to join with hon. gentleman in extending to you my sincere congratulations. I am not quite satisfied in my own mind as to the advisability of continuing this present discussion. I have been educated and entertained, and I might say that conscientious and constructive discussion may have a place yet in these proceedings. We are told that in a multitude of councillors there is safety. As one just undertaking the responsibilities of a member of this House, I do not intend to delay the proceedings by a long-drawn out speech. I desire, in a very humble way, to summarize some of the principal thoughts that have been expressed in relation to the Speech from the Throne. One hon. gentleman on this side of the House said that it was wise for us to consider the statements that were made in Parliament because they went out through the country. I believe he was right in the declaration, but the thought came to my mind: was it not just as important that this Parliament should

consider some of the statements that have been made and sent here from the country? I desire to state frankly that this Government is starting under very difficult circumstances, and an economic recovery cannot be brought about in a day, but it is my conviction that the Government will attain its objective, namely, the restoration of the political, economical and social life of Canada to a state of normality. What are some of the statements that come from the people of Canada to this Parliament? The people of Canada very emphatically stated on the 6th of December last that they wanted a change of government.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I do not believe in abusing the retiring government. I do not think that we get anywhere by abusing one another. Very definite statements have been made, that there was to be a revision of the tariff, that the railways should be owned and managed by the government, that the natural resources of the Dominion should be developed, and that constructive economy be practised in the administration of the country's affairs. Something has been said about unemployment. I will admit that the condition is very, very serious. But it is serious in the respect that it is an indication of a defect in administration. When these symptoms arise in Canada, it is time for statesmen and for everybody to begin and diagnose the case. Sir, I say that, while there have been world-wide conditions brought about by the Great War, and while there has been reaction resulting in pessimism, deflation in prices and so on, we believe that the national policy has outlived its day of intended usefulness. We are of the opinion that its continuance in force has been the underlying cause of Canada's present condition. We sometimes spend a good deal of time in swatting the fly, on account of the contagion that his little feet carry, forgetting to clean up the cesspools and the slough ponds that are the source of the trouble. We want revenue; of course we do. We have a debt to pay. But a policy that brings in revenue and places a small percentage in the national treasury, allowing the major portion to find its way into the pockets of individuals, is destructive. The present high tariff is destroying the equilibrium of the nation, economically, financially and industrially. One of the main essentials of good statesmanship is the ability to strike and maintain a true balance in national affairs, but we believe that the present system is submersive of the best interests of the country as a whole. What is the solution? It is to be found in a change of policy.

Something has been said about agriculture, and reference was made to the subject in the Speech from the Throne, in a faint, though judicious, way. I am sorry that the Progressive party is sometimes misunderstood. There seems to be a misunderstanding between the people of the rural districts and those of the urban centres, not so much in the West, perhaps, as in the East and in Central Canada; but we trust that the day is not far distant when that misunderstanding will have disappeared. We do know that between the urban interest and the rural interest there is an interdependence; we know that those interests are positively inseparable; and we are also aware that a country must take care of its manufacturing interests. But there is another outstanding truth to be considered, and that is, that no nation that is over-industrialized is in a very normal condition. The greatest source of wealth to a nation lies in the fertility of its soil, and it matters not who tills that soil. If I understood the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) correctly, he said in his speech that the basic industry of Canada was agriculture. That being so, and statesmen having acknowledged the fact from time to time, we feel that agriculture should be encouraged, not, of course, in a selfish, narrow way, but having regard to its relation to other fundamental principles. Much has been said, by men who have pioneered the West and who have laboured in this industry, as regards what should be done by governments. In summing up these opinions, we find that they want markets that are unbarred, they want economic transportation, and they want just remuneration, untampered with. Now, I believe that this Government will see to it that the agricultural industry receives fair treatment.

There is the problem of railways, and I do not think that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) is to be envied. Indeed, I think it will devolve upon this House to assist him as best it can. This subject will be discussed by men who are eligible to deal with it. It pleases me to hear men, who have the ability and the experience, confining their remarks to this one particular question. We find that the railway freight rates are almost prohibiting transportation. In my own province it costs $500 to remove one hundred cords of

wood to a point about eighty miles distant from our county town. Under weak management the railways have perforce fallen into the possession of the Government. If there was anything on this earth that could die twice, I might say that we have been tariffed to death's door and have been railroaded nearly to the grave. There are two prominent factors in successful railway management—honest, competent direction, and the production of the natural resources of the country. I might place in the same category the three paramount problems, the railway problem, the immigration problem, and the problem of developing Canada's natural resources. These matters go together. Now, I do not wish to take up more time, because I do not feel that I have the ability to deal with these questions as they should be dealt with. But it is very necessary that something should be done, and we believe that it will be done.

I should like to say something in regard to the Soldiers' Settlement Board, which has been referred to rather cautiously. I believe that it is in the mind of the Government to do something more for our returned soldiers. Of course, much has been done; but we think that there could hardly be a limit to what Canada should do for those of her sons who fought her battle. Canada cannot afford to forget her returned heroes.

In conclusion, let me say that there are fundamental principles for us to consider. One has been mentioned by a number of hon. gentlemen, namely, unity; but I think that one of the main principles that should govern administration is unselfishness. When personal selfishness enters into the hearts of hon. members to whom the country entrusts the administration of its affairs, such selfishness is not only out of place, but is very destructive. Especially in all our deliberations I believe that we should be careful not to be biassed by racial or party prejudice, for it is only by maintaining a cool, dispassionate judgment that we can best advance the true interests of this great Dominion.

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (South Toronto): I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to participate in this debate, but as several important points have been raised, and as some hon. members at least have expressed themselves as though inspired by rather a jealous feeling against my native city, I feel it incumbent upon me to address the House.

[Mr. Sexsmith.]

In the first place, Sir, I would crave the privilege of joining with those who have preceded me in conveying to you my most hearty congratulations on your election to the high position which this House has conferred upon you. I do that with all the more satisfaction because I recall that when I entered Parliament you were one of the first to extend to me that courtesy, friendliness and companionship which a new member very often so earnestly and keenly desires. Moreover, in view of all that has been said regarding the solid Liberal representation from the province of Quebec, I, as a Canadian, cannot be restrained from expressing my admiration at the rising to the position of First Commoner of this country of a Canadian from the old French province of Quebec who has been signally honoured by the great Republic of France in being permitted to wear in the lapel of his coat that, to a Frenchman, very cherished decoration of the Legion of Honour. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon me this personal reference. I speak it because I am more than ordinarily sincere and earnest in conveying to you my keen appreciation of your election.

Regarding the Speech from the Throne, which is the subject matter of this debate, it raises to my mind only three important points: First, the railways, next, the tariff, and, third, immigration. True, the Speech from the Throne makes reference to the recent election,—to the restoration of good times, so suddenly identified, which have come, according to the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) in response to the vindication of the principle that the people rule, while the old government, so full of wrong doing, has been thrown out, with the result that better times have dawned, like the rising sun on a new day, to warm and cheer every corner of this vast Dominion.

Now, when we commence to analyze the situation we need not be at all surprised. I for one was not in the least surprised at the result of the election. We but shared the fate that overtook practically every government of every other country that participated in the war. Our defeat was a natural consequence and a natural condition of the war. Would any man imagine for one moment that any government that had to undertake, with the energy, the force, and the perseverance which the Union Government and, later, the Meighen Government had to pursue, to tax the people, to raise enormous revenues, to restrict them in their liberties, to confiscate

their property, to compel in some instances enlistment and service for the defence of the Empire and civilization,—would any man imagine, I say, that that government was going to be popular with men who did not share the views of the great bulk of Canadians, and that those men were going to submit without venting their animosity upon what they conceived to be the authors of oppressive measures against themselves? People as a rule do not like to be taxed, when they are taxed they complain, and if they are taxed inordinately they rebel; which is exactly what has resulted in the defeat and overthrow of the Meighen Government. It has not been due to the lack of policy, to any wrong doing; it has simply been the natural and consequential result of the people objecting to pay the bill when the account is rendered. It is exactly the same as some people treat their doctor. They will call him out at night, they will plead on all fours for him to come speedily and often to their homes —"Don't neglect to call when you pass the door,"—but when he renders his account they will hardly know him as they pass him by on the street.

The political entity is practically the same as the individual, and I may tell hon. members of the Government that a day of reckoning will surely follow. They may take to themselves to-day the great consolation of having achieved victory. Well, I do not envy them their victory. It will be their privilege, their duty, their necessity to impose similar and even greater taxes, and to collect them, the burden is going to be grievously heavy, and the revulsion of feeling will speedily follow. When the tax collector comes for payment, the people will say, "Why this Government is no better than the other; we will have another change and see how it works."

Let us without bigotry approach and analyze the situation as far as we can. We have to-day a Government in power which has not the support of a majority of the members of this House. When the Government look across the floor and see ranged upon this side the Progressives and the old despised Tories, as they would feign make out we are, they must sometimes wonder as they go home at night how long the game is going to last and when the end will come. I hope they will have what the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) promised to give the national railways—a fair trial. It would be the greatest possible misfortune to let them out of the hole they are in until they have had a fair trial so the country will be able to pass judgment upon their acts. I for my part am not going to try to upset the Government,—just yet. I want to wait and see what they are going to do.

We have on this side a bunch of farmers. I remember when they started, I was in this House in the old time when we had the Union party and the Liberal party. Why, many of us who now sit in different places used to go to the same caucus,—the hon. member for Marquette was a member of the government then. Well, we had one or two hon. gentlemen who did not like their environment. They were very uncomfortable; they never loosened up as we felt they should; they were not as friendly as we thought they might be. They manifested a sort of narrow contractedness which did not come from us, and they began to edge off sideways. They did not know what they were, but they called themselves Farmers because most of them came from the West. In those days the hon. member who sat for the constituency of Red Deer, Mr. Michael Clark, was foremost in the expression of independent thought, although that independent thought did not, in most cases, appear to lead anywhere. But I believe he was at that time the right bower, if I may say so—the chief henchman—of the leader of the Progressive party, the hon. member for Marquette. The then member for Red Deer said: Well, as a name, "Farmer" will not do; "Agrarian" will not do, for it means the same thing if it means anything. So, if the people do not understand what Agrarian is we will call ourselves "Progressives", and it was Progressives from that day henceforth. Well, the late hon. member for Red Deer progressed to the very end. Finally he said: "There is nothing more to this. The Progressive party is simply a class; it represents nothing more than class selfishness. I cannot follow them in that line, so I will quit." And now we fail to see that distinguished and outstanding figure in this House. No longer do we hear the eloquence which had thrilled so many of us; no longer are we impressed with his whole-souled conviction of what must really be regarded as the Belial of absolute free trade.

Well, we must now designate our friends to my left as Progressives. But a rose by any other name will smell as sweet. I have listened very carefully to their addresses, and so far as I can gather it, their only text, their only idea, is the defence of the farmer. All they want is

to secure redress for the farmer; to see that he is accorded relief. They regard the farmer as the whole of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SHEARD: No?

Mr. CALDWELL: Open that other eye.

Mr. SHEARD: I want to remind my hon. friend in all sincerity that there are other things in Canada besides farm labour and farm work.

Mr. CALDWELL: Toronto, for instance.

Mr. SHEARD: Oh, you may sneer at Toronto if you like, but Toronto and Torontonians, I may tell my hon. friend, have just as much right to existence, despite his intimation to the contrary, as have the members from the Prairie provinces. And they too may need some things in order to enable them to enjoy independent life and to contribute their little mite to the progress of this country.

I am willing to grant all that can be granted for the benefit of the farmer; I am desirous of doing everything that is practicable in order to assist him. I am willing to listen to his grievances, and if any suggestion can be offered which would grant a measure of relief without ruin to the rest of the country, I for one should be prepared to support it.

I was pleased and edified, Mr. Speaker, by the deliverance of the hon. member for Marquette, leader of the Farmer party, in the early stages of this debate. I will at least pay him this compliment: he said in clear and definite terms what he really meant; his words seemed to carry with them his conviction; there was no humbug or camouflage about them. That went a long way with me, and I thought that if there was anything we could reasonably give him, it should be given. But there is a good deal that we cannot give him, as I see the situation. Let us take a look first at the railway problem. We have a tremendous mileage of railway in this country—twenty thousand odd miles, the result of long-continued maladministration. It does not make a particle of difference at whose door we lay the blame; the fact remains that we have a number of railways that have never paid, that are out of repair, and that cannot be operated without enormously increased expenditure for equipment and improvement of roadbed. I believe as firmly as any one in the nationalization of the railways and will go as far as I can toward carrying it into practical effect. I am with my hon. friends the Progressives heart and hand in the determination to hold what we have or what has been left for us to redeem in the pawnshop of the country. One hon. gentleman, speaking the other day, referred to the railway system as a miserable foundling. It is. It was conceived, I was going to say, in iniquity and born in corruption; it has marasmus of the very worst kind, and whether we can afford it relief or not I do not know. We suffered in this way. Year after year the railway corporations came to this House and received large subsidies which never went into the railways at all, but found their way into the pockets of the profiteers and mandarins who were using the railways as a means of milking not only the Dominion but the provinces as well; using them through the floating of bonds and the borrowing of money upon them. And would you be surprised to hear that for their venture they received a knighthood? Truly Canadians are a long-suffering people.

Well, now, what is to be the result? For some years to come, a decade at least, we shall have to provide $100,000,000 a year to keep up, to put in repair, to equip and operate these railroads and give them a chance to live. When you bring a starved infant to a doctor you are advised that if you want the child to have a chance for life, you will have to feed it. According to our information, and I believe it is correct, that is the condition our railroads are in to-day, and we have to feed them. Take the Canadian Northern; I would ask any man who goes over that road whether he imagines that in its present state it is a going concern? Not a bit of it. It will require improvement, repair, additions, new equipment, and so on. I venture the guess that we will have a deficit brought down close on to $100,000,000 if not more. If we are to maintain the policy of public ownership of railways we must not hesitate to face this condition; we must be prepared to meet it year after year. That is the first thing we have to think of.

In addition to that, we have to provide for the running expenses of the country. At the present time, to pay pensions and the liabilities contracted through the war, we have obligations amounting to $650,000,000 per annum. Our obligations have almost, if not entirely, doubled. The national debt of Canada steadily increased from the time of Confederation down to the beginning of the war, and it now represents a large an-

nual liability which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has to provide for in addition to other requirements. Is that a very engaging task for any hon. member when we have on this side, to my left, members clamouring for a lower tariff? Really what they are saying is: We want an abolition of the tariff, but we will be satisfied if you scale it away down. That, of course, would mean a depleted revenue from the tariff. If the Minister can meet their demands and the country's obligations I would like to see him do it. I doubt if there is a single man in this House or in this Parliament who is better qualified to speak on matters of finance than the present Minister of Finance, but I venture to tell him that it is absolutely impossible for him to meet the requirements for carrying on this country unless he maintains the revenue producing element which has entered into the policy of all governments in this country in the past. He may be able to obtain revenue by more taxes, but direct taxation is bad.

Now I come to the question of immigration, and it is a very important one. I am not one of those who are so keen to get immigrants into this country, because having lived in a large city all my life I have seen the evil results of immigration. We must hand-pick our immigrants in the future if we are going to develop. I have had a lot of trouble over this question of immigration, because I have a lot of Jews in my riding. However, to keep to the point, a man coming into this country who knows nothing about farming will make all sorts of promises to get into the country, and may say he is going on the land, but unless he has had experience in farming he ought not to be admitted as a farmer. In my judgment, we do not want immigrants who are going to infest our cities. How can we expect an inexperienced man to succeed as a farmer in the West, where, as the former member for Red Deer used to tell us, the climate is so rigorous as to make that country a close cousin of the North Pole. He must be a sturdy immigrant to succeed in farming in our western country, and unless he is an experienced man with a great deal of energy and perseverance, after a while he will drift into the cities, walk around for some weeks looking for a job, and perhaps get work in some factory that he is not very well fitted for. All the time he runs great danger of joining the ranks of the unemployed, which means that he will have to be maintained and fed, and that is what we in the cities particularly do not want. Let us help to keep the immigrants on the land. It is the duty of this country and of this Government to offer every reasonable assistance to the immigrant to enable him to stay on the land and furnish him with the necessary opportunities that others have had who have preceded him and succeeded in farming. I would not be too keen to encourage even the artisan to come to Canada, but would rather encourage and lay the emphasis upon those who have had experience and training in the real science and practical art of agriculture.

Coming now to the question of the tariff, I am an adequate protectionist. What does that mean? It means that I am in favour of a tariff that is adequate to protect the growing industries that are springing up in this country. It is a tariff that must have the element of protection in it. One hon. gentleman to my left asked how the tariff could possibly help the farmer. Perhaps I may be permitted to answer that question. In the province of Ontario, farming is very different from what it is in the Prairie provinces, where the farmers have advantages which our Ontario farmers never had but would be delighted to have. The farmers in this province have not one-quarter of the advantages enjoyed by the farmers of the West.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SHEARD: Perhaps you think I know nothing about it. I want to tell my hon. friends that I have worked on a farm in Ontario, and when we grew wheat we had to start in and cross-plough from the spring of the year till the next fall, and then start in again and break the ground and fallow it and rest it before we could get a crop of wheat, and then only a poor one. All that meant money. I was talking to a farmer from Manitoba some time ago, probably an exceptional one, and he told me of the conditions out there. He said, "My land is exceptionally good, I grant you. I have cropped wheat from my land continuously for thirty years, I have as good a crop now as I had when I started, and I do not fertilize at all." What Ontario farmer can say that? In Ontario the farmer has to alternate his crops, and fertilize continuously, and then he cannot grow wheat as the farmers in the West do. For him protection is his only salvation. Why? Because it builds up the industrial centres in Ontario, of which Toronto is

one, and furnishes him with a home market which consumes eighty-five per cent of all he produces. The Ontario farmer has to go into truck farming. That, of course, does not appeal to the farmer on the Prairie provinces, but it is a vital thing to the farmer in Ontario, and I am inclined to agree with the hon. member from British Columbia who said the other day that tariff requirements and tariff preferences are largely a matter of geographical location. They are fundamentally that. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) told us in his speech the other evening that British Columbia needed protection because it was in close competition with the adjacent states of Washington and Oregon which, in some cases, produced better fruit, and therefore they needed protection to keep that fruit out. Some gentleman said "You should not have gone there" or words to that effect. Well if we followed that argument to its conclusion we might say with equal reason that the gentlemen who went to the Prairie provinces to grow wheat should not have gone there not because it was not good to go, not because the soil was not perhaps the best wheat growing soil in the whole world; but you were too far from the market and you should not have gone so far. The same argument will hold in this case; it is a matter of geographical advantages and requirements; and in this wide Dominion, stretching as it does from the Atlantic to the Pacific we must consider the conditions. It is all very well to talk about free trade in England but the conditions in Canada and the conditions in England are not parallel for a minute. We have a country to the south of us producing precisely what we produce, they are our competitors and we, to a certain extent, are theirs, they are producing grain and foodstuffs on certain parts of their soil that are equal to ours. They have been manufacturing with a great deal more speed and efficiency than we have yet been able to attain and the consequence is that in many instances, in many particular branches of industry, they have exhausted their raw material and they want the Canadian material to carry on their manufacturing. If we permit them to enter they will get our raw material, they will work it up into finished products, they will supply all our large centres, and they will then say "Well, the Canadian has not enough ingenuity to work up his raw material into finished products." You may say "Oh, but we will get the advantage, we will get cheaper goods." Yes, you may, those of you who live on farms of 1200 or 1500 acres in extent where wheat is produced and facilities given to ship it to market; but you must realize there are a large number of workers in the centres of population who are employed and gain their living by manufacturing those things which otherwise would be made in the United States at less cost and shipped in here at a cheaper price because over there owing to smaller overhead charges for manufacturing and the enormous numbers in their home market they can produce at far less cost for the Canadian market than we can do with our comparatively small population of eight millions of people. I can take you down to the lower end of New York city and to Jersey City, and through the state of New Jersey, and I can show you factories which are turning out clothing, ladies garments and various kinds of wearing apparel, which factories would sweep Canada and flood the whole of this Dominion with their surplus stock if it were not for the regulations which prevent the importation of such goods in enormous quantities into the Dominion. The tariff helps to keep these goods out and at the same time serves the good purpose of contributing to the revenue.

Some hon. MEMBERS Oh, oh.

Mr. SHEARD: However that may be as you like. The Minister of Justice, I think, has declared what his policy is; he has declared for the Laurier-Fielding tariff. That was a protective tariff and that is the tariff which we in this corner of the House are going to support. While we are with you on the railway policy, on the question of public ownership, and will assist you all we can, we are going to stand for adequate protection, which we will maintain, no matter how you may differ from us in opinion, is necessary and essential to protect industries in the large centres of this Dominion, and we hope we will convert you to our way of thinking.

A good deal has been said about differences of policy. I was somewhat surprised to read a new definition of Liberalism which was made by the Prime Minister in an address given in this city on or about the 13th of March last to the Liberal women of Ottawa. He defined Liberalism as an attitude of mind and heart; and I was wondering if it was possible to transform or change Liberalism as it used to be into this new doctrine, and whether that was henceforth to be its condition.

Some remarks were also made by the Prime Minister as to our being Tories. The leader of the House said that he never attempted to stretch Liberalism so as to embrace Toryism. Well I beg to remind hon. members that there are worse things than Toryism.

Some hon. MEMBERS What are they?

Mr. SHEARD: I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) that if he reads history he will find that all the great efforts that have been made in this country, and a great deal of the prosperity and the progress which Canada has achieved, have been initiated, developed and carried to completion principally by the Liberal-Conservative party; and he can call them Tories if he likes. We are asked to-day to make concessions to the Northwest. Who made the Northwest?

Some hon. MEMBERS: The Tories.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We did.

Mr. SHEARD: I hear some hon. gentleman among the Progressives say "We did." The country was made before my hon. friends located there. It was a great Tory chieftain who initiated the building of the railroad that enabled my hon. friends to get there; they must not forget that the opening up of the West was largely due to Conservative efforts. When it came along to the time of Alexander Mackenzie, and I remember that time—the Dominion was practically on the rocks. Talk about farm produce and farming conditions! Why you could not sell anything on a farm anywhere. Potatoes were hawked from door to door in the city of Toronto for 25 cents a bag, and the vendor placed them in the cellar for that price too. It was the protective policy which resulted in the development of our industries, made possible the utilization and direction of our raw materials and enabled our home market to exist at all, it was that policy which gave confidence to the capitalist who put his money into the development of the manufacturing industries of this Dominion; and following this came the opening of mines and storehouses of treasure which are the astonishment of the world to-day and were never previously dreamed of. There is nothing becoming in the sneer sometimes indulged in on this subject by people who do not know the real, the fundamental and basic conditions on which this nation has been built. Then I want to say still further that it was the same party, in the main, who founded, fostered and developed the British preference as against all other preferences.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a new doctrine.

Mr. SHEARD: That is something that is still in existence and will be carried on for a long time to come. We on this side are quite determined to wait and see. I am very keenly interested in the Budget which the Minister of Finance is going to bring down. I might venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that I really believe my hon. friends opposite are somewhat seized of the responsibility of their position because we do not hear so much from them this session; they are very silent, a contrast, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, to their course last session. Why there was not a single debate at that time but we heard from them at length. For example there was the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon); we were certain to hear a blast or two from him and there were two or three others who were equally voluminous in their utterances and their menaces. Well, they are silent as the tomb. They are confronted to-day with a situation which must have astounded them when they realized their position, and probably they are cudgelling their brains to know what to do. It is our privilege to watch and wait.

I do not believe in long speeches. If a man cannot say all he has to say in thirty minutes, he had better leave the rest of his speech unsaid. May I say in conclusion, that I join with my hon. friends opposite, as I join with the party to my left, to work for the common good of Canada, for the development and prosperity of this Dominion, for the strengthening of the Empire as a commonwealth of nations, of which we form a part. We expect them to do their part and not to cast across the floor of this House intimations—I was going to say insinuations—of a sectional character, as if they were meant to taunt those of us who happen to hold opinions contrary to theirs. Such debates, and such distinguished characteristics of debate, cannot, in my humble judgment, contribute to the harmony and unity of purpose which should prevail in parliament. We hope that the result of our deliberations will be beneficial to all concerned, and I am sure this will be accomplished if we will only endeavour to yield a little, and if my Progressive friends will only realize that they cannot get everything they wish from Parliament. Rome was not built in a day,

and it will take time to accomplish results. I hope we will all work for the benefit of the country and the peace and prosperity which we hope to see this Dominion enjoy.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure to me to meet face to face, many of the great men from the East whom I only knew previously by name. I congratulate you, Sir, on the high position to which you have been appointed. I have listened with some interest to lengthy speeches for a great many days during the recent debate. I congratulate the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) on the splendid address he gave. It was very pleasing to most of us to find a young man holding, and giving expressions to, such high ideals. I have taken note of some of the passages-at-arms across the floor of the House, and truly on both sides it can be said that they did whet their tongues like swords and bend their bows to shoot their arrows, even bitter words. But, sitting here in my place listening, I wondered sometimes what they hoped to gain by it. However, I have obtained some information from these speeches. One thing is certain, that both parties, Liberal and Conservative alike, appear to gain inspiration mostly when they are slinging darts at each other.

I am pleased, Sir, with the fact that the Speech from the Throne deals very largely with those planks in the platform of the Farmers', or Progressive party which are most essential. Particularly does it mention the deplorable state of agriculture as regards markets and prices. That agriculture is in a deplorable state in Western Canada to-day is due to a variety of causes. One of these causes is the drought which has prevailed over very large areas of the Prairie provinces. I believe hail to some extent is responsible for hard times. But the worst feature, Sir, as regards agriculture to-day in Western Canada, and to a great extent in the older provinces as well, is the loss of faith and courage, and the dark outlook as to the future which is facing our people, brought about, not by natural causes, but by the persistent manipulation of legislation in the interests of those who control the manufacture and distribution of all our commodities, and who own and control all the facilities which we need to use in a public way.

There are plenty of evidences to-day that agriculture is in a deplorable state in Western Canada. In support of that statement I point to the fact that some of our rural telephone centrals are being closed at the present time, and some of the municipalities are also closing the day schools for the next six months, because the taxes cannot be collected. Mutual insurance companies are finding a hard time to exist, and some of them have already gone under. In every activity in which we engage at the present time, it is impossible to find a market at a price which leaves anything for the producer. In Saskatchewan, we have determined to follow diversified methods of farming and towards that end we have established a system of co-operative creameries. We are also engaged in the live stock business to an extent that does credit to that young province, but at the present time the markets for the products of the dairy are closed to us on account of high freight rates. The chairman of the Co-operative Creamery Company in Saskatchewan is authority for the statement that New Zealand is landing her butter on the coast of British Columbia cheaper than it can be shipped there from central Saskatchewan. The result is that butter cannot be produced and marketed except at a loss. Live stock cannot be moved under the present freight rates and leave anything for the farmer. Now that the prices of all farm products have fallen, in most cases below pre-war prices, it is only reasonable to expect that some consideration will be immediately shown in the matter of freight rates.

These things have darkened the outlook of the Canadian farmer, but the callousness of the late Government and the Railway Commission—place the blame where you like—will bring calamity, sudden and final, to the agricultural interests in Western Canada, unless something is immediately done to relieve the situation. The failure of the Railway Commission to lower the rates on grain before the last crop was moved, as we expected it would, has resulted in filching something like $18,000,000 from this already impoverished industry. We are still paying about $92 per car more than we should to get our wheat to Fort William. The effort to make the railways pay their way by repeatedly increasing the freight rates is only another case of killing the goose that lays the golden egg; it is curtailing production and providing less and less for the railways to earn. Surely it is only common sense to realize that freight rates in any country cannot be made higher than will permit commerce to move freely. Speaking of railways, I

claim there is only one policy to be followed if economies are to be effected, and that is a real system of consolidation of all government railways under one management and control.

I was very much struck with the speeches of two hon. members from the Maritime provinces. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) gave a long address relating particularly to the Intercolonial railway, but just what he wanted when he said that he did not want that road linked up with any other Canadian system I hardly know. Does he want that railway as a mere toy? The only grievance that I could find in his complaint was that the joy of free riding had been interfered with since the railway had been linked up with the Canadian system. Undoubtedly consolidation would be a benefit to all concerned in that there would be control in a centralized buying of rolling stock, motive power, rails and equipment of all kinds. There must also be union terminals and through traffic rates established before the railways can be economically run. At present the West provides an example in this respect of unified management and control. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, west of Winnipeg, have been incorporated into one system, and the whole of the West is reaping the benefit in service; and I can assure the House that we are proud of the railways in Western Canada, and the improvement that has been effected in the service since this was brought about, to say nothing of the economies.

Now, to enable the agriculturists to go on the land this spring with some degree of hope, faith, and courage, immediate and drastic measures are needed, particularly with regard to transportation and the marketing of our products. This is surely needed in the interests of the country as a whole, if the evil of the unemployment situation and trade depression is ever to be overcome. When you consider the fact that the western crop provides nearly 30 per cent of the value of all our exports, it is obvious that there is nothing that will restore confidence at one stroke, so to speak, so much as the re-establishment of the Wheat Board. It was a short-sighted policy on the part of the late government to discontinue this method of marketing our grain, just when the farmers of Western Canada began to have some faith in the work it was doing. It should have been continued at least during the whole of the reconstruction period, which evidently has not yet passed.

Since our coming to Ottawa it has cheered our hearts somewhat to find that the Government has taken note of the fact that our markets for some years past have been restricted; and we are glad that they are now setting themselves the task of obtaining freer trade relations with other countries, particularly the United States. Had I taken part in the flag-waving campaign of deception that was carried on in 1911, I should not be found as one of the number sitting under that banner to-day, knowing the awful consequences that have ensued.

Speaking of the tariff in general, it is in this system of trade prevention that we find the cause of the great loss in rural population in western Canada, particularly in the older provinces. We find in it, also, the reason for the stagnation of development in the three prairie provinces and the older provinces as well. We see in this system of trade penalties the basis of that perfect organization in the Dominion to-day that controls all manufacturing and the distribution of every commodity which the workers on the land need to use. In the most stable part of Ontario there has been a large loss of rural population. Up to 1911 the rural population of Ontario, perhaps the banner province of the Dominion, had lost some 111,620 souls. I can point to some counties in that province to-day where great losses have occurred. For instance, the township of East Zorra in Oxford County has closed, during the last twenty years, 13 per cent of its farm homes, and Ashville, in Huron county, which I am informed is the finest agricultural township in Ontario, has closed 15 per cent of the farm homes during the same period. Surely there is a cause for all this.

While the Liberal government in years gone by was tardy in dealing with this great system of privilege, which robs the workers of their earnings and concentrates, under the control of the few, the wealth that is created, we are looking forward now with hope to something practical being done, and we trust that before the session comes to a close the Government will take itself seriously and try to implement the promises and pledges it gave in its platform of 1896, 1910-1911, again in the convention of 1919, and the promises it made during the last campaign that brought it into power. When the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) spoke the other day he said he believed in the Laurier-Fielding

tariff. I wondered just what he meant. It seems to me there are two phases to that tariff: one, as professed in their platforms and on the hustings during the campaign; the other, what they have actually put into practice. But at this time it is surely plain to all that the old national policy has had a fair trial and that after forty-three years of its operation under the most favourable circumstances conceivable it has brought about conditions that at the present time amount almost to a calamity. This old national policy, which my hon. friends to the right so strenuously uphold, was advocated for the purpose of looking after the working man. He was to have good wages, or as it was expressed, "a full dinner pail," and our natural resources were to be developed. What condition do we find to-day? That policy is responsible for the worst unemployment situation this country has ever faced, and has brought about the very calamities that it was intended to avert. It is no use saying that the war is responsible; the war simply put off the trouble for a time. Unemployment is rife from one end of the Dominion to the other, and, according to my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), while a quarter of a million men are idle, our manufacturers are importing raw material from any and every country where they can obtain it the cheapest, although our own mines and forests abound with the very raw material needed. What is the matter? I have it on the authority of the late president of the Massey-Harris Company that that company is dependent on foreign countries for seventy per cent of its raw materials. Our agricultural implement companies to-day import large quantities of Georgia pine for the tongues of their binders, drills, mowing machines, and other implements, while our forests abound with timber suitable for that purpose. The old national policy is a failure.

Mr. HARRIS: Will the hon. member kindly tell us where the connection comes in between the national policy and the bringing of Georgia pine into this country to make tongues for binders and other agricultural implements?

Mr. EVANS: I see the connection, Sir, in that the old national policy was advocated for the very reason that it was going to develop our natural resources. Those resources are still undeveloped, and our manufacturers are seeking their raw materials in foreign lands to-day.

[Mr. Evans.]

I find on page 157 of the Report of the Dominions' Royal Commission that although Canada supplies over eighty-five per cent of the world's nickel, yet when that commission went through the Dominion only a short time ago there was not one nickel refinery in this country. I believe that under the pressure of war necessity some small refining plants have been established since then. I repeat, the old national policy has been a failure in that it has failed to do what it was advocated to do.

If trade had been carried on on a freer basis with the great country to the south of us, and with the rest of the world as well, we would to-day have a contented and virile population twice as large as we have now. Hon. members to my right have held up to us the benefits of the home market. I submit that a contented population upon the prairies to-day and throughout the other provinces would provide our manufacturers with a home market which their restrictive policy has destroyed. What folly it is to talk of a home market for the grain of Western Canada, three-quarters of which must be sold in foreign countries. That old theory has been exploded, and when it is put forth now we cannot treat it any more seriously than a joke. Freer trade relations will ensure wider markets. But then I am met with the question: What will you do for revenue, where is it to come from?

On the motion of Mr. Evans the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at eleven p.m.

Wednesday, March 22, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRATT vs. DELPHINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a despatch which appeared in the Montreal Gazette of yesterday, under this caption:

Suit for £8,000 will be pressed.

Revelations interesting to Canadians expected in Pratt vs. Delphine action.

The despatch proceeds:

Details of great interest to Canadians promise to be ventilated when the case comes for trial. It will be remembered that in another action indirectly connected with this one, but in which Col. Delphine was the plaintiff, it was shown that he had agreed to accept a commission on frozen meat contracts secured while he was associated with the staff of the Canadian mission in London.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is probably aware that it is against the rules of the House to read newspaper extracts before the Orders of the Day are called. He should put his question on the Order paper, or summarize its purport.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but it was in order to put my question that I was reading the despatch. The despatch concludes, that this case might be of interest because it might show—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —it might show that one of the Canadian mission in London, Col. Pratt, had a commission on the $25,000,000 trade credit extended to Greece by the late Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to put his question on the order paper as being more in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) whether he has been informed of that despatch, and if he intends to investigate it.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, until my attention was directed to the despatch by the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres, I had no knowledge of the alleged commission. The matter will be investigated.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, March 21.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): (Resuming) Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the tariff we are always confronted with the question: If we have freer trade relations with other countries where is the revenue to come from? This question is always raised by those who desire a tariff high enough to prohibit the entry of any goods on which duty may be collected. One hon. member to my right said last night that the tariff was needed to protect Canada against the influx of American goods from the factories of New York and Massachusetts, as well as to provide revenue. I wonder how he expected to collect revenue on goods prohibited from entering this country! But that is about the kind of reasoning and logic that we have become accustomed to from those who favour a trade restriction policy. I, on my part, may well ask: Where are the earnings of our people now going? Taking my figures from trade reports in the Canadian Year Book, I find that the average production of manufactured goods for the five years from 1910 to 1914 inclusive—this was before the war and when trade conditions were normal—amounted to $1,400,000,000; the average consumption at home during that time was $1,350,000,000. On the average, there was exported $50,000,000 worth each year. That is, twenty-seven times as much manufactured products were consumed at home as were exported. So the situation, so far as the Canadian consumer is concerned, stands thus: The tax that went into the federal treasury was on the average $92,000,000 for those five years; while the total tax due to the tariff on Canadian manufactures amounted to $497,000,000—$405,000,000 of which went into the pockets of the protected interests. The amount we are now getting in revenue from the tariff is only a small portion of our yearly requirements; this year, I believe, it will amount to only about one-fifth.

Now, some manufacturers protest that the tariff does not bring about higher prices to the consumer. Obviously, in that case, the tariff does not protect, and they will not suffer from its removal. But, take one industry alone for one year before the war, when, of course, conditions were normal. I find that in the boot and shoe industry we paid because of the tariff over $3,065,000 in excess of the total wages and salaries received by all those employed in that industry. If we were, then, to consider the interests of the country it would have paid the people to scrap every boot and shoe factory, hand over to the workers their full wages, and pay a direct subsidy to the Government of $3,065,000 instead of the paltry half million which went into the treasury from that industry in that year. Or, to be more explicit: We paid that year on boots and shoes alone, because of the

duty, $10,763,890.61; the customs duty amounted to $585,996; the enhancement in price to the Canadian consumer was $10,177,893.90; the wages and salaries paid to all those employed in that industry in that year amounted to $7,698,333, being less by $3,065,557 than what the manufacturers received owing to the tariff. And further, the tariff, we were told, was needed to maintain higher standards of living among the workers of the land. If you divide $7,698,000 among 17,227 employees, you get an average of $446 for the year, or of $1.46 for the day. I think you will agree with me that in a country where the price of every article of food and clothing is enhanced by the tariff, $446 a year will not permit a worker's family to live under very comfortable conditions; nor would it do so even in pre-war days. But we must not forget that this average of $1.46 per day really does not indicate the average amount received by the workingmen, because the salaries of higher-paid officials is included in that calculation.

After all, Sir, I am not sure that the tariff as it stands to-day is the greatest economic evil militating against the workers of this land. But it is the basis or foundation upon which the structure of privilege is built. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) spoke of the Anti-Dumping Act as being the saviour of some Canadian industries. That act, which was passed in 1904, closed up the last gap of liberty for the consumers of this land; it put a lever in the hands of the protected manufacturers which they have used fully to their own advantage. As a specific instance, I want to point out that the United Grain Growers Company, to whom no manufacturing concern in Canada would sell for co-operative distribution, were forced to seek their supplies from independent companies in the United States. But those supplies were brought into Canada under the dumping penalties of this Act. The invoice prices of the goods were disputed, though the goods were purchased in the regular way; and on the implements which were imported the company paid from 52 to 68 per cent of the total cost by way of duty. In 1916 the price paid by this organization for a gang plough was $87, but the customs appraiser valued it at $103.79. The regular tariff rate then was 27½ per cent. The ad valorem duty, including war tax, on $103.79 amounted to $28.60, and the dumping duty was $16.79, or a total of $45.39, equal to 52 per cent ad valorem on the purchase price, although the regular tariff rate was 27½ per cent. I think it is plain to us all that in many instances the Canadian consumer is forced to submit not only to the imposition of rates as shown in the tariff schedules of to-day, but to the addition of arbitrary rates as well.

Now, I have before me an article from that old champion of liberty, the Montreal Witness, setting forth an incident which occurred some time ago in the city of Montreal. The protected milling combine of Canada put up its prices to such an extent that the bakers had either to increase the price of bread or to seek their flour elsewhere. They took the latter course; they sought their flour in the United States, and after paying the duty on it and the heavier freight rate, were able to maintain the usual price for bread. And then what took place? They were brought under the penalties of this Anti-Dumping Act, and the consumers of that city were handed over to the tender mercies of the protected combine. As I have said, the act closed up the last gap of liberty that had been left open to the consumers of Canada.

We in the West have been trying in every possible way to lower the cost of production on our farms so that agriculture may live, but we have been met at every point. We have been thwarted in every way by the ramifications of the great O.B.U.—One Big Union—which, because of the protective tariff inaugurated in 1879, is now able to control the distribution of every commodity in the land. In fact, Sir, the threat was made some time ago that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which was described as a young athlete not knowing its own strength, was able at one blow to close every industry in the land, and in a short time to bring millions of workers to the verge of starvation.

I wish now to return to the railway question in order to show, as I have already in some measure tried to do, how this system of privilege is the cause of most of the trouble in our national problems of to-day. Under the bounty legislation of 1897-99, plants for the manufacture of steel rails were installed at Sydney, Cape Breton, and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Both these companies were of American promotion. In 1900 an amendment to the Railway Act was made providing that equipment made in Canada had to be used, by all railways subsidized by the government. This measure was opposed at the time even by the Conservative party, particularly by Sir

Charles Tupper, whose name, I believe, is still reverenced by that party. He opposed it on the ground that it was contrary to freedom, but the measure was adopted on July 12, 1900. Although it was 1904 before either of these companies produced any rails, a contract was entered into with the Sault Ste. Marie Company just before the election of 1900 for the delivery of 25,000 tons of rails yearly to the Intercolonial Railway. Neither the government, nor the opposition made known to the public this contract, and not until the new parliament met in the following April were the contract audits terms made public. It then became known that the price of these rails was $8 a ton above the price in England and the United States. The actual figure was $32, with a bounty of $7 added, which made $39 a ton. The world's price for rails at that time was $24 per ton delivered. Yet this kind of thing was defended by the government of that day, on the ground of the national policy. Then in 1903 an act was passed giving the government power to impose by Order in Council a duty of $7 per ton on rails, and this duty came into effect on August 12 of that year. We sometimes wonder why our railways do not pay their way, but when they are capitalized according to the cost of construction in this way, it is not so much to be wondered at. When we built the government section of the National Transcontinental we paid $32 per ton to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, with a further bounty of $7 per ton, making $39 per ton for the steel rails that we used on that section of the road, and at the same time that company was delivering rails in the southern Punjab for $24. The amount of bounties that these two companies got, particularly between the years 1904 and 1911, amounted to $17,250,000.

Up to 1897 the Liberals, who had long been in power, persistently and vigorously opposed the old national policy in all its features. But democracy in no English-speaking country ever suffered a more disastrous setback than in 1897 when official liberalism capitulated to this new feudalism. Since that time there has been no dividing line between the Liberal and Conservative parties, and there has been no education carried on among the people of this country along the lines of democracy except by the organized farmers of Eastern and Western Canada. That there is no dividing line in principle between the two old parties has been confirmed in the House during this debate when hon. members of both parties have declared that they still adhere to the Laurier-Fielding tariff. To-day the Progressive party is the only body in this House representing true democracy in Canada as it affects the people. While there was only a small number of this party in the last Parliament we are now a unit of no mean proportions, and if the Laurier-Fielding tariff is maintained for another four years I venture to predict that we shall come back in still greater numbers. The Progressive party is not looking for any privileges. All we ask is a square deal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EVANS: Some hon. gentlemen to my right seem to doubt that. I repeat, we are not seeking any privileges, that all we ask is a square deal. You cannot protect the farmer. My question to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Sheard) last night is still unanswered, and it is as incapable of being answered as it was seventeen years ago, when Sir Richard Cartwright asked it in the House. We seek for ourselves only what we desire for every one else, and that is liberty, but under the old national policy in all its ramifications as we know it to-day the people of Canada have no liberty. If we had complete free trade with the whole world so that we were free to buy and sell where we chose, we would still have no privilege, because the same opportunity would be open to all. I repeat, we are not asking for any privileges, but only for a square deal. The evil day on the farms —and I can speak more for Western Canada than for any other part—has been postponed thus long only by the industry of our people and the fertility of our soil, which we have exploited to satisfy the greed of those who have the privilege of absorbing our earnings. Now the time has come when we can no longer pay monopolistic prices for our commodities and sell our products at prices to compete against the product of the cheap labour of Europe and Asia.

Perhaps the worst feature of the agricultural situation to-day is the effort of the returned soldier to make good under conditions which are driving hundreds of experienced farmers off the land. How can we expect our boys who have been to Europe and faced death to preserve the liberty of this nation, to come back and be satisfied on farms in this country under such conditions of bondage? I say "bond-

age," and I am using the word in exactly the same sense that Sir Wilfrid Laurier used it in 1893, when he declared that protection was bondage, and he illustrated his meaning by saying it was bondage just as slavery was bondage in the United States. Many of these boys are to-day walking off their farms in despair, and their last state is worse than their first. I say to this House that when these boys fail to make good, it is we who are responsible, and we are in duty bound to see them settled in some way so that their living is assured. No question is settled until it is settled right, and we may as well set ourselves now to solve in a practical way this great twentieth century problem of equity of distribution. It is justice, not privilege that will make this a prosperous country.

Mr. EMMANUEL D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with the hon. members who have preceded me in this debate in extending to you my most respectful and at the same time most sincere congratulations on your election to the eminent and important post of Speaker of this House. Your remarkable talents, your long parliamentary experience, the noted services that you have rendered to your country designate you plainly for the high post of honour and responsibility that you at present fill with such dignity and nobility and I feel convinced that you will continue in your new duties to do honour not only to your race and your province but to the whole of Canada.

I am also happy to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion to the Address for the excellent speeches they made. The speech of the hon. member for Westmount-Saint Henri (Mr. Mercier) pleased me the more, because in addition to being eloquent it was given in the French language. Ever since I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House I have taunted the late government for ignoring the rights of the French language in this Parliament, dispensing as they did with a member to second, in the French language, the motion for an address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. I also rise at present to offer the Government, whose eminent leader is the Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, my most sincere congratulations, not only on my behalf, but also in the name of the French race and that of the province of Quebec for having acknowledged that the French language has a right to be heard in Parliament. It may be said that it is a hobby of mine to insist at each session, in order that the rights of the French language be so recognized. It is of little consequence what may be said, I hold that I have accomplished my duty towards myself, my county, my race and towards my province, each time I register a protest. I have been sent here to represent the electors of Rimouski and those of all Canada, and when I rise in this House I always believe that I am fulfilling a duty and whatever certain members of this House may think or say, is of little importance to me.

Since the sixth of last December, Canada has secured at last a constitutional government elected by the people and for the people. I am confident that this Government, whose distinguished leader is the one who was found worthy amongst all to wear Sir Wilfrid Laurier's mantle, will follow the policy that Laurier preached all his life, a policy which has given between 1896 and 1911, an era of prosperity, peace and happiness unknown until then in Canada. I feel that not only the rights of the French language will be shown deference within these parliamentary walls but that in all spheres, in all the departments and in all things which relate to the administration of public affairs, the French language will maintain its rights; and it affords me pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to particularly congratulate you in having given the example yourself in repeating "adopté" after carried; and moreover for having been so thoughtful in having a bilingual calendar placed on the table of the House of Commons. The rights of the French language are in safe hands, that we all know; your patriotism is well known, so is your love for your race and that of your mother tongue and I feel assured that the French language will more and more recover its rights in this Parliament.

On the sixth of December last the province of Quebec did not vote against the late government with the idea of revenge; but united itself to all provinces of the Dominion to sweep from power an autocratic government, which from 1911 to 1917 had governed the country in a most despotic way, and the province of Quebec, as well as all the other provinces of Canada, felt that it was more than time to sweep this government from power, so as to place at the head of the destinies of Canada, a government which would know

how to respect the opinions of every one, a government which, whatever be our faith and language, would recognize that every one in this country has equal rights and would treat us all as Canadians. If I have placed my trust in the present Prime Minister, it is because he has always given proof that he was a true Canadian. I express the hope that he will continue to be a Canadian, that he will show himself an anti-Imperialist so as to contrast with the Prime Minister who preceded him; that he will remember first of all that our common country is Canada and not England.

I was glad to learn that the Government had decided to economize and to do so specially where it was most needed. We hear that the budget of the Militia Department is to be reduced. So much the better, for if all military expenditure could be wiped out we would be the better off. I trust the Government will continue in this right path. I also notice with pleasure in the Speech from the Throne, that the Government has also decided to make special provision for the farming class. I have the honour of representing in this Parliament an essentially agricultural county—and I am proud of it—each time the Government will promote the interests of the farming classes, it will necessarily be doing something for the county of Rimouski, and invariably when doing so shall receive my hearty approval; however, if on the one hand it reduces the militia expenditure, I hope it will not reduce the budget of agriculture, but on the contrary will increase it if possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of prolonging this debate much longer, my aim for the present, is not precisely to discuss the Speech from the Throne, but specially to point out that I was quite consistent when I blamed the late government for ignoring the rights of the French language. This is the reason why I thought it my duty to congratulate the present Government because it had acknowledged that the French language had undisputed right to be heard in the Council of the Nation.

Mr. JOSEPH HENRY HARRIS (East York): Mr. Speaker, I rise with a good deal of trepidation to address the House for the first time. Should I err in not observing parliamentary traditions I entreat your indulgence, Sir, and also the indulgence of hon. members generally.

The Speech from the Throne refers to a great number of questions which doubtless are of great concern to the people of this Dominion; but these references are vague in their nature and have not as yet been amplified in the speeches which up to date have been made by Ministerial supporters. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) did, perhaps, enter to a certain extent upon an exposition of Liberal and Progressive thought, as the Prime Minister is wont to say; but I fail to see where my hon. friend's line of Liberal and Progressive thought harmonizes with some of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). The hon. member for Westmount-St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) spoke in a similar strain to that of the hon. member for Brantford when he said "We Liberals know the part which industries, large or small, play in the activity and the future of this country." When we compare such remarks as these with the utterances of the hon. member for North Winnipeg in favour of a reduction of the duties on certain commodities, I fail to see that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite can be regarded as in any way stable. Such utterances recall some of the campaign literature issued during the late election by my hon. friends, which we are now asked "not to take too seriously." Under the circumstances we on this side await with considerable interest the trade policy which is shortly to be announced by the Minister of Finance.

In the absence of the Prime Minister I refrain from making any remarks which might better be said when he is present; but I cannot allow to pass unchallenged his statement, to be found on page 53 of unrevised Hansard, to the effect that the Government will truly represent all shades of Liberal and Progressive thought. I do not for one minute think, if that were the case, that hon. members to my left, Sir, would pay their own railroad fares to the city of Saskatoon and there debate for ten hours the question of whether or not they should be taken into the ministry as pure Liberals. I do not think any such understanding would have caused them to hold the prolonged conference referred to; I am rather inclined to accept the statement of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) who has declared that he did not understand the approaches made to the Progressives in that light.

The ground with respect to immigration has been pretty well covered, from all angles, during the present debate; but to my mind, Sir, the great essential with re-

gard to immigration to Canada has been entirely overlooked. That essential, which is an important one, is this: it is not only right and proper that the immigrants who come to Canada from European countries should have a clear bill of health, but we should require the further condition that they possess a clear conception of British institutions and of British ideals; and it should be made known to them that they must, to the fullest extent, abide by our Canadian law and our Canadian statutes. There are in the country at the present time a large number of Europeans —and a large number more are wanting to come to our shores at the present time —who will not, if they can avoid it, follow agricultural pursuits. I think that during this session legislation should be brought down to take care of this particular class of immigration. We have in this country a large number of labouring Canadian men and women. We have also these European labourers. The Europeans, Sir, as you know, and as hon. members know, can live on a piece of rye bread and perhaps a red pepper or Spanish onion each day. Our Canadian men and women live more respectably and pay municipal, and perhaps provincial and federal taxes. It would be well if by legislation, an income tax of some description were imposed on immigrants who are wont to live in European fashion, and this tax should be commensurate with the municipal taxes paid by our Canadian labouring men and women. I would place the onus of collecting this income tax on the industries who employ such labour.

A great deal has been said by the hon. gentlemen to my left with regard to the railroad policy of this country, and the policy we ought to pursue. I cannot see where there has been anything very constructive in their remarks up to the present moment. If hon. gentlemen opposite are going to be guided in their administration by the Progressive thought which has been expressed in this House, I submit, they have an abundance of such thought in hand already to guide them. But in reviewing the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Brandon (Mr. Forke) and the hon. gentleman from King's county P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) and also the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), I cannot see where the suggestions are going to help in any way to solve the railway problem. They said—and I am sorry to say that there was considerable applause in this House when they said it—that the natural trend of trade in this country should be north and south. It is to be regretted if the minds of this House are to revert to the generation of Goldwin Smith; if we cannot see within our fair country the possibility of a nation here, and a nation within the British Empire. Having in mind, Sir, that the solution of our railway problem is to get tonnage for our railways, I couple with that the suggestion that we should use our endeavours as far as possible to make trade flow, not north and south, but east and west across this continent. The hon. gentleman from North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) quoted Kipling, which intimated in a short space of time there would be no East or West. If my hon. friend to the left and my hon. friend from King's county have their way as to how the trade channels shall go in this country, I venture the opinion that within another generation we shall have an East and we shall have a West in this fair Dominion of ours, and what is more, Sir, I prophesy that the prophecy of the ex-President of the United States in 1911, as to what would happen to us would be fulfilled. That suggestion I do not need to more than mention on the floor of this House. It was that we would be an adjunct to the United States. There is only one policy for this country, and that is unity of the East and the West. If we want to become one great nation within the British Empire, we must keep our freightage going across this continent, in order that the lines of steel might have something to carry. That might solve the railway problem.

We have in this country a number of Canadians who do not get their living from the top six inches of the soil. In this connection, I will make a personal allusion; I am more or less of a farmer. I was raised on a farm, and the biggest part of my life has been spent on the farm. I know what it is to follow the lonely furrow. But I recognize also that we have in this fair dominion of ours 700,000 workers who are sustaining perhaps 2,000,000 of people, and I submit their point of view must be taken into consideration, as well as the point of view of the agriculturists.

Mr. KELLNER: Does the hon. gentleman recognize the fact that the Labour group is on this side of the House?

Mr. HARRIS: I recognize the Labour group, but which faction of the Labour group is on this side of the House I am not in position to state. There are labour groups and there are labourers.

It is to be regretted, perhaps, that in the course of this debate on the Speech from the Throne a number of perhaps half-true statements have been made. I have in mind more particularly a reference made in the late hours last evening to a tendency on the part of some of our manufacturing institutions to buy all the raw material that they possibly can in other countries. Referring to page 314 of unrevised Hansard I find the following statement:

> Our agricultural implement companies today import large quantities of Georgia pine for the tongues of their binders, drills, mowing machines, and other implements, while our forests abound with timber suitable for that purpose. The old national policy is a failure.

I cannot see the connection. The hon. gentleman also intimated that 75 per cent of the raw material used by the firm of Massey-Harris comes from other countries, this statement being in the same paragraph as the statement with regard to lumber. I take issue with him. I hold no brief from the Massey-Harris Company; I do not know any of their executive or any of their officers, I will admit I have bought binders, mowing machines and rakes from them in the past, but other than that I have had absolutely no connectioin with them. I submit for the consideration of the hon. gentleman from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) the following:

> At least 75 per cent of the lumber used by the Massey Harris Company is Canadian material, and our policy absolutely is to purchase everything possible in Canada, and more particularly Canadian lumber, whenever possible.

I was very much taken with the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) when he said that the best policy for Canada to pursue was a policy which would make for unity. I agree with that statement in its entirety, and if we are to have unity in this country, I say there is room for expression of all shades of thought, but we must not strive to serve simply our own provinces.

I would suggest that, in order to pursue an immigration policy which will make Canadians out of those who come to our shores, we must first adopt a railway policy which will make trade channels run across the continent, so that, in the course of time, eastern thought and western thought may get more closely together. As a result of this we shall have a more united country. We must have a trade policy that will provide all classes of work for the minds and hands of all classes of people to do.

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): Mr. Speaker, without undue egotism, perhaps I may lay claim to the full average timidity which comes to us who for the first time essay to address this very august chamber. If I violate any of the standards of discussion, I crave in advance that you will not hold it against me as mortal sin, because it will not be deliberate. I join in the general pleasure at your elevation, Mr. Speaker. In honouring you, we have greatly honoured ourselves. Apart from this incident, your public career has long since stood you forth as an outstanding national figure; and a part of your effort and, indeed, not a trivial part, for I have carefully and constantly read the speeches you have delivered in this House, has been devoted to the promotion of a real spirit of fraternity as between the different provinces of this Dominion. Elementary though it may seem to have sometimes to say so, that, of course, is the corner stone which the Fathers of Confederation have predicated upon which to build their great structure, knowing too well that it could subsist upon no other. Mr. Speaker, may I say something with a personal touch now that you are elevated to your high position as First Commoner? For your patriotism and loyalty you have been penalized by the visitation of the messenger of sorrow. It is a sorrow which is softened and subdued by the recollection of duty magnificently performed; and in common with thousands of other parents in this Dominion in every walk of life, some of them in this House, you have the experience that, when you think of those who, in the glory of their youth have entered into untroubled rest, the mind is prone to wander and to linger amongst the flowers of Flanders. Honour to them! Eternal honour to their names!

May I speak just one word of my admiration of the appropriateness of the speeches of an hon. member from the West and another hon. member from the East, who respectively moved and seconded the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech? These hon. members were setting a standard by which they tried to approximate the advice of the poet, to forget, sometimes, that there is any East or West at all. With you yourself in that Chair, that

elevated Chair, and with the honour of a lady member companioning amongst us in these humbler seats, I think we have the circumstances under which there is particular likelihood that these discussions will be carried on with dignity and with a spirit of sweet reasonableness, however animated the debates may sometimes become.

Somewhat careless of the order in which I might touch on a few topics, I want to give my tribute of praise to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) the leader of the Progressive party, for the excellence of the contribution which he made to this discussion. I am sure, if he will allow me very humbly to say so—perhaps he is not in his seat, but I can say it to his followers who are present—that his presence, so far as I am concerned, is abundantly welcome. That speech of his must
4 p.m. have justified in full measure the expectations of his friends in the qualities of fairness, lucidity and ability which it exhibited; and without discounting, for one moment, the talent, the spirit that inspired his remarks, it is true that he was in a position more favourable than that of those of us in this House who practise a pretty steady allegiance to the old party system, to make a speech absolutely judicial in its tone. Perhaps, that is one way of saying that the party system has its defects, as undoubtedly it has; but it is, perhaps, a platitude on my part to say that I consider, although I will not develop this argument for many moments now, that the benefits very greatly outweigh the defects. Those of us who adhere, in the main, to the party system, and who belong to one or other of the two historic parties, will find it difficult to obey what seemed like the extremely good advice of the hon. leader of the Progressives, that we should get right down to business, because we conceive that there is a certain duty attaching to us to tell the country or the public of the good record or the good works that we perceive in our own side and of the defects that we think we perceive in the other side, a privilege which, of course, is entirely mutual. In this way, we carry forward these debates and if our fires sometimes burn a little too fiercely, or if our bias carries us a little too far, the great public will make proper allowance for that and will render the verdicts which, after all, are nothing less than steps in our national life. Thus both the House and the country expect, and even await, something of the discussion which we have been having, of which the speeches of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition were virile examples.

After all I wonder if we cannot detect in the attitude of the Progressives some evidence of that party spirit against which they do not altogether hold up the finger of scorn. In all friendliness I would remind the hon. leader of the Progressive party that his followers did not obey with any slavish alacrity his suggestion that we should immediately "get down to business;" on the contrary they have made very valuable contributions to this debate. And we welcome them. It was interesting to hear those hon. members recount their local conditions, even though those conditions were sad and sometimes bespoke profound depression. Out of the welter of opinions expressed we hope, Mr. Speaker, that there will follow a serious study on the part of us all to solve our national problems, keeping always in view the greater good of the greater number.

Now, the hon. leader of the Progressive party, with whom I happen to have a slight but very pleasant personal acquaintance of a couple of years' duration, declared that in so far as this new administration did what he conceived to be right, he would support it. I take that to be, not a platitude, but a reasonable statement made in good faith, and, so far as I am concerned, I reciprocate it; if I find the Progressives adopting an attitude which I believe to be right and feasible I promise now to support them, and although of course I am not the spokesman for the Government, I think it is likely I can say the same on its behalf.

While I listened to the speech of the hon. Prime Minister—who, I regret, is now passing through the Valley of the Shadow, —I could not help thinking that to his courageous, courteous and brilliant platform work in the memorable campaign just closed is due in large measure the verdict which we so abundantly obtained. In a qualified way I can congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and I do so very sincerely. I humbly congratulate him upon the good voice in which we have heard him in this discussion, and upon his apparent good health, after coming through a campaign which must have thrown an immense tax upon his powers of endurance. I can congratulate him and his supporters upon having immediately prior to this session, discarded a garment which was clumsy and ill-fitting and which

bore the trade brand of "National Liberal and Conservative Party." I hope that it is but the beginning on their part of the complete renunciation of camouflage. I congratulate him on the unanimity and enthusiasm with which his supporters are saying that he will make a splendid leader of the Opposition. But I would not be entirely frank if I should also state that their verdict upon him as leader of the late government was similarly enthusiastic and unanimous. However within recent times, rightly or wrongly, the office of leader of the Opposition has been given judicial notice in this House. It is one of the most important offices in our parliamentary institutions. Therefore we patriotically hope that our Conservative friends are right in thinking that their leader is going to fill that office so well. When the great Laurier adorned it, he was the same contented patriot, the same happy warrior as when for fifteen years he had led a government whose record is written in letters of fire from one end of the country to the other.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition was gracious enough to say a kind word to all who came to this House for the first time, and I think we all esteemed this graciousness from a man of his prominence; but I am sorry that later he spoiled its effect because as to those of us who were elected against his government he poured out his condemnation, protesting that we were here because we had misrepresented the issues and humbugged the people. I can try to understand the mentality which could produce that right about change in one speech of an hour or so in length, but as to the ethical standards involved in that change I confess I am utterly at a loss to understand, because it seems to me that I would be best preserving my self-respect by refraining from congratulating any honourable member whose passage to this House was stolen by the ugly medium of fraud and wholesale misrepresentation. For myself I may say that I am not aware of having deceived the people, and if I wanted to argue it on a lower plane, which is not remote from a testing of the probabilities of the case, I would say there was no need to deceive the people, but that the indictment founded upon pure fact against the late government was so conclusive that no human imagination could strengthen it by resorting to deception or fraud. There were two elements upon which we depended for our victory,—the undisputed facts and the common sense of the people.

Now, there are many problems confronting the country at this time, but without disrespect to any hon. members who have preceded me in this debate, I doubt if we have yet received any real practical suggestions. For instance, the problem of immigration compels our attention. If we get a man to come to this country and become a producer of food, and stay contentedly upon the land, he is at least one of the humble units that will help to solve this problem, with which is so closely interwoven the complex railway problem. Can we in time multiply such a human unit by millions? But it is suggested, perhaps insisted, that the immigration be of a drastic selective character; and there you have another difficulty.

On the question of the tariff—and I say it with no disrespect—it is hard for any hon. member to add anything new. And for my part I do not propose at present to try. It is sufficient to say that in my humble view, if there is one man who can bring this country of ours out of the mire into which it has fallen; who can lay down some policy which will tend to do away with the estrangements between labour and capital; who can produce a budget which will relieve the feeling as between East and West; who will keep before him steadily the motto: "The greatest good for the greatest number"—that man is, of course, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I know, too, that in the way of suggestion we shall have the help of the Progressives. So far as they make suggestions which are well-founded I will keep my promise to support them if I believe they are right. Of course, we have to remember what the apostle Paul said, that "all things may seem possible, but that not all things are expedient."

The railway problem is a tremendous one, Mr. Speaker. It has always been a mystery to me why a government elected primarily and by common consent as a union government to finish the war should insist upon taking over some twenty thousand miles of railway. To ask us now if we believe in it would be about as sensible as asking us if we believed in an invasion of small-pox after every house in the community had been quarantined because of its arrival and because of its ravages. I do think that, if the late Government had taken the people into their confidence by consulting them before embarking on these steps, almost infinite in their magnitude, the people would have hastened to vaccin-

ate themselves against the introduction of any such disease in the body politic. But in the happy phrase of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), government ownership of railways is upon us, and it will have to be given a fair chance.

I could not regard with levity the suggestion of my able friend the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that as regards the operation of 1,600 miles of the Canadian Government-owned railway in the United States it was possible to foresee that there might be international entanglements. The ex-Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) told the Progressives the other night—this is merely by way of illustration—that if they had got their reciprocity pact in 1911 it would never have survived until to-day; the Farmer bloc in the United States, he said, would have seen to that. Well, I think he is entirely wrong. If that reciprocity agreement had been adopted it would have proved so popular with the people of both countries that there would be no reasonable fear of its revocation for long years to come. But I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the positive dogmatism of the hon. gentleman. The poet said that he "peered into the future, far as human eye could see"; this hon. gentleman goes further. I hope he is the only man in the House who says positively that the reciprocity treaty would not have survived until this day. Why was he so positive, why was his government so positive, then, that to run 1,600 miles of government-owned railway in foreign territory could not possibly lead to any revocation or any entanglements; that it could continue until Gabriel should blow his trump, the crack of doom? But I have an open mind as to that; it is a legal question. Having regard to what befell some of the efforts at legislation on the part of the late administration, particularly by Order in Council, at the hands of the highest courts in the land, I am not disposed to accept their ipse dixit for the legality of the proposal that they put forward with respect to the operation of railway lines in foreign territory. But in any event it is a fair matter for serious consideration. I do not think the other hon. gentleman from Toronto was right, either, when he said that co-ordination of the railways could be completely consummated in a time hardly longer than would be required for one of his own marathon speeches in this House.

The question of the Intercolonial involves a tragedy so far as the people of the Maritime provinces are concerned. Come with me, Mr. Speaker, back to the time when Confederation was in the making. The proposal for maritime union was then under way. Our markets lay with the United States, and those markets were dear to us. I admit that the reciprocal arrangements had been temporarily abrogated. But there was more than a fair chance that the New England states would have been only too willing to deal with our Maritime provinces as an entity, in view of the maritime union which we then were on the verge of adopting. But down come the Fathers of Confederation from farther west, Sir, and they say: "True, you have these American markets; true, reciprocity is a potential factor in your relations with those markets; we see the point at once; but come into the larger union and we will build you a railway through which you will obtain a substitute reciprocity with the great and intelligent provinces of Canada." We took them at their word, Mr. Speaker, and we want the understanding fulfilled in letter as well as in spirit. It was never intended for one moment that that road should pay, or that it should be a commercial road in any sense of the term. Scores of reasons could be advanced for reaching that conclusion, but perhaps it is a short-cut to say that the very fact that it was to be a government-built and government-owned road was proof that the Fathers of Confederation thought it was never intended to pay. I know very well they had no data before them in those early days which would make them think that a government-owned railway would be a paying investment for the country. If you read the speeches of Sir Charles Tupper, that outstanding figure among the Fathers of Confederation, you will see that he said time and again, and developed the argument with his usual brilliance, that there was an infinitude of difficulties in operating a government road economically as compared with its operation by a private company.

But, shades of the Fathers of Confederation! When the Railway Commission met at Halifax some weeks ago, delegates from an indignant populace down there went before them and said: "Please give us rates which will not stifle our traffic, which will not destroy our commercial ambition; please give us reasonable inter-

provincial rates as well as reasonable rates for our local traffic," what were they told? "We will not entertain any suggestion in regard to freight rates unless the proposal is based upon purely business considerations." It is true that that statement was somewhat modified the same day by the chairman of the board when he said that, after all, the Railway Commission had nothing to do with rates concerning those lines which belonged to the old Intercolonial Railway. But by some device they do assume control over those rates, which are very trying to business in the Maritime provinces. They are discouraging our people in a marked degree, and accelerating in a considerable measure the exodus to-day of our young men and young women to the United States. My opponent in the last election, the Minister of Public Works in the late Government, saw the blunder, the tragic unfairness of this as the campaign wore on, and in his campaign literature, in a newspaper under date of December 2, 1921, there appears this, "Vote for McCurdy and I.C.R. Headquarters at Moncton." Now, "I.C.R." has for railway men throughout this Dominion only one meaning, and that is is the Intercolonial railway, as it is so named in the very Act of Confederation, and if there is anything in the principle of Cabinet unity, I say that my opponent there pledged the Government of which he was a member to give us, if returned to power, nothing short of what my hon. friend the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has asked for, namely, the divorce of the Intercolonial from the Canadian National railway system.

The hon. leader of the Progressive party has asked, and very properly, and in a spirit of perfect fair play, what advantages there would be in such a change. I wish to supplement the answer that was given to him by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). In the first place, if we get that local management at Moncton, to which the Minister of Public Works in the late Government pledged himself in the last campaign, we shall, of course, expect to have there a manager and staff fully and perfectly acquainted with the local conditions. Now, is that something merely academic, or is it something which is intensely practical? Let me give you an illustration. Only a few weeks ago we had a few periods of snow storms, and I am informed by old men in the service of the Intercolonial whose judgment and whose integrity and carefulness in what they say upon any railway question I would not question for a moment, that because of the lack of knowledge of local conditions on the part of the men who were sent down from Toronto,—and I am saying nothing disrespectful of them personally; the same thing would have happened if men had been sent up from Halifax to take charge of the Toronto lines,—thousands upon thousands of dollars of the people's money was absolutely wasted through bungling in trying to keep the road clear of snow, and a great deal of valuable time was lost to the travelling public. You can see at a glance that on a single-track railway one blunder may effectually tie up the whole system and easily run away with ten or twenty thousand dollars or whatever it may cost to rectify the mistake. Well, in this case the blunder was made, and it was made because we did not have local management by maritime trained men who knew every mile of the conditions and exactly where the snowdrifts assert their most treacherous strength. That is only one example; I could give others.

I also put forward as another advantage in having local management by men who know minutely the local conditions, that the men on this road have been railway men and their fathers and grandfathers before them ever since Confederation, and their sons after them. The road is of the genius of their life. With it they grew up, and I will pit them for competency, so far as their territory is concerned, against railway men in any part of the wide world. They have been used from Confederation down, to have managers over them who knew their business and were perfectly acquainted with the local conditions. They worked under such managers in harmony, and their labour was of high and excellent type. But to-day when we are professing so much solicitude for the welfare of labour, we are insulting these men by putting over them bosses and managers and commissioners, and what not, whose bungling orders, much against their better judgment, they have to obey. I think if William Jennings Bryan were here he would say in this case, "You shall not press down upon the brow of Labour this crown of thorns." The London Times, referring once to an engagement in which some British troops had suffered a reverse because of the incompetency and bungling of the officers in command, said editorially, "Here is a case of lions, led by asses," and when

I see the humiliation to which our own men have been subjected by these people who have been imported, and who know nothing of the local conditions, I am vastly tempted to use the same figure of speech.

What other local advantages would there be? Heretofore, as our men grew up with the service, if an office worth while fell vacant, it was their reasonable ambition to secure it as a reward for duty long and faithfully performed; but now, if an office falls vacant,—and I could cite only too sadly instance after instance,—a man is rushed down from Toronto, perhaps an outcast of the defunct Canadian Northern, and he gets that prize which by all the rules of ethics and by all the rules of railroading, to my thinking, in a democratic country, should go to one of our maritime trained men.

Then, if we had a local management who knew the local conditions, surely in the future as in the past the supplies for the road would be fairly apportioned along the line. At the front door of this building only yesterday I was talking to a lumberman who lives in the constituency of my hon. friend from Cumberland, and he told me that when immense quantities of ties were rushed down from Ontario and laid by the side of the road in vast quantities he had asked, "Gentlemen, what price do you pay for such and such? We will supply them right along the road for you as cheaply or cheaper than that. Our lumbermen are idle, their horses are idle, we have had a hard winter. The wood I would select for those ties is very much better than the wood which appears in these Ontario ties." But no, under this Czar-like management in Toronto, we are bereft of the privilege of selling anything to the road except actual perishables and such coal as we can force upon them after a great deal of bickering, and after the most determined stand that we shall have at least partial justice in the Maritime provinces.

As to freight rates we have enjoyed our own rates up to a comparatively recent period in accordance with the spirit and the terms of the Confederation Pact,—such terms as permitted us, with reasonable profit and security, to compete in interprovincial trade, and we also enjoyed reasonable rates in the matter of local delivery of our freights. But those rights have vanished. The new Czars who came into control of the railways linked up our rates with the blanket freight rates that obtain in Ontario, and I say that was done in complete defiance of the spirit of the Confederation pact. What we require is local management by men conversant with local conditions: and we entertain the hope that ere long that Confederation pact will again be given effect to and that we shall once more enjoy these reasonable rates which formerly prevailed. Have we the right, as representing the people of the Maritime provinces, to expect anything less than that? Why, Mr. Speaker, we cannot run an excursion train for any purpose—for pleasure or for any other object—even for a few miles, without having to appeal to the powers at Toronto. The other day a trackman was killed at Halifax under sad circumstances, and application was made to Moncton for a pass to enable the widow to accompany the remains to the burial ground. That application had to go to Toronto, and to the distressing circumstances from which the family naturally suffered was added the suspense of having to wait for transportation. It was not until ten minutes before the train left with the dead man's remains that there was handed to the poor widow, on a rush order through the mail, the pass which enabled her to go to the funeral of her husband. Is there another road in Christendom whose rules would have subjected a woman in that sad position to such needless anxiety? Sir, I believe that if the door of a stove in a little rural railway station down there should be found to be broken, a new one could not be substituted for it until slavish, formal and tedious application had been made to the great powers in Toronto. And further as a colleague sitting near me suggests, the article itself would have to be bought in that city. Why, if we had local management of the Intercolonial railway we would be enabled to obtain the return of the proper equipment of that railway which was so shamelessly looted when the line was absorbed into the great national system in which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take such remarkable pride.

The conditions which have resulted from the change I have described are arraying the people of Nova Scotia against the people of Ontario, because the latter are being blamed for what has taken place. I am sorry, Sir, that under what I might almost describe as a system of slavery they are trying to impose, the natural result is being produced in the minds of the people of the Maritime provinces, a spirit against the people of Ontario which sometimes borders upon hatred. After all, we people down there are free men and have as much

right to stand in an honourable position as any other section of the community before the great Jury of this Nation, and we shall strive to maintain our rights inviolate just as we would expect the people of Ontario to do were there any issue in which they were directly concerned.

The leader of the Opposition said he did not blame the Canadian people for putting them out of office, but he did blame the Liberals who deceived them. That is a pretty fine distinction and one not entirely complimentary to the intelligence of the electors. However, I do not wish to be understood as speaking in any unfriendly way of the people of Ontario. I blame the autocratic government, which the Canadian electors so recently dismissed with scorn, for bringing about the state of affairs complained of in the Maritime provinces. I entertain the hope that the fairminded men of this House—and I have faith in the absolute fairness of many of our Progressive friends—will join in investigating our case from their detached and impartial position, and that if it is ultimately found that our claims are justly founded, we shall see in the future a scrupulous observance of our confederation rights.

I was not present when an hon. member from the far West stated what we in the Maritime provinces wanted was the privilege of free passes. I think it was scarcely worth the hon. member's while to indulge in such a sneer as that. I am not aware that the system of granting passes was ever abused in the Maritime provinces. I know that I was in close touch for a good many years with hon. members who represented those provinces on the Liberal side of the House, and I am sure that they at least never received any excessive favours in that regard. I regret very much to observe in the Toronto Globe a comment in regard to the deputation from the Maritime provinces which waited on the Government a short time ago, to the effect that we wished to have a restoration of the good days when the conductor went through the Intercolonial cars and had very little to do except gather up the passes. I desire to say that the young man who penned that comment did not know what he was talking about and that there never was such a state of affairs as alleged. I resent the statement and assert that the evidence does not support it.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was severely taken to task by hon. gentlemen opposite because he made an observation which to me seemed to be nothing more than a bit of good-natured philosophy. The Prime Minister's remark was that campaign literature during election time should not be taken too seriously.

An hon. MEMBER: He meant Tory literature.

Mr. PUTNAM: The ex-Minister of Customs (Mr. Baxter) pointed a very menacing finger at the Government benches and said that for his part he would absolutely stand by the campaign literature of the Tory party. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) read the Prime Minister another lecture in the same direction. Well, I am going to ask my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Baxter) if he supports the campaign literature of his late colleague (Mr. McCurdy) as thus embodied in the Truro campaign literature of his party, "Vote for McCurdy and I.C.R. headquarters at Moncton". When the hon. member arose the other day and registered the unctuous resolve that he would stand for the rights of the Maritime provinces I was disappointed that he did not frankly say that he, with his splendid intellect and great influence, would range himself with us who are trying to bring the Intercolonial back to its former status; but plainly and impliedly he did, he said he would stand by it all. And this is what the former Minister of Public Works circulated by the thousands in the homes of intelligent and honest electors of my county.

Mr. HANSON: What does the hon. gentleman mean by wanting to get back to the old Intercolonial days? Does he want a return to the halcyon days of the late Henry R. Emmerson, when it was a political machine pure and simple?

Mr. LOGAN: It was no such thing.

Mr. PUTNAM: No. The hon. gentleman should not give my words a meaning that they do not reasonably bear. We want the ordinary conditions that should enter into the management of any government road. I think our people are reasonable and intelligent, but as between the days of Mr. Emmerson, and the tyranny and stifling of trade and ambition that obtains now, why give us back those good old days.

I am going to deal with this question of the authenticity of campaign literature just a little further for the benefit of those two hon. ex-ministers of the late government. I have here a circular. I had not intended to refer to it at all, because to do so might smack just a little of ungenerosity

to a fallen foe, which, perhaps, is more prevalent in politics than it should be. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to see how sincere those men are—perhaps the word is not too strong—in their references to campaign literature. This letter was circulated broadly throughout my good county of Colchester, bearing date November 26, 1921, and at the top there is a real good portrait of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, and at the bottom it is signed with his autographic signature. It was very widely distributed in the closing days of the campaign. Here is one paragraph which I particularly submit to the attention of those hon. gentlemen who preceded me:

> Reports from all parts of Canada indicate that Mr. Meighen's government will undoubtedly be sustained.

But I shall forget all that, and come to something better—

> It remains for you to say on 6th December whether Colchester shall continue to hold the honour and be represented in Parliament by a cabinet minister, or by a member who will sit on the back benches.

That is from a cabinet minister, holding no less a portfolio than that of public works. If it were physically possible that he and I could now be both in this House I would love to discuss with him the good or bad taste of saying that my county would hold the honour of being represented by himself. But I pass that by, and I ask any hon. gentleman in this House if he thinks there is a government having a cabinet minister within the realm of democratic institutions anywhere who would make an appeal like that over his own signature—not to vote for a man for no better reason than that he would be a back-bencher. I submit that to the good democracy of my hon. friends the Progressives, most of whom conducted their campaign with very little hope, or very little sordid ambition, that when they came here they would immediately become cabinet ministers. But, Mr. Speaker, you occupy a plane above the rest of the commoners, by common consent, by the traditions of this country, which obtained in England for hundreds of years before. We have this form of government in Canada. But surely no hon. member is to be subject to any such stigma as this because he is not in the Cabinet. Now, the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works might have found a great many legitimate reasons which he could have advanced, why I should not be elected. However, Mr. Speaker, what do you say to this as an indecent and sordid reason—that I was to be voted against simply because I would be a back-bencher? I am very glad my lot has fallen to these back benches literally and truly, because of all the pre-election statements which the former Minister of Public Works made, that is the only possible one that came true. If the whips had not placed me here, I would have been generous enough to insist upon taking a back bench, to break the hon. gentleman's hoodoo. This is the letter which the hon. ex-Minister of Customs (Mr. Baxter) and the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) say they will back up, and I leave them to their fallen idols.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker; as a new member, I will not take up the time of the House with any preliminary remarks, further than to say that I feel honoured to belong to a party which has within its ranks the first lady member who has had the honour of a seat in parliament. Since the opening of Parliament I have taken a keen interest in the different speeches that have been delivered, and one thing I remarked in particular was that the first eight members who spoke in the House had not one word to say in connection with that portion of this country which is to Canada what California is to the United States—British Columbia, the land of sunshine—nor did they have one word to say about the unemployed. They did not have one word to say about the oriental question which is to British Columbia the most vital question that will come before this House at the present session, and last, but not least, they did not have one word to say about the men who stood between us and tyranny, the men who ennobled Canada on many a bloody field, the men who withstood the German onrush and accomplished that which was never surpassed in British history.

I say that they did not have one word to say in connection with the oriental question, which is one of the most important questions to the people of the West. It would seem to me that we in the West know more about this question than do the people of any other section of Canada, because, we have to live amongst, and to associate with, these orientals. The people of British Columbia, with their destiny on the Pacific coast, are more exposed to oriental competition than the people of any other portion of Canada, and the effect of oriental immigration is, at the present

time, costing this country millions of dollars. We cannot get away from that fact, and the effect it will have on civilization in the future is something we cannot afford to ignore. Experience has proved that they refuse to adopt our standard of living; the white race will never assimilate with them; nor will it want to do so. Therefore, I say that the two races should not be brought together. Why should our boys and girls have to compete with oriental labour that is contracted for in Yokohama and such places? They should not have to do it. It is true that the Federal Government receives a revenue from the Chinese entering this country; but why should the people of Canada and the country itself not come before revenue? Why should these orientals be brought in to compete with the white people of this country? Mr. Kabura, a very prominent Japanese in Vancouver, made this statement a short time ago:

> It is nothing but the ignorant class that is opposed to the Orientals coming into Canada.

He added:

> Wise men wish to suppress such manifestations of ignorance.

That statement is not correct. Some of our eminent statesmen know that the two races will never assimilate; it was never intended by nature that they should assimilate, and they should never be brought together.

The people on the Pacific coast know what the orientals are, because the orientals who come to Canada, as a general rule, remain on that coast owing to climatic conditions there. People in the East do not have the experience that we have in British Columbia, but you may have it if this condition of affairs continues. Let me point out how the oriental population increases. In 1910, there were 20 Japanese children born in British Columbia —not a very great number—but how many were born in 1920?—657. Last year, the birth increase in the white race was seventeen per thousand; but what was it in the Japanese race?—69 per thousand. Is that increase not sufficient, without allowing any more of those orientals to come to our shores? If this state of affairs continues at the present rate, where shall we find ourselves in another twenty-five years? Every one who has a vision of a greater Canada should be interested in this problem.

5 p.m.

Why should the people on the Pacific coast have to build schools to educate the oriental? They cannot afford to build schools to educate their own children as they would like to do, but they have to build schools to accommodate those orientals who come in. Let us see what a school inspector, a man who is not affected by racial prejudice in any way, says along those lines. This school inspector was asked to give a report, and he said:

> Mingling of Chinese with white boys and girls in the public schools constitutes a growing menace, and it has to be stopped.

He does not say "it should be stopped;" he says: "It has to be stopped," and he knows what he is talking about. He continues:

> There is a danger in these Chinese boys, many of whom cannot even speak English, the coming from their unsanitary quarters and mixing with other children. We know that it is not only a tendency with the Chinese to live in unclean quarters, but a practice. In four public schools in Victoria there are 216 Chinese students.

That is what the taxpayer is up against on the Pacific coast. Why should this state of affairs continue? Why should we, as I have already said, have to provide facilities for teaching orientals, when we cannot educate our children as we would like to do? We must realize what we may expect in the future if this state of affairs is to continue. I am told that last year it cost the taxpayers in Vancouver $60,000 to teach orientals. Oriental immigration should be stopped and stopped at once; it has a tendency to lower not only our standard of moral life, but of labour and of civilization. We cannot get away from these facts. Why should the oriental be allowed to supply cheap labour for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many? Is there any man in this assembly to-day who would like to see his little girl, eight or nine years old, having to sit in a school beside an oriental boy, fifteen or sixteen years of age, and that oriental boy having an opportunity of associating with that child of his? If there be such a person, I would not have very much respect for him, and I do not think there is any one here who would entertain such views. Then, why are the laws of this country such that we have to put up with such conditions on the Pacific coast? This state of affairs should be stopped and stopped at once. Why should we not rather try to have this country a country of homes, homes that would be a source of happiness and contentment, homes which will help to build up this country of ours, for there is no teaching to

equal that which the child gets in the home? But we can never have home life as it ought to be, as long as the oriental competes with the labouring men of this country. Why should the laws not be such that they will help to make home life what it ought to be? The Government ought to stop, and stop at once, this oriental immigration.

The question of the returned soldier is one that I prefer not to have very much to say about, because so much has been said and so litle done, that it must become pretty tiring to those men who did so much for Canada and for civilization. I need not tell hon. members what the man who went on the land and purchased a farm with borrowed money is up against; I need not cover the ground which has already been covered. We know that at least 95 per cent of our farmers and stockmen did not make a dollar last year, and personally I do not know a farmer or stockman in the district that I represent who has made a dollar from farming. Under such conditions, how do we expect these men, having to pay interest on borrowed capital and taxes, to make the success in life which they ought to? It is up to the Government to appoint a commission to investigate this matter and then to bring in an act whereby those men will get a fair and square deal. That is all the boys want; they are not asking for charity; they do not want it. They made good overseas, and I have no doubt that they will make good on the land if they are given a square deal. In my opinion, those men who are on the land should get a revaluation of their land, stock and implements, and the inflated values at the time of purchase should be squeezed out, and that done at once. Give the men a chance. As for the men who are receiving pensions, a man who was injured overseas and who came back to Canada, should not be obliged to come before a board every month or two in order that the board may see whether it can do something to lower his pension. He should receive a pension, and it should not be lowered simply because he tried to improve his condition through a little work. There is no doubt in my mind that as these men advance in years their war wounds will cause them still more trouble. Therefore I say a minimum pension should be set and those men should be encouraged to improve their condition. Why should a man be divorced from his wife and family simply because he went overseas to fight for his country? Yet that is exactly what is happening to-day, and I see a report in the press that the Government expects to put more of these men into hospitals. Why not try to provide them with homes of some kind, humble though they be, where they can live together with their wives and families? I see no reason why it should not be done. A scheme has been under consideration for some time to take a portion of an Indian reserve near Kamloops and build cottages on half acre plots, where these men could enjoy the comforts of home life and work on their land when they felt fit to do so. This project has been discussed for the last four or five years, but nothing has been done. Why cannot we carry it out? Let me read to the House a report from Dr. Irving of Kamloops in connection with the proposal. I may say that he is one of the most prominent doctors in the West and is recognized as an authority on the treatment of tuberculosis. He reports:

> For many years we have all found that our apparent cures of T.B. on leaving the sanatorium almost always break down when the men take up the struggle for existence in keen competition with able-bodied fellows.

When these men leave the sanatoriums they have to make a living. They are not supposed to be discharged until they are cured, but it is practically impossible to entirely restore them to health and strength. Dr. Irving proceeds:

> Thus the money spent and work done in their case becomes a loss to the country and to themselves.
>
> In order to overcome this economic loss, the plan of Mr. Denison—

I might say that Mr. Denison has no axe to grind, he is above reproach. He has taken a keen interest in the welfare of our returned men back from France:

> Dr. Irving said the plan of Mr. Denison would work out admirably is the opinion of those who have done T.B. work or have lived under climatic conditions where tubercular work is carried on. I am quite sure there is a wonderful opportunity to develop a scheme that will fill a long felt want in our system of treatment and at the same time do much to eliminate much sorrow and suffering that now exists among these returned men.

Cannot the Government do something to carry out this scheme? The late Government, I understand, did take some action, and here is what one of their ministers stated:

I know nothing to prevent the officials going ahead with the work directed by the committee to establish the model city on the edge of Kamloops.

Apparently the details of this project have been worked out to a certain extent, but nothing has been done to put it into effect. Cannot we get some action? Cannot those men who did so much for Canada obtain some relief? Before I came down here I went out to the Tranquille Hospital to talk to some of them who, I know, had comfortable homes before the war; but they let country come first, they went out to fight Canada's battles. Now they are at Tranquille, unfit to go back to the Coast where their wives and families are, and in some cases I know those dependents are getting no help except from charitable institutions. Surely this state of affairs cannot exist very much longer; it is not in the interests of the country that it should; those men who did so much for us are entitled to better treatment and, I repeat, something should be done and done at once.

I am not going to take up the time of the House talking about the elections and election tricks. I do not see why our time should be wasted reading extracts from the press and manifestoes and going over the same old campaign ground again. That is not what we are here for; we are here to make laws for the betterment of the people, and that is what they are paying us to do. Then why should we not get away from that old political game? I should like to know what the Government is going to do with the National railway system. It seems to me that a board of managers should be appointed to take charge of it, but I do not think it should be a board composed of politicians; it should be composed of practical railway men who have a life study of railroading,—have worked themselves from the ground up and know railroading from A to Z. I have no doubt that if such a board is appointed there will soon be a different tale to tell in regard to the conditions of our publicly owned railways.

And what are the Government going to do with respect to the returned men? Are they going to treat those men honestly and fairly? It seems to me that in honour and justice to those men that is the only thing the Government can do. If they do not we shall have met the test of peace far less nobly than those boys met the test of war.

What is the Government going to do about the unemployed? There is scarcely anything said about that question in the speech from the Throne. Have they no scheme of relief? I do not believe this country owes any man a living, but I do believe it owes every man who is willing to work a chance to earn an honest living. I believe the Government should start some work of a practical character that will help to relieve unemployment and at the same time be for the benefit of the country as a whole. There is no reason why such a scheme should not be started, for there is lots of work to do here and Canada has a bright future. For instance, why should we not start the building of a trans-continental highway? Some say that is work for the various provinces to undertake. I do not think so. I think it is up to the Dominion Government to start such an undertaking and carry it to completion. There is no reason why such a scheme could not be carried out, and if properly carried out it should not cost the taxpayers of this country one dollar. Last year over two hundred and fifty thousand tourists came from the United States to British Columbia. If such a highway were built these tourists could be required to pay toll; the cost of the road would thus be met, and the people in the vicinity would have the benefit of it. The carrying on of such a work would also go a long way toward relieving unemployment, and it would give the people of other countries confidence in Canada. I say that it is up to the Government to carry out this work.

As to oriental immigration, what are we going to do about it? I must say I was disappointed that no hon. member who took part in the debate had anything to say on this subject. It was not my intention as a new member to address this House, but I feel it my duty to bring this question to the attention of hon. members. We on the Coast feel it very keenly; we feel what you people in the East will feel within the next twenty-five years if oriental immigration is not stopped. There is no getting away from it; the orientals do not go into the outlying districts to assist in the development of the country. They flock to the cities, and they are more than anything else responsible for the unemployment at present. Why should we encourage the immigration of that class of labour? Why not close our gates against it? I say that we should close our gates against it, in the interests of humanity.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House any further. I simply wish to say

that if we have confidence in this country and in our people—that unwavering confidence that we had in our boys at the front even during the darkest days of the war—Canada has a bright and prosperous future.

Mr. CLEMENT ROBITAILLE (Maisonneuve) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I would not be performing my duty if I did not join with the hon. members who have preceded me in this debate in extending to you my congratulations and those of my constituency (Maisonneuve) which had the honour in the last Parliament to be represented by you and which I have the honour to-day of representing. The title of Speaker is most appropriate, for you are one of the most eloquent speakers of this country; the duties attached to the post are specially suited to you because your talent, your experience, and your uprightness have placed you in the Speaker's chair by the unanimous choice of this House. However, if the post is admirably suited to you, on the other hand it deprives us of the pleasure of listening to your eloquent speeches on the important political questions which interest this country, and by mockery of fate, you are called upon to listen the most and to speak the least.

I must also equally congratulate the hon. members who have moved and seconded the motion to the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. It is not my intention to discuss all the momentous questions contained in the Speech from the Throne. But I shall simply state that the county which I represent is one of the most important in Canada. As you are aware the division of Maisonneuve is a manufacturing, farming and working centre. It is a country where there exists big and small industries and nevertheless, on the 6th of December last, all of these interests united together to give their support to the Liberal candidate, because they had faith in the Liberal policy, because they had full confidence in the Liberal programme which aims at establishing an equitable tariff for all concerned, including the consumer; at re-establishing the finances of the country, at restoring industrial and agricultural activity and providing work for the labouring classes, who have been idle for a number of years. One might be led to say that the late government, in a desperate effort, wished to provide work for your old county, Mr. Speaker, by granting a contract to the Canadian Vickers Company, of Maisonneuve, for the construction of an ice breaker. This matter had been urged previously for many months by the metal workers; many requests had been forwarded to the late government demanding this enterprise; but all in vain, when suddenly, two or three days, I believe, after nomination, in November last, the hon. Minister of Marine of the day, Mr. Ballantyne, granted the contract to the Canadian Vickers for the construction of this ice breaker. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing was but a put-up job.

So far as to state ownership of the railways, I am very willing to give it a trial, but my personal opinion is that it will never be a success, because first of all the State cannot manage nor promote traffic as well as a private company; another probable cause of failure is due to progress in other spheres, for often progress is made in one sphere to the detriment of another. I refer to the development of the automobile and to road improvement. Without pretending to be an expert on railways, I believe that the largest returns, that is, what is most remunerative for a railway company, is its passenger traffic and freight transportation on short hauls. Now, within the last few years, we have noticed motor busses and motor trucks transporting passengers and goods from large centres to remote places in the country. What therefore happens, is that railways cover the same road without any passengers or freight; consequently without earning any returns. This new development is but in its infancy. However the farmers and the country dealers own their motor trucks and motor cars and carry their products and goods to the large town markets.

Mr. Speaker, another question which I wish to discuss is the one raised by the hon-member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) when he spoke on the soldiers' return home from the front. He stated that we should not stick strictly to the letter of the law with reference to the Pension Act, because too often injustices are committed. I approve the remarks of the hon. member on this subject. In fact, we are aware that wrongs have been committed. In my own county there are a great number of soldiers who have seen service at the front; some are in poor pecuniary circumstances and cannot obtain an indemnity proportionate to the sacrifices made, or sufficient to provide for the essential necessities of their family. Only a few days ago I received a letter from one of these returned men. He is a South African war veteran and receives a pension

of 48 cents a day; in 1915, he joined the Canadian army and he was demobilized in 1919. Here follows what he says:

885 Lasalle Ave.,
Maisonneuve, Montreal, Que.,
March 6, 1922

Hon. C. ROBITAILLE, M.P.,
for Maisonneuve.

Sir,—I am putting my case in your hands as a Canadian citizen.

1. I am a veteran of the South African War on a pension of 48 cents a day. Am residing in Montreal seventeen years, never been in a police court in that time.

2. When the Great War broke out in 1914, I volunteered my service with the P.P.C.L.I. met with accident on Mountain street and did not proceed to Ottawa with that Unit.

3. In October 1915, joined the C.G.G. without medical inspection, only eye test. Served Canada, England, France and Belgium. Demobilized February 28th 1919 without medical inspection.

4. I have been going through treatment at the D.S.C.R. Montreal from Dec. 1920 until August 1921, and judged as incurable by Doctor Keenan, Chief Medical Adviser D.S.C.R. Montreal.

5. Have been recommended for a 100 per cent disability for increase of South African Pension. I was boarded again and recommended for 20 per cent for Canadian Pension. Was told by Canadian Pension Board I was not entitled to Canadian Pension as I was getting full compensation from the Imperial Government. Imperial Government says they are not accountable for my present disability as I have served with the Canadian Forces.

6. I have been strongly recommended for Pension by Doctor London, Chief Medical Adviser for the Province of Quebec, also Col. K. R. Marshall, D.S.O., Toronto, Ont., whose documents are attached to my medical papers. Now I have been thrown down for the second time by Dr. W. A. Burgess, Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, Ottawa who over-rides the Doctors in Montreal. I am a Canadian citizen, my wife is Canadian born, my children are Canadian born, I am electrician by trade, cannot follow my occupation through disability; how is my family going to live on 48 cents a day, after me giving my services for my country. Am I to starve also?

I remain, Yours truly,
H. A. GIBB,
885, Lasalle Ave.,
Maisonneuve.

No. 177133,
87th Batt. C.G.G.
3352
1st Leinsters Regt.
Late Royal Canadians 100th Batt.
Born April 28th, 1872, at Limerick, Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, this man who on two different occasions served his country is referred from the Imperial to the Canadian Governments and vice versa; nevertheless his pension remains at 48 cents per day, when it is clearly established by all the medical authorities that he suffers from a disability of 100 per cent. I would feel very grateful if the law on pensions was applied in a more humane way, and in a spirit of gratitude for the soldiers who so well defended our country, instead of having it applied too strictly.

Mr. L. J. LADNER: (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise with a natural diffidence to address for the first time the Parliament of Canada. I wish at the outset to tender to you, Sir, my congratulations quite sincerely, from a personal knowledge of your long career in Parliament and from having read, as many young men do, diligently and conscientiously the fine debates in Hansard. I must say, however, that in your elevation to the first place in the Commons we are losing one of the greatest and most powerful debaters in Parliament.

It is not for any personal satisfaction or honour that I take part in this debate. I do so because I believe it is a duty I owe to my constituents, as it is the duty of all members of this House who come here with a definite proposal or some concrete matter to lay it before their fellow-members, who may, perhaps, not be so well informed as to the views of his constituents.

We have here, Mr. Speaker, four parties, and I have no doubt but that the addition of two of these parties will have a salutary effect upon the business and legislation of this Parliament. One calls itself the Progressive party. Notwithstanding the scathing denunciations and somewhat exaggerated terms which have been applied to our party by hon. gentlemen opposite, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while we do not have the word progressive in our name, in all the deeds and acts of the Liberal-Conservative party as found in the pages of our country's history, progressive is expressed. Right down through our history until the 6th day of December, 1921, we find this to be so. I exclude the 6th day of December, 1921, Mr. Speaker, because I do not consider that a day to which the word "progressive" can be either conservatively or liberally applied. The 6th day of December appears to be free of political phenomena—just progressive.

I should like in the few minutes that I shall take part in this debate to avoid as much as possible covering many of the subjects, which have already been discussed at great length and in very general terms, but I cannot in duty to my own province permit this occasion to pass without a reference or two to the question of the tariff.

We are four parties in British Columbia, but we are a solid thirteen, irrespective of

party, for a protective tariff. The members from British Columbia have always supported the Macdonald Liberal-Conservative national policy, modified to that of the Laurier-Fielding policy as it has been called in this House by certain hon. members. I submit, however, that at this stage, on this 22nd of March, after listening to the various debates upon that question we can now apply the real and correct name to the tariff policy of this Government. I think the proper name would be the Gouin-Fielding tariff policy, which we heard explained a short time ago. If, however, the opinions and the sentiments of the hon. members from British Columbia, thirteen in number, are not sufficiently convincing to this Government, may I be permitted to read the words of one who leads the Liberal party in the province of British Columbia? I refer to the Liberal premier of British Columbia, "Honest" John Oliver, who has been there for a number of years. On a certain occasion he came to Ottawa, and some hon. gentlemen now present will remember that he made a keen analysis of, and somewhat denunciatory remarks upon, the proposed Liberal tariff as drawn up at the convention held here in August, 1919. It may perhaps be wearisome to hon. members to be continually listening to the reading of newspaper clippings, but this one is so pertinent, the remarks so true as they affect British Columbia, and the ideas so soundly expressed, that I believe it would be informative to the House if I read a few paragraphs. I quote from the Vancouver Province of the 7th of August, 1919; the same quotations are found in the Globe of that day. Addressing the great Liberal convention here in August, 1919, Mr. Oliver says, with respect to the tariff policy enunciated there:

> If you pass this resolution as it is reported from the Committee, you are furnishing, not a weapon of defence for the Liberal party, but a weapon of attack by which the Borden Government will successfully attack the Liberal party. In 1911 I went down to defeat in defence of the reciprocity pact. I went into that fight with my hands tied, and this resolution will have the effect of tying my hands behind my back and the backs of a great many other Liberal candidates in the next election.

And surely enough when the next election took place we found a Liberal Government in control of the legislature of the province and not participating in the election to any extent whatsoever. I am not saying that under the influence of any party bias, or prejudice; I say that to indicate to hon. members that so far as British Columbia is concerned this is a matter of real importance. I trust, therefore, that the Government will take cognizance of the attitude of the thirteen members as well as of the Premier of the province. In the same speech Mr. Oliver continues with respect to the tariff policy which more strongly appeals to hon. members to my left:

> The reasons I call this class legislation and why it is sectional and why it will put a club into the hands of our opponents, are these: Let us take one item—farm tractors. They should be on the free list, but is a tractor any more an implement of production than the power that goes into your factory or the gasoline engine that goes into the fishermen's boat or any other object? Is a plow more an implement of production to the farmer than the machinist's tools to the mechanic or the plumber's tools to the plumber? Is any one an article of production more than another?

And then Mr. Oliver continues:

> You have no answer. It is not a square deal and is not Liberal.

Referring to the tariff also he says:

> It is a get-by proposition and the Liberal party in this crisis should not put any get-by proposition before the people.

I think all hon. members who look at this matter frankly will realize now that the tariff platform of that time was a get-by proposition, and hon. gentlemen opposite hold their seats by virtue of the pledge of their leader at that convention. Now I find it necessary to quote one or two more lines from Mr. Oliver's speech:

> You want free cement. We have three immense plants in British Columbia, all of them idle. Why put cement on the free list and not the reinforcing iron that goes into it? Is it consistently logical? What answer can you give? You have no answer.

Then he concludes with these words:

> If this Liberal party has a policy at all it is a policy of justice to the masses of the people, and if you have to resort to taxation it must be put on the men who can bear the burden. I can not go before these returned soldiers who came to my office and demanded that I give up the reins of Government (and I told them I wouldn't and that I was going to give them a square deal) and say to them that I voted for a resolution that would give free gasoline for millionaires and leave the tax on the little boots and clothing that the veterans kiddies have to wear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is perhaps wearisome to some hon. members to listen to these quotations, but I desire to make the point that the hon. members from British Columbia and the official leader of the Liberal party in that province are against the policy enunciated by the

Liberal party in that convention and which seems to have some considerable support in this House, and are in favour of the policy which they have supported consistently from the beginning to the end.

On the motion of Mr. Ladner the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 23, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Chief Electoral Officer a certificate of the election and return of Joseph Rodolphe Ouimet, Esquire for the Electoral District of Vaudreuil-Soulanges.

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW MEMBER

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Joseph Rodolphe Ouimet, Esquire, Member for the electoral district of Vaudreuil-Soulanges, introduced by Sir Lomer Gouin and Hon. J. A. Robb.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. PAPINEAU (Beauharnois) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the following report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committee of the House during the present sessions.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Acting Prime Minister) moved the adoption of the report of the Special Committee to prepare lists of Select Standing Committees, as follows:

No. 1

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs:

Baxter,
Black (Yukon),
Bureau,
Cannon,
Copp,
Demers,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Findlay,
German,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Guthrie,
Hammell,
Hudson,
Jacobs,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Laflamme,
Lapointe,
Maclean (Halifax),
Macphail (Miss),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Morrison,
Porter,
Ryckman,
Sexsmith,
Stewart (Lanark), and
Vien—28.

No. 2

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Archambault,
Arthurs,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Blackadder,
Boivin,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bristol,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Carroll,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Clifford,
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desrochers,
Drummond,
Ethier,
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Forke,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Garland (Carleton),
Gendron,
Gould,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Halbert,
Hocken,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hughes,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Essex),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Knox,
Kyte,
Ladner,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lavigueur,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Mackinnon,
MacLean (Prince),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McConica,
McCrea,
McDonald (Timiskamingue),
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
McTaggart,
Manion,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Maybee,
Mercier,
Mewburn,
Milne,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
St. Père,
Savord,
Séguin,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Queen P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Humbolt),
Stewart (Lanark),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Tobin,
Vien,
Wallace,
Walsh,
White, and
Wilson—126.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Archambault,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Binette,
Bird,

Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bureau,
Charters
Chew,
Church,
Clark,
Davies,
Denis (St. Denis),
Deslauriers,
Drummond,
Ethier,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gendron,
Hammell,
Harris,
Jones,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
King (Huron),
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lewis,
Lucas,
MacKinnon,
MacLaren,
McGiverin,
McKillop,
McMurray,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mercier,
Morin,
Pacaud,
Papineau
Porter,
Power,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Raymond,
Reed,
Robitaille,
Senn,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Stein,
Stork,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Walsh,
Ward,
Woods, and
Woodsworth—64.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4

ON STANDING ORDERS

Messieurs:

Binette,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Chaplin,
Chew,
Clifford,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Duncan,
Euler,
Evans,
Gervais,
Gould,
Harris,
Hughes,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lavigueur,
Leader,
Léger,
LeSueur,
MacLaren,
Maclean (York),
McIsaac,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Munro,
Parent,
Rickman,
Séguin,
Steedsman, and
Woodsworth.—33.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5

ON PRINTING

Messieurs:

Baldwin,
Cardin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Coote,
Euler,
Fansher,
Hocken,
Humphrey,
Jones,
MacKelvie,
McConica,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Michaud,
Prévost,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Robinson,
St. Père,
Thurston,
Turgeon, and
Wilson.—23.

No. 6

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messieurs:

Archambault,
Beaubien,
Blackadder,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bristol,
Brown,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain.
Chisholm,
Clark,
Coote,
Crerar,
Demers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Elliott (Dundas),
Forke,
Gardiner,
Gauvreau,
German,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Hudson,
Humphrey,
Jacobs,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kyte,
LeSueur,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McMaster,
Manion,
Martell,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Power,
Ryckman,
Sheard,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Lanark),
Stewart (Leeds),
Thurston,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Vien and
Wallace.—61.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messieurs:

Baxter,
Bird,
Boivin,
Bristol,
Caldwell,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carruthers,
Chaplin,
Chevrier,
Clifford,
Coote,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Demers,
Desaulniers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fortier,
German,
Good,
Gordon,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hubbs,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Johnson (Last Mountain),
Kellner,
Kennedy (Essex),
King (Huron),
Ladner,
Laflamme,
Lavigueur,
Logan,
Low,
MacKinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York),
Macphail (Miss),
McCrea,
McKay,
McMaster,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Marler,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Mitchell,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Porter,
Rankin,
Reed,
Robb,
Robitaille,
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,

Stein,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stork,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Vien,
Walsh, and
Woods—82.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Brethen,
Brown,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carruthers,
Charters,
Chew,
Clifford,
Crerar,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Duncan,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Garland (Bow River),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Good,
Halbert,
Hatfield,
Hubbs,
Hunt,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Jones,
Kay,
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Knox,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Leader,
Léger,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacKelvie
MacLean (Prince),
McConica,
McCrea,
McKay,
McKillop,
McMaster,
McMurray,
Malcolm,
Marcile (Bagot),
Maybee,
Millar,
Milne,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Neill,
Papineau,
Prévost,
Pritchard,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sexsmith,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens),
Spence,
Stansell,
Stein,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humbolt),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Warner,
White,
Wilson, and
Woodsworth.—105.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 9

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messieurs:

Bancroft,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Delisle,
Dickie,
Duff,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Grimmer,
Hatfield,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Léger,
LeSueur,
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McKenzie,
McQuarrie,
Marler,
Morrissy,
Munro,
Pelletier,
Putnam,
Ross (Simcoe),
Savard,
Spencer,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Humbolt),
Turgeon, and
Word—36.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10

ON MINES AND MINERALS

Messieurs:

Arthurs,
Black (Yukon),
Boucher,
Cahill,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Church,
Clark,
Davies,
Déchêne,
Denis (Joliette),
Dickie,
Drummond,
Forrester,
Gendron,
Hanson,
Hunt,
Knox,
Lapierre,
Logan,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Macphail (Miss),
McBride,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martell,
Munro,
Neill,
Pacaud,
Pelletier,
Prévost,
Ross (Kingston),
Shaw,
Simpson,
Speakman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork, and
Warner—37.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 11

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATERPOWERS

Messieurs:

Blackadder,
Bourassa,
Caldwell,
Carroll,
Church,
d'Anjou,
Desaulniers,
Duff,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Halbert,
Hoey,
Hunt,
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
Ladner,
Lanctôt,
McDonald (Temiskaming),
McKillop,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Millar,
Munro,
Murphy,
Power,
Rinfret,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Turgeon, and
White.—34.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 12

ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

Messieurs:

Boivin,
Ethier,
Fansher,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Hocken,
MacKelvie,
McGiverin,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Prévost,
Rinfret,
Robinson, and
Ross (Kingston)—13.

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members.

No. 13

ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs:

Béland,	Lapointe,
Carmichael,	Lovett,
Deslauriers,	Lovie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Maclean (Halifax),
Euler,	Meighen,
Gauvreau,	Robinson,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Ross (Kingston),
Irvine,	Ross (Simcoe),
Johnson (Moosejaw),	Sheard,
King, Mackenzie (York),	Sinclair (Oxford), and Walsh—21.

Motion agreed to and report adopted.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That Messrs: Anderson, Bancroft, Gordon, Logan, Macdonald (Pictou), Pacaud Papineau, Wallace and Wilson be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY—JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing Their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Carmichael, Deslauriers, Drayton (Sir Henry), Euler, Gauvreau, Gouin (Sir Lomer), Irvine, Johnson (Moosejaw), Mackenzie King (York), Lapointe, Lovett, Lovie, Maclean (Halifax), Meighen, Robinson, Ross (Kingston), Ross (Simcoe), Sheard, Sinclair (Oxford) and Walsh, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING—JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely Messrs. Baldwin, Cardin, Charters, Chevrier, Coote, Euler, Fansher, Hocken, Humphrey, Jones, MacKelvie, McConica, Malcolm, Marcil (Bonaventure), Michaud, Prevost, Raymond, Rinfret, Robinson, St. Père, Thurston, Turgeon and Wilson, will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES

On motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding, the Select Standing Committees of the House were severally empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records; with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. McMurray for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, March 22.

Mr. LADNER (resuming): Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment of the House last night I had made some casual observations relative to the tariff question; and now I refer to the railway question. We on this side of the House desire that the Government should fulfil their promise of the 13th instant given by the hon. Prime Minister that before this debate closed an expectant House, and no doubt an anxious country, would be made aware definitely and concretely what the proposal of his Government was with respect to our national railways. In order that there may be no misunderstanding in this connection, I should like to read to hon. members the words of the Prime Minister on that occasion:

The reference may not have been necessary on the ground that it did not involve legislation, but it was necessary that the country and Parliament should be informed at the opening of Parliament exactly as to the purpose of the Ministry with respect to the National railroads which are in our possession at the present time.

Then the Prime Minister continued:

But I would remind my right hon. friend that the proper person to discuss railway policy is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), and I would prefer, until he has had an opportunity of addressing members of the House to defer saying anything further with respect to the meaning of the co-ordination as set forth in the Speech from the Throne. I think the language must be perfectly clear to hon. members. If there is any doubt as to what is in the Government's mind, that doubt will be cleared up by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is very grave doubt on this side of the House as to the

policy of the Government in this respect, and I put it again to my hon. friends opposite that it is only fair and right that the people should know now, before this debate closes, the railway policy of the Government. I observe that the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) is in his seat, and he will no doubt, as we say in court, "take judicial notice" of our request.

There has been a noticeable absence in this debate of reference to our returned soldier problems. I do not take it, however, to indicate apathy on the part of hon. ministers that we have had very few observations and even fewer concrete suggestions from the Government on this important question. The Government does say in the Speech from the Throne:

> The work in connection with the re-establishment, medical treatment and vocational training of former members of the Canadian Forces is being sympathetically and energetically prosecuted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing which should be considered—and which the people will expect hon. members to consider—in a non-partisan spirit, it is this question, and I submit that there are many changes which must and should be brought about in our pension and land settlement regulations. I desire to bring to the notice of the House two instances of the injustice that is wrought by the present pension regulations. I know of a case here in Ottawa where a soldier died some time after he returned from active service overseas. Because his widow could not prove to the satisfaction of the Pension Board that that man acquired the disease to which he succumbed as a result of his war service, she was deprived of the pension to which she should be entitled. Her husband died of cancer, and the onus of proof is so severe and difficult that the widow cannot establish positively that the disease was a result of his war service, although there were indications that it was. I know another case in British Columbia of a young lawyer who went overseas, served faithfully, never cared to admit that he was in ill health or did not feel very well, and got a one hundred per cent discharge, but to-day tuberculosis has become noticeable in him. However, the regulations governing soldiers' civil re-establishment do not permit him to have the advantage and benefit of the assistance which he ought to receive. The poor fellow is in a very bad state of health and has a widowed mother to support. I give those two instances to show how necessary it is that something should be done to modify the regulations which at present result in such injustice and neglect of most deserving cases. I hope the House will appoint a special committee to go into these things, because if there is one matter that is dear to the heart of every true Canadian it is that which pertains to the welfare of the dependents of our soldiers who made the supreme sacrifice overseas. In that connection I would commend to the Government the suggestions made by the Great War Veterans' Association a few days ago through its Dominion Command. Many of those suggestions are practical and sound, as I know from observation and experience.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) in the course of his speech on the 17th instant stated that he would like to see the Royal Northwest Mounted Police removed from British Columbia. I would suggest that he speaks only for himself, not for his colleagues from that province. If there is one body of men which gave us comfort and a feeling of security at a time when our constitutional system was in danger, it was the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, whom everybody respects and only revolutionists fear, and I think it would be a terrible mistake if this fine body of men were to be eliminated. It would seem that the proposal of the Government is to reduce this force.

Now I come to the real point of why I am taking part in this debate.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member says "Hear, hear." Maybe he made a better point, but I will do the best I can. In the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the handing back of their natural resources to the Prairie provinces. It is stated in very general language, and as the matter is so important I shall read the statement:

> The long standing question of granting the control of the natural resources of three Western Provinces to their respective Provincial Governments has engaged the attention of my Ministers. Sympathizing with the desire of the authorities of these Provinces, which have now advanced to maturity, to have the same control and management of their resources as is possessed by the older Provinces, my Government have made a proposal to the Governments of the several Provinces concerned, which it is hoped may lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question at an early date.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not very explicit, and the Prime Minister was asked by the

leader of the Opposition to give a fuller explanation. On March 13, as will be found at page 45 of unrevised Hansard the Prime Minister explained that portion of the Speech from the Throne in these words:

> May I read from the letter which I sent to the Premiers of the different Provinces. The opposite paragraph is as follows:
>
> "If, however, the Governments of the Prairie Provinces would not be satisfied with such an arrangement—"
>
> That is the one similar to the offer that had been previously made.
>
> "—but would prefer an accounting between the Dominion and the Provinces from the beginning, by an independent tribunal, we would not object to such a plan. In any agreement that might be come to along these lines it would be, of course, necessary, that adequate provision be made for crediting the Provinces with all money received by the Dominion and charging to the Provinces all outlay by the Dominion, directly or indirectly in relation to the management of the resources. Any award duly made by the tribunal should be binding on both sides. Any sums found to be due by the Dominion to a Province or by a Province to the Dominion might be capitalized and interest adjusted in connection with the annual Provincial subsidy."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are very few questions of greater importance to the Prairie provinces, and there are none of more importance to the other provinces, than the relationship of those provinces to the Dominion with respect to their natural resources, with respect to the land which has been alienated, and with respect to the various cash contributions which have been paid from time to time; and if there is an objectionable feature in what is now contemplated it is the proposal under which the Government of Canada, the federal authority, proposes to enter into a direct and separate transaction with the Prairie provinces in complete disregard of the rights and claims of all the other provinces. I submit to hon. members here that that policy is not only unfair and unsound, but is calculated to accentuate the differences which already exist between the several provinces. I propose to show, Mr. Speaker, that the proper course and policy to be pursued on a matter of this kind is the one which, when it settles the rights and claims of the Prairie provinces, will also settle the rights and claims of the other provinces of the Dominion who voluntarily came into Confederation; and surely it would not be right for the federal authorities to deal with the public domain to the disadvantage of those provinces who when they entered Confederation pooled

their resources with the public resources of Canada. Take for example the Maritime provinces. They have on a number of occasions expressed their claims. They say they want compensation and an equivalent for lands reserved for school purposes for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They also claim compensation for the cash subsidies paid to Manitoba and Alberta purporting to be in lieu of lands, and they also want compensation for the lands granted to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in which the people of the Maritime provinces, in common with the people of the other parts of Canada, have a proprietary interest. In short, they claim that they have contributed large sums of money to make and develop Canada; that there were placed in the hands of the Dominion Government, as trustees of the Canadian people, certain great areas of land, certain resources, in which these original provinces have a proprietary interest, and they declare that the Federal Government acts in a fiduciary capacity in that regard for the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these claims advanced by the province of Nova Scotia and other provinces have a great deal of merit. Under the circumstances, is it fair for the Dominion Government, in total disregard of such claims, to enter into a separate and distinct transaction with the Prairie provinces? The same question may be asked, as I think I can show conclusively to the satisfaction of hon. members, with respect to other provinces in the Dominion.

When Confederation was formed the six original provinces contained an area of approximately five hundred million acres. In addition to these five hundred million acres, there was a vast area of two billion acres which constituted the common domain of the federated provinces of the Dominion. But in 1898 and 1912 the Dominion Government increased the grants of natural resources and of lands to the province of Ontario to the extent of 115 million acres thus making Ontario's total 261 million acres, or in other words practically doubling the original area of the province of Ontario. When we come to the province of Quebec we find that its original area was 124 million acres, but subsequent grants in 1898 and 1912 increased the total acreage of Quebec and her territory now consists of 452 million acres, so that that province to-day is four times the size it was at the time of Confederation. To-day when the provinces of Ontario and

Quebec, which exercise a great political influence in Canada say: "No, the Prairie provinces cannot have back their natural resources; we have a proprietary interest in them and we want an accounting for the money they have received"—surely when that takes place the Prairie provinces can say to Ontario and Quebec: "We have a proprietary interest in 440 million acres of the common domain given to you since Confederation, and we are also entitled to an accounting." The point I wish to make is simply this: Any province which desires to make a separate transaction between the Dominion Government and that province without at the same time taking recognition of the proper claims of the other provinces—any policy of that kind is unsound and narrow and is calculated, as I said before, to increase rather than diminish the differences that exist between those provinces.

Now, what do the Prairie provinces say: They say: "We want back our natural resources, we want an accounting for the land that has been alienated, and we want the original annual subsidy of $562,000 that we received for several years past." And they repudiate the right of other provinces in connection with their claims for proprietary interest in their domain. In other words, the Prairie provinces ask for the original grant of lands within their boundaries which the original provinces of the Confederation got at the time Confederation was entered into.

Now, Sir, it would be an oversight on my part if I did not speak upon the very just and very moderate claims of the province of British Columbia, a matter which has been one of great concern in our province for many years. Many hon. members will remember that Sir Richard McBride fought for a long time to bring about an adjustment of this question, and I deem it well to quote a few lines from one of his speeches, towards the end of his career. Speaking on the subject of better terms on 19th July, 1907, he said:

> I say again, ladies and gentlemen, this is not a party question. I am not talking as a Conservative to Conservatives but as a Canadian to Canadians, I say to the people of British Columbia that they should legitimately follow up their grievances and carry them to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members from British Columbia are to-day, once more, presenting the grievances of their province on that question. But we do not want those grievances settled apart from the rights and claims of other provinces; we want to co-operate with the other provinces and decide upon a policy which will bring about a fair and proper adjustment of all these claims at the same time. When our province joined Confederation, one of the terms of union was—

> And the Government of British Columbia agree to convey to the Dominion Government, in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable in the furtherance of the construction of the said railway, a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway, throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed, however, 20 miles on each side of said line.

At the time of Confederation the province of British Columbia had a proprietory interest in those lands, and conveyed a belt 40 miles wide and 500 miles long to the Dominion Government in trust, Mr. Speaker, to be appropriated for the purposes of railway construction. The point I wish to make is that the trusteeship has failed. Those lands were never used for railway construction, and, the trust having failed, we are entitled to a return of the lands because we had the reversionary interest in them. In that area there is something in the neighbourhood of $35,000,000 worth of timber alone, taking the price of $1 a thousand. A few days ago the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), told us that the province of Nova Scotia came into Confederation also under the terms and understanding that they should have a railway. The province of Nova Scotia got the railway, and paid nothing, but the people of Canada paid $100,000,000 for it. In British Columbia we had a distinct pact, but the Government of Canada, on account of other influences, failed to carry out that pact. Before we got our railway we had to give the Dominion Government what is known as the Peace River block, three and a half million acres of land, conservatively valued at $35,000,000. We had to give a vast quantity of land on Vancouver island, which we should not have been obliged to do under the terms of Confederation. That land was conservatively estimated at a value of $25,000,000. Then, unlike some of the other provinces, British Columbia, since Confederation has contributed to the Dominion Treasury the large sum of $40,000,000 in excess of what it has cost the government. So that when you add together the value of those lands, the cash contribution, and the timber in the railway belt you find that British Columbia, in order to have the Canadian Pacific railway—a national and imperial railway—constructed

across the continent to Vancouver, has paid in lands and money the enormous sum of $130,000,000.

I ask you for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to contrast British Columbia with the other provinces. A moment ago I mentioned Nova Scotia. They got their railway and the Dominion Government paid $100,000,000. Ontario secured an area of land out of our common domain double her original size. Ontario has received an appropriation of money grants for canals and things of that kind from the Dominion Treasury, far in excess of $125,000,000. Quebec is to-day four times the size she was in 1867, and has acquired natural resources of great value—timber, mines and lands. Quebec has also received large appropriations from the Dominion Government. The claims of British Columbia are these: we say that the railway belt, given in trust for railway purposes, and not used for such purposes, should be given back to the province. We have paid enough without that. We say that the 2,000,000 acres on Vancouver island should be handed back or that we should have an accounting. We claim that the Peace River block, still intact and of great value, should be returned to us. A large quantity of Indian lands were also conveyed by the province of British Columbia, when she was a Crown colony, to the Dominion Government in trust for the Indians, to be taken care of by the Dominion as guardian for the Indians. We claim that large portions of those lands, which have been practically abandoned by the Indians, should be handed back to British Columbia. On that point I would like to quote a few words from the terms of Union, section 13:

> To carry out such policy, tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose shall from time to time be conveyed by the local government to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefits of the Indians.

Therefore, we claim that, the trust being at an end we are entitled to a reversionary interest in those lands.

Now I ask the hon. gentlemen to turn their attention for a moment to the question of subsidies. We find that Ontario, as of the 31st March, 1921, received annually $2,400,000; Manitoba $1,470,000; Saskatchewan $1,753,000; and Alberta, with a population of 582,000, has received a subsidy of $1,162,000. British Columbia, with almost the same population as Alberta, received the sum of $623,000, about one-third of what each of the Prairie provinces received. Hon. gentlemen will surely see that the policy of a government which makes a separate and distinct transaction with the Prairie provinces, and neglects and ignores the claims of other provinces, is not one which is calculated to meet with the approval of the public of this country. We are told that the Prairie provinces, unlike the province of British Columbia, have cost the Dominion of Canada since Confederation something like $40,000,000 in excess of what they have received. British Columbia, on the other hand, has contributed the sum of $40,000,000 in excess of what the province has received. I desire to draw to the attention of those who, perhaps, have not travelled in British Columbia the fact that we have also important physical disabilities. We have great expense for our administration, for the police, for government agencies, for schools, for roads, trails, bridges and for other things—an expense which other provinces do not have to face. The province of British Columbia perhaps may not interest all hon. gentlemen present, but, so far as the policy of the government is concerned, I wish to repeat, and I hope the hon. ministers will remember this—and I am sure that my views are shared by every member from the Prairie provinces—that any settlement of this very important question of provincial rights and of better terms must be made in a broad national way, all at one time, and not piecemeal as has been proposed by the Government.

I trust and hope that when the policy of the Government in this matter is announced in detail, we shall find manifested that spirit of co-operation by my hon. friends to my left, the Progressives, which they profess in their speeches, and which I am sure they will practise in this parliament; and even though they may have the advantage of securing a separate deal with the government, because of their strategic position politically, that in the spirit and understanding of the ideals which they have professed in their eloquent speeches during the last few days, they will be consistent and will refuse to accept from the government the temptation of their natural resources, to the prejudice and the injury of the other provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. ALFRED STORK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, as this debate is coming to a close, I should like to take up the time of the House for a few moments in order to make some brief observations in connection

with matters pertaining to British Columbia. The constituency which I represent is, I think, one of the largest in the Dominion of Canada, and in view of the fact that many members, whose particular constituencies are not so large as mine, have spoken at great length, I will trespass upon your generosity. May I be permitted to state that my constituency embraces an area of 164,600 square miles, and, with the possible exception of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black), I travel, perhaps, the longest distance of any member to attend a session of this House. My constituency is larger than England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Denmark, Holland and Belgium all put together, so that I think such a territory alone should justify my being given an opportunity of voicing, for a few moments, the aims and ideas of the people who have sent me here to represent their particular interests.

I am perhaps, a little late in arriving here. In the year 1917, the people of the constituency of Skeena elected me by a "home" majority of something like 600; but due to the conditions under which the election took place, I was declared counted out by the overseas vote. I am not here to hold post mortems; we have had sufficient of those up to the present time; I wish merely to say that I regret that I have not been able before to take my seat in this House, for the reason that a great deal of misrepresentation has taken place in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. I do not believe the fortunes of any particular individual are an issue in this Dominion of Canada; but owing to the fact that, since 1911, that branch of the present Canadian National Railway system, known at that time as the Grand Trunk Pacific, has more or less fallen upon evil days, I have regretted exceedingly that, prior to the present session of Parliament, there has not been in this House some member to correct, from time to time, misrepresentations which have appeared, in the press and upon many platforms throughout the Dominion. In that connection, let me say that the railways, known now as the Canadian National Railway system—known at that time as the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific—running west from Edmonton as far as Red Pass Junction, run practically parallel, separated by, perhaps, only a few yards.

A great deal of energy has been spent in attempting to discredit the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the country through which it passes, in order to make it appear that the construction of that railway was not justified but that the construction of the Canadian Northern down to Vancouver was the proper thing to do. A great deal of energy has been spent along that line, and I, therefore, wish to compare, just for a few moments, the territory through which these two railways run. I know no better method of comparison than to state to the House that the territory through which the Grand Trunk Pacific passes is a country immensely wealthy in agriculture, timber, minerals and other natural resources. As I said before, the two railways run practically parallel from Edmonton to Red Pass Junction. The Canadian Northern runs from Red Pass Junction down the Thompson River to Kamloops, and then parallel to the Canadian Pacific from Kamloops into the city of Vancouver. The schools—and I think this is a fair criterion,—built in the years 1916 to 1920 on the Canadian Northern railway in British Columbia are twelve in number; on the Grand Trunk Pacific the number of schools built is 46. In the year 1921, one school house was constructed on the Canadian Northern and 22 on the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway is now a national proposition, and there is perhaps no railway on the continent that has such a mileage and at the same time that is not supplied by feeders or supplied with spurs. In connection with this railway running from Edmonton into the port of Prince Rupert, if we had a twenty-mile spur built to Stewart lake, it would open up a vast new agricultural country. A seven-mile spur built into Francois lake also would open up a vast new agricultural country. A seven-mile spur from Telkwa would open up immense coal areas in that particular region. One hundred and fifty miles of a spur line to the Ground Hog country would bring into the market a vast quantity of anthracite coal. Twenty miles of a spur line into the Copper River country would tap a great and very valuable deposit of iron ore. As this is a national road, the country must get behind it, and we can do no better than develop the natural resources which lie contiguous to the national railway system. I believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in his idea of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, had the proper plan. It was built with an imperial viewpoint; it was part of the "All-red" route. It opens up, I believe, the best country that you can find in the whole Dominion of Canada. In connection with

this railway which runs westward to Prince Rupert, let me cite to you what I find in "5,000 Facts About Canada". The editor states:

> Prince Rupert—436 miles nearer Orient than any other Pacific port. Population, 8,000. Assessment, $17,138,492. Single tax. City owns telephone, water and electric light systems. Five schools, including high school.

I may say that we have just opened up a new school at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars.

> Greatest fishing port on Pacific coast. 20,000 ton drydock; largest cold storage plant on Pacific coast, with magnificent harbour, ranking third in world harbours.

I believe Sir Wilfrid Laurier had the proper idea when he decided to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific railway as a national asset.

Before I take my seat, there is one phase of British Columbia life which I wish to draw to the attention of the House. British Columbia entered Confederation in the year 1871, and the agreement under which she entered was that a railroad would be built to link up British Columbia with the rest of Canada. But in that particular bargain I do not find any clause stating that British Columbia must harbour within her borders an oriental population which is designed for the whole of Canada. The people of British Columbia have no desire to be sacrificed upon the altar of international goodwill. The oriental question in British Columbia is reaching a most acute state. The oriental has absorbed the salmon fishing industry of the province, and the truck farms of British Columbia are very largely in his hands. He is also spreading into the timber industry, and I understand the mercantile industry is controlled to the extent of thirty per cent by the oriental population. If we continue at the rate at which we are going we shall very soon find that the whites will have a very small place in British Columbia. The birth rate of the white population in that province is seventeen per thousand, while that of the Japanese is 69 per thousand, or four times that of the white people. The birth rate in Russia is 46 per thousand, in Germany 26, and in Great Britain 24—quite a difference as compared with 69. The oriental question presents another aspect, which is a serious one indeed. We are troubled to-day throughout Canada with the unemployment problem, and as a Canadian I believe that this question should receive the earliest attention of this particular Parliament. I should like to see Canadian resources in the West, and, for that matter, in the East as well, developed by Canadian labour. It is not a pleasant thing to see the vast and ever-increasing oriental population prospering in our own country, while the men who fought overseas for the safety and well-being of this Canada of ours, now that they have come back, have to stand idly by and see the work of the province carried on by orientals. I believe that the country would understand its problems better if people travelled somewhat more. There is nothing like travel to give a man a broader vision. Members of Parliament will soon rise from their session. Instead of taking a trip to Europe to visit some foreign country, they should go to British Columbia. In fact, I invite every hon. member of this House to take a trip to that province. There is no country in Europe that can compare with it. The mountains of Switzerland, the sunny skies of France, and all the varied and beautiful scenery that you can find on the continent of Europe cannot, I assert, compare with the magnificence of British Columbia. Its rivers, its lakes, its mountains, and its forests are inviting. Let hon. members spend their vacation in that province and we in British Columbia will lay before them the problems incident to that great country. If that were done this House could better understand our point of view, and I am sure that its members would return from such a trip very much benefited in health, besides having a clearer knowledge of our problems.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this late stage unduly to prolong the debate. Were it not that certain documents have come into my hands during the past few days touching a matter of vital importance to all who are interested in agriculture, a matter on which I think we should have a clear understanding as to what this Government's attitude will be, I should not have spoken at this time; and I do so now only at the request of some of my fellow-members. The matter I refer to is the question of the British embargo upon Canadian cattle. Perhaps I may say first, however, that I have listened with a great deal of interest and amusement, and, I hope, not altogether without edification, to the controversy that has gone on across the floor of the House; and I confess that in my unregenerate days, that is, before I became a member of the Progressive party, I might have enjoyed taking part in such an

exchange of courtesies. However, I passed a self-denying ordinance for myself which I will try to observe, and I trust that I shall not unduly transgress it in this debate.

I heartily concur in what the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) has said, that it would be well for us to visit other portions of the Dominion. For my part, I intend to avail myself of the invitation that he has given, and I should also like to visit the Maritime provinces to see if I could get their point of view in regard to the Intercolonial railway. Possibly they might not give it to me, but I should be glad to go there in any case.

Mr. LOGAN: We will give you our point of view.

Mr. BROWN: A newspaper suggestion was made a short time ago that the Government should undertake the cost of transporting members of this House to all portions of the Dominion in order that they might better familiarize themselves with the country's problems. In view of the straitened finances of the Dominion, I would not urge that suggestion, although I see the need of it. Perhaps, if I might venture the remark, the most
4 p.m. outstanding illustration of that need has come from the members from the city of Toronto. One of those hon. members indicated what he thought about agricultural conditions in Western Canada, when he quoted from a letter that he had received from a friend, stating that he had raised wheat for thirty years, every year without treatment. Now it is unfortunate that any such idea should prevail in regard to Western conditions. It was Lord Dufferin, I think, who once made the statement—a very unfortunate thing for him to have said—that all you needed to do in the West was to tickle the ground and it would bring forth a crop. Well, hon. gentlemen from Toronto do not seem to have learned anything since that day. The hon. member who quoted that letter wondered why we in this corner laughed in derision when he read the statement. It very clearly indicated that he had simply no conception of the conditions that prevail in the West, and I think that if the Government of this Dominion could not send that hon. gentleman from the city of Toronto to the Prairie provinces, the Prairie provinces themselves might well afford to finance the expedition.

I wish to refer briefly to some remarks made by the Minister of Finance in the late government (Sir Henry Drayton), since they are directly connected with the matter I have particularly in hand. Referring to the question of reciprocity, he said that the Americans desired to get hold of our wheat only because they wanted to benefit by the cost of handling it. That is by no means an altogether correct statement. Hon. members, and hon. gentlemen from Toronto, will understand that we in the northwest produce a grade of wheat that is unsurpassed on the globe. It ought to be remembered also that the area in which that wheat is produced is limited. So far as the United States is concerned, that area consists only of the northern states there—those that touch the international boundary; and it is by no means correct to say that the only interest the Americans have in our wheat is the desire to handle it. We know from past experience when conditions were normal, that there was a demand for a certain proportion of our wheat by the mills of the United States, and we desired to benefit by that demand. We have heard much about the things that go to make for national unity; but I may say that it is not calculated to produce any feeling of goodwill on the part of those who live in the Prairie provinces to be told, on the one hand: You must buy our apples or our machinery; and, on the other hand: You must sell your stuff only to us. It has been this attempt to restrict us both in our purchasing and in our selling that is, perhaps responsible for the presence of the Progressive group in this House to-day.

Now, coming more directly to the question of live stock—and I may say that the live stock industry, next to the wheat industry, is the most important in the Northwest and undoubtedly the most important in Ontario;—I wish to point out that the failure to ratify the reciprocity pact in 1911 was of untold injury to the people of the Prairie provinces. The conditions in those provinces are such that we very frequently find it not only profitable but in many cases necessary to market our cattle in an unfinished condition. Very often a farmer is short of feed and, altogether against his own will or desire, he must find a market for his cattle. The United States under normal conditions is capable of absorbing large numbers of those cattle. A few years ago, if I may be pardoned a personal reference, I sent some steers down to the Winnipeg market. A few weeks afterwards I received a letter from a gentleman in the state of Illinois who had got

my steers, my name and address having been on their ear tags. He said: "We like your Canadian cattle; they are good feeders, and we want to get them." Mr. Speaker, if they want to get them, we want to sell them, and in spite of all that has been said about the necessity for trade lines running east and west, there is a trade in respect of which the lines must run north and south. If they do not, then there can be no trade.

An hon. gentleman opposite spoke the other day of Canada's being an absolutely self-contained nation. I was reminded of the remark of the countryman who went to the fair and saw a giraffe for the first time: "There ain't no such animal." It is futile to talk of a self-contained nation in this year of grace when the absolute interdependence of nations is being shown as never before. There is not and cannot be such a thing as a self-contained nation.

I think I have shown the necessity for our having access to the United States market for a certain class of cattle. It is the market that has absorbed the class of cattle which are not suitable for export to Great Britain, even under the most favourable conditions,—even if the embargo were removed. At the same time, the necessity for the removal of that embargo is apparent. Hon. members undoubtedly understand the situation as it has prevailed for nearly thirty years. The embargo was originally imposed ostensibly for the purpose of keeping out disease, but really to protect certain British interests. It is now recognized that there is no disease, and the embargo is being continued purely for the purposes of giving protection to British interests. In this connection I want to acknowledge, on behalf of the organized farmers, the debt we owe to the Hon. Manning Doherty, a member of Mr. Drury's government. By the way, I was amused when one of the members from Toronto sought to appeal to the Progressives by intimating that Mr. Crerar might be satisfactory to certain interests, but that Mr. Drury was not. We in the West, however, were told during the campaign that if we only had Mr. Drury, everything would be satisfactory in regard to the Progressive party. Well, we are satisfied with them both, and I want to pay every respect to Hon. Mr. Manning Doherty for what he did in connection with the cattle embargo; he brought the matter before the British authorities in a way in which it had never been brought before.

[Mr. Brown.]

Unfortunately, there seems to have grown up an impression in Great Britain that the official attitude of the Canadian Government toward the question of the embargo is one of indifference. I have before me an extract from The Canadian Gazette, published in London, dated February 16. I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to this paragraph. I cannot think it correctly represents his attitude; indeed, I am prepared to believe that the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture would be in perfect harmony with my own in respect to this matter. But here is an indication of the impression that has grown up:

> "We are sorry, of course, but it is really your business, and not ours." That, in a sentence, is the impression which Canadian cablegrams bring to us of the Canadian reception of the decision of the British Government not to remove the cattle embargo. Mr. Motherwell, the new Dominion Minister of Agriculture, says in effect: "This is essentially a question for the home authorities", and he adds: "Since we ourselves in our own interests have now imposed an embargo on British cattle we have little to say on the subject." Of course, the embargo abolitionists may reply: "Yes, but Canada's embargo on British pedigreed cattle is because of admitted disease; Britain's embargo on Canadian store cattle is, on the other hand, in spite of the admitted absence of disease."

I think our position would be well expressed in that last sentence. There is a very great difference between our attitude in excluding pedigreed cattle because of admitted disease and the attitude of Britain in excluding Canadian cattle when there is admittedly no disease. I am prepared to recognize that in any event this is a matter to be dealt with by the Imperial authorities. I am prepared to recognize also that we who have imposed protective tariffs against British goods are not in a very strong position to protest against their imposing protection. But I think it would be very unfortunate if we should in any measure countenance the impression that we are indifferent in this matter. There has grown up in Britain during the last few months a very strong body of public opinion in favour of having that embargo removed. In an Associated Press despatch in to-day's paper it is announced that there is shortly to be called by the Lord Mayor of London a national conference on live stock at the Guildhall, which representatives from many large cities will be invited to attend. I deem it my duty to express, Mr. Speaker, as I believe I have a right to do on behalf of the organized farmers, the view that this

question of the removal of the embargo is by no means a matter of indifference to us. Great uncertainty exists as to where the market for our live stock is going to be; we are not sure of the American market, and we are not sure of the British market. I shall not undertake just now to discuss the relative merits of those two markets, but if we do not get one or the other, then the live stock trade, it may almost be said, is doomed. It would be very unfortunate to allow that impression to prevail over here, and I trust that the Government will make it very clear that so far as their official attitude is concerned it is in harmony with the views that I have expressed.

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations in this debate I wish, in common with hon. members who have preceded me, to offer to you my sincere congratulations. I know that your rulings will be fair and impartial and that we shall all receive every courtesy from the Chair. I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address who were to me perfect strangers, but who have become my personal friends since my coming to this House.

Each member in presenting his views has spoken largely from his own local viewpoint, and I think that I may be pardoned if I follow somewhat along the same lines. Indeed, it seems to me to be the duty of a representative to ascertain the wishes of his constituents, to interpret them to the House, and to endeavour to have them embodied in legislation, if such legislation is not detrimental to the country as a whole. I do not know that I should have taken any part in this debate but for some remarks made by some hon. members who have preceded me. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) the other day made the following statement, and although I cannot say that I have caught the true significance, of his remarks, I wish to read it to the House. Referring to the Prime Minister, he said:

> My hon. friend said that the entrance of a third party gave the Conservative party in many cases the opportunity for victory; but he will find that in many constituencies which his own party carried, their success was very largely due to the same fact—I am told his own former constituency, for example. I do not know whether down by the sea it is only a wraith of political mist, but something drifted to us there in the atmosphere—perhaps it came over from Prince Edward Island—that there would not have been entire sorrow or great heartburning in my hon. friend's party if there had been a minority instead of a majority for him in North York.

Now, I fail to understand what my hon. friend means. If he has any reference to the county of Prince, which the hon. Prime Minister represented in this House for two years, and which I have the honour to represent at the present time, I may say that he is altogether astray in his supposition. If there is one constituency in this Dominion more than another where the Prime Minister is regarded as a personal friend to whom the people wish to pay every tribute of respect and wish every success, it is the county of Prince, P.E.I. Further, if I may be pardoned any personal references, at the time that the hon. Prime Minister was chosen leader of the Liberal party I, along with some other local men, was spoken of as a possible contestant for the seat, but we were only too glad to make way for our leader and allow him to enter this House through the portals of the county of Prince. Again, when the general election was on this fall, a delegation came from the province and waited upon our leader and again offered him the opportunity of allowing his name to go before the Liberal convention. I heartily concurred in that action. If the hon. member for St. John has reference to our attitude in the province of Prince Edward Island, I wish to tell him that he is drawing on his imagination, and that is equally apparent if we apply his reference to the Dominion generally, for throughout the length and breadth of Canada the election of the Prime Minister in North York was hailed with delight.

Reference has been made from time to time to the province of Quebec. Down in Prince Edward Island we are sometimes termed "Little Quebec", because we are pretty strong Liberals in that part of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What about Nova Scotia?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Nova Scotia is all right. We elected one hundred per cent of our representatives to this side of the House at the last election, and I believe that if we had had the six members that were conceded to us under Confederation in that province we would today have two more members on this side of the House to swell the Liberal ranks The county I have the honour to represent contains a large percentage of French-Acadians, and a more loyal and more patriotic people cannot be found in any

part of this fair Dominion. Their war record can safely be put in comparison against that of any other part of the country, and their patriotic services on that occasion brought forth plaudits from the whole of Canada. Personally, I am very proud to represent one of the constituencies of Prince Edward Island whose people of every class proved themselves so patriotic and so true to our national ideals. In this connection I would pay special tribute to our noble women. I do not say that the people of the island are all Liberal, they are divided in their political allegiance as are the people of every other province; but whether Liberal, Progressive or Conservative, they have high ideals and take a great interest in the government of the country.

Possibly I should be over on the other side of the House with my farmer friends. I happen to be a farmer, and in that capacity I represent largely the viewpoint of the agriculturists.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: You are in the right place here.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Previous to the election some of my Progressive friends did me the honour to suggest that possibly I might let my name go before their convention as their candidate. I appreciated the honour very much, but believing that possibly within the lines of the Liberal party we could achieve our ends and get as good legislation in the interests of our agriculturists as in any other party, I could not accede to their request. I was only too glad to take up the fight for the good old Liberal party again, and I am glad to say that in a three-cornered contest we were able to win with the largest majority that was ever rolled up in the history of that constituency.

Now, Sir, I have every sympathy with the views advanced by our Progressive friends on the opposite side of the House. I know they have their own difficulties, and I understand their desire to improve their marketing conditions. They are to-day, I believe, asking for a Wheat Board, and if I understood the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) aright yesterday, I think he tabled a memorandum on that subject. We are willing to give our Progressive friends every assistance. If the establishment of such a board is equitable, just and right, it is only fair that they should have it. I am not conversant with every phase of the subject, but I am eager to learn, and I shall be glad if our Progressive friends will give us on this side of the House every information in relation to the subject so that we may be able to discuss it intelligently and endeavour to understand their viewpoint.

Down in the Maritime provinces we have our own difficulties to overcome, as has been pointed out by previous speakers in this debate. Our natural market is the New England States, and we would naturally desire to sell our products there whenever possible. Just to give an illustration of how we are handicapped in the matter of trade at the present time on account of the Emergency Tariff which was put in force by the United States about a year ago, I might cite one or two experiences that have been encountered. First of all let me say that I have pointed out to our people at home that no party in Canada can remove that Emergency Tariff; it is up to the United States to say when they will remove that barrier and let our products enter that market, and we can hardly expect them to do it until they are good and ready. But here, for example, is what we are up against in the province of Prince Edward Island. We enjoy a large trade in potatoes, but this year we are obliged, when shipping potatoes to the American markets, to pay a duty of 25 cents a bushel. This money had to be paid at the port of entry in American funds before the produce would be received for shipment. Yet in the face of that handicap the Seed Potato Growers' Association shipped to the United States over 160 carloads of potatoes. We also produce in Prince Edward Island a large number of lambs which we are obliged to market each fall; and last year we could get a better price for our lambs in the American market, even after paying $1 per head duty, than we could elsewhere. I think these illustrations should cause our friends who opposed the reciprocity agreement in 1911 to realize what an injury the rejection of that agreement was to the Maritime provinces at least. If there is any province in this fair Dominion that would be benefited by such an agreement it is the province of Prince Edward Island. I think the same thing applies with equal force to the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

It has been said on different occasions that our channels of trade should run east and west, but for our province the natural channel is in the other direction; and we

have lost money every year when we could not sell our surplus products in the United States market. Despite this fact various politicians have been making efforts to divert our trade from its natural channel. Of course, the law of supply and demand exercises an important influence in trade matters, and in years when there is a crop shortage at home we may find a market in Canada. Generally speaking, however, when we have a full crop there is no possibility of our selling our surplus products in the home market. Past history therefore has not substantiated the theory that the building up of manufactories in Canada can be depended upon to provide a home market for our products.

I do not know that I need to discuss the immigration question at any length. I believe this country of ours has within its borders at the present time about all the people that we can handle and support to the best advantage. There is one thing, however, that I would like to touch upon: For some years past we have had railway harvest excursions from the Maritime provinces to the West which have induced a large number of our young people to leave home. In the West they obtained a few months' work, but I am sorry to say that our Progressive and farmer friends there do not go in for mixed farming to the extent that they perhaps ought to do, and failing to get employment upon the farm many of these young folks from the East have drifted to the large cities of the West and joined the great ranks of the unemployed. The result of this process is that the Maritime provinces are being, to a certain extent, depopulated. Hence I question whether this policy of running excursions from the East to the West is one that should be continued; perhaps the western provinces might find labour closer home and the present policy of draining the eastern provinces of young men might be discontinued. As to immigration I think the immigrants brought to this country should be very carefully selected.

It would seem that one has to be very careful in making remarks upon the Civil Service Commission—it is a very delicate subject to speak about. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) brought the hon. members for Halifax to task for having appointed a committee from their constituency to deal with civil service organization. The civil service system is possibly a good thing carried too far, but the question is, has it in the past been fairly administrated in the best interests of the country? Our friends opposite, when they came into power, indulged in wholesale dismissals. The vacancies thus created were not filled upon merit but in accordance with record of the appointees as good party workers and good party men in their respective ridings. Immediately afterwards, when all positions were filled with their friends, the Civil Service Act was invoked and the lid was nailed down with respect to future appointments, which was not a fair deal. To give fair effect to the Civil Service Act all public positions throughout the Dominion should have been vacated and refilled on the basis of merit, after passing a successful examination.

An hon. MEMBER: The Civil Service Commission should be an independent tribunal.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Certainly it should be. If the appointments were made in the impartial way which I have suggested there would be no dissatisfaction with the civil service. The people may not want all the patronage system back, but there is considerable dissatisfaction with the manner in which appointments have been made in the past.

With respect to the railway question a peculiar position obtains in our own province. There, the question is not so much one of co-ordination of the whole railway system of Canada as it is, perhaps, one of standardization. It may not be clear to all hon. members just what is meant by that. Let me explain that in Prince Edward Island we have a narrow-gauge railway. A few years ago the car ferry was put into operation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, which enabled mainland cars to be brought over into our province. As a result, part of our railway system was standardized to allow the standard-gauge cars to run over our railway, but there are still large portions in the eastern and western districts of Prince Edward Island which have not yet been standardized, and over which the wide gauge or standard trains from the mainland can run. With reference to the question of shipping potatoes at the present time, we can only ship them over the standardized portion of the road, or the main feeders. Only in the spring months can our farmers get cars and ship out potatoes safely, and the farmers on the narrow-gauge section of the railway are handicapped and are unable to ship their potatoes at all till the spring of the year. I say it is very unfair to oper-

ate this road in this way. We had the Minister of Railways down there, and, after seeing the conditions, and looking at it from a business standpoint, I am sure he is convinced that it would be in the interests of the railway system, even from a business standpoint—because it would save all the transferring of freight—to standardize that road immediately, and put each section of the province on an equality with respect to the railway accommodation. I have every confidence that that matter will be taken up and brought to a successful conclusion at a very early date, and also that improvements needed at Alberton and Cape Traverse will be made.

Regarding the Intercolonial railway, I am entirely in accord with everything that has been said by the members from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Immediately upon the headquarters being moved from Moncton to Toronto, we in the East began to get the worst end of the deal, and ever since then freight rates have not worked to the advantage of the shippers of our province. No doubt the other members that are here from Prince Edward Island are in the same position as myself. They are flooded with telegrams from merchants down there, asking for reduced rates on shipments of potatoes. The market for potatoes is so limited, and the freight so high, that it takes almost one car of potatoes to put two others on the market. The people down there are asking that a special freight rate be arranged to allow us to ship out this year's crop. Our friends in the West are asking for a Wheat Board. Wheat can be kept over the season, it is not a perishable product. We have a perishable product; if it is not shipped out within a month or so, it is an entire loss to the producer. I think if this matter is brought fully before the Minister of Railways he will see that we get some relief. We are all at one regarding the lowering of the freight rates substantially on all products. The fisheries of the Maritime provinces are a very important question, which I will not touch upon, but I think, in view of the large amount of money spent yearly on agriculture, that more assistance should be given to fisheries in the Maritime provinces, and I trust this Government will use their influence in that direction.

The tariff has been discussed from different angles, and we have heard some people say they want a tariff for revenue purposes, and some say they want a protective tariff. And some contend that a protective tariff and tariff for revenue purposes are the same thing. To my mind, there is all the difference in the world between a tariff for revenue purposes and a protective tariff. A protective tariff, to my mind, defeats the object for which it was intended—that is if it was intended to produce revenue—because once you put a tariff as high as 25 or 35 per cent, which shuts out importation, you get no revenue; you protect the manufacturer to a certain degree, and any extra amount on the price of the article you buy goes into the pockets of the manufacturer, instead of into the revenue of the country. A tariff for revenue purposes should be a low tariff, say 10 or 12 per cent, or as low as it could be made, which would allow the people of this country to import goods from the United States if they required them, at a reasonable price, and, at the same time, contribute a reasonable amount to the revenues of the country. I believe that our Progressive friends are with us to a large extent on that question. I do not think that they believe the time is opportune now for introducing free trade in this country, because they realize that the financial conditions of the country are such that we should move very carefully. But we want a revision of the tariff. I think if any company cannot now compete with a foreign company on a tariff of 10 or 12 per cent, or a low tariff, it would be better for that company and better for the country that the company should go into some other line of business than for us to have to pay the increased price and so keep them in business, at the expense of the consuming public.

I come now to a question which has received some attention from members on the opposite side of the House, and I think I shall be pardoned if I refer to it. That is the question of the natural resources of Canada. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in speaking the other day, did me the honour to refer to the campaign literature that was used in my constituency at the last election. He said—

> Why, the leader of the Government elected one of his supporters in this House, even the hon. member who succeeds him in the representation of the county of Prince, by advancing a claim on behalf of Prince Edward Island that that province had millions of dollars of interest in the resources of Western Canada. I read from an advertisement published under the heading "Why vote for MacLean?" Among other reasons, none of which appeal very strongly to those who have had experience in this House, the following is given:

"Because by doing so you will be upholding your birthright in the public domain of the western provinces, in which millions of dollars are involved and justly coming to us, in spite of Mr. Crerar's contention and assertion to the contrary, and we can surely do with that money now."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is not true in its entirety, I can surely say that the last portion of the paragraph is absolutely true, that we can do with that money now, because in Prince Edward Island we have to pay fairly high taxes as a province. The candidate of the Opposition in the last election, a gentleman for whom I have every respect, was one with me on this question, and he had helping him in that campaign an outstanding constitutional lawyer, who elaborated this claim to a very large extent, and pointed out that the Maritime provinces certainly had an equity in those lands. Referring to the article which appeared in the paper down there, it is news to me if the Conservative party are taking the opposite stand to-day. I feel that in our province it is not a political question. Both Liberals and Conservatives down there are one in regard to this question. I may tell my Progressive friends that the candidate representing their party, a very intelligent gentleman, took the stand that we had an equity in these lands, and that he was very sorry the leader of the Progressive party had taken the stand he did in regard to the western lands, and that it would be his duty, if elected to this House, to try to show them that the leader of the Progressive party was wrong in his attitude as far as the eastern provinces were concerned, and that he would use his best endeavours to make his Progressive friends see eye to eye with the eastern provinces on that question. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman who has just spoken develop the claim of British Columbia on this question to some extent. The Maritime provinces—Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—take the same stand, and I wish to also give some attention to this question. I wish to quote from an article prepared by a gentleman in Nova Scotia, a member of the local legislature there—Mr. Tory. This is a good Conservative name, and one would suppose that his compilation of the facts would be fairly conservative. He sets forth a claim somewhat as follows, and with which I am in accord:

Compensation as an equivalent for lands reserved for school purposes for the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Compensation as an equivalent for cash subsidies paid to the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, purporting to be in lieu of lands.

Compensation as an equivalent for land granted to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in which the people of the Maritime provinces had a proprietary interest in common with the people of the other provinces of Canada.

Compensation for the nonfulfilment of certain obligations respecting the Maritime provinces, clearly set forth or implied under the terms of the British North America Act.

I do not wish to quote at too great length from this article; but on March 26, 1919, certain questions which had been put on the Order Paper of this House with regard to those western lands which were received, were answered, as per Order Paper No. 17,412, as follows:

1. How many acres of land have been set aside by the Federal Government for school purposes in each of the provinces of Canada?

The answer was:

Manitoba, approximately, 7,993,600 acres; Saskatchewan, approximately 8,421,000 acres; Alberta, aproximately, 7,798,600 acres.

In answer to question No. 2, it was stated:

Provided, that on a township being surveyed, should such sections or either of them, or any part of either, be found to have been settled on and improved, then and in such case the occupant or occupants, conforming to the requirements of this Act shall be confirmed in such possession.

Question No. 3:

What is the amount to the credit of each province on account of school lands with the Federal Government?

In answer to this question, we find that there is to the credit of the three Prairie provinces the following amounts in round figures: Manitoba, over $4,000,000; Saskatchewan, over $7,000,000; Alberta, over $4,000,000; making a total, in round figures, of about $16,000,000.

Then question 4 reads:

What amount has been paid by the Federal Government to each of the provinces to date on account of school lands?

The answer being:

Manitoba	$2,576,568 52
Saskatchewan	2,397,978 45
Alberta	2,108,440 35
Total	$7,082,987 32

Of course, interest at the rate of 5 per cent is all that is supposed to be paid on that amount.

The fifth question reads:

What is the average amount received per acre in each province on account of school lands?

The answer is:

	Per acre
Manitoba	$ 9 72
Saskatchewan	17 92
Alberta	13 54

Question No. 6:

What is the approximate value of the school lands unsold in each province?

And the answer is:

Including the unsurveyed territory, and estimated at $7 per acre in Manitoba, $10 in Saskatchewan, and $9 in Alberta, which is considered a fair valuation, the approximate value of unsold school lands in each province is as follows:

Manitoba	$49,778,000
Saskatchewan	69,672,000
Alberta	55,408,000

If those answers are anything like correct, it will be seen that a very large amount of money is involved in these western lands. I do not say that possibly this money can be realized, but that is the price that was set upon those lands in the answers to the questions put on that occasion.

Coming down to the question of what proportion should go to each of the Maritime provinces, I have the following figures: Nova Scotia, with a population which is 6.8 per cent of the population of Canada should be credited on actual credits, with $8,000,000, and on contingent credits, with $65,000,000; New Brunswick, with a population which is 4.9 per cent of the population of Canada, should have actual credits of $6,000,000, and contingent credits of $46,000,000; and Prince Edward Island, with a population which is 1.3 per cent of the population of Canada should have actual credits of $1,710,000. On this item alone, at 5 per cent, the province of Prince Edward Island should receive $85,531 annually. Therefore, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who took exception to this little editorial that appeared in a Prince Edward Island newspaper, will see that in view of the facts given in this House when his government was in power, he cannot complain too much regarding this article:

Coming to the claims of Prince Edward Island, I think we have outstanding claims other than those outlined in the remarks that I have made so far. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, we were credited with $50 per head of the population or $4,700,000. Prince Edward Island was building her railroad at that time, costing in round figures $3,000,000. Immediately upon our entering Confederation, that railroad was handed over to the Dominion Government, and the cost of the railroad was deducted from our credit at Ottawa. If we had been paid 5 per cent on our first credit allowance, we would be receiving $235,000 annually, as a subsidy from this source alone; whereas, on account of the cost of the railway being deducted from this credit allowance and then the railway handed over to the Dominion—although this railway may not have been a great asset to the Dominion, it cost the province that amount of money —along with other withdrawals that were made from capital account, our credit balance was reduced to $775,000, on which we received five per cent, or the small sum of around $38,000 annually in subsidies. I leave it to my hon. friend from British Columbia who made a case for his province, if that is a fair proposition. If it is fair that land in British Columbia, which, they claim, was handed to the government before they could get their railways built should be handed back to the province of British Columbia, now it is equally fair that this $3,000,000, which we paid for the railways of Prince Edward Island, should be put back to our credit and we should receive 5 per cent on that amount.

Another question is this, that we received a subsidy of $20,000 some years ago, and Sir Charles Tupper advanced the claim then that we should receive that on account of large developments of railways and canals throughout other parts of this Dominion. That being the case, what is the situation to-day when the Dominion has taken over the Canadian National railways and become responsible to all the provinces for their huge railway obligations, that it has wiped off the slate and taken over those obligations along with certain other obligations to the banks of our country? If it was true back in Sir Charles Tupper's time that we should receive $20,000 annually on that score, what is our position to-day when we consider the tremendous expansion of railways and canals throughout this Dominion?

Another question is with regard to population. When Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, we were to receive fifty cents a head of our population up to 400,000. It was anticipated then that the population of Prince Edward Island would increase to such an extent that we would receive this fifty cents per head on 400,000, and Quebec and Ontario were

in the same position. This agreement worked out splendidly for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, because their population kept increasing by leaps and bounds, and we find that after reaching a population of 400,000, those provinces came back, in 1905, and had all those limitations swept away and the population limit set at 2,500,000, on which they were to receive 50 cents per capita in subsidies.

What do we find with regard to Prince Edward Island? Prince Edward Island's population has remained practically stationary since her entry into Confederation, and on account of not being able to retain her population on the whole, her participation in the Canadian Confederation has not been greatly beneficial to her; in fact it has been detrimental. In the matter of population we are, if anything, rather in a worse position than we were in 1871 before going into Confederation. Prince Edward Island, as well as Quebec and Ontario, was allotted 80 cents per head of population up to a population of 400,000, but that little province, far from attaining that population, has, as I have said, remained stationary and her sons and daughters have gone to the western provinces to swell their population on which they secure $1.50 per capita in subsidy. When Quebec and Ontario reached the limit of 400,000 they applied for an increase, and the subsidy for those provinces was fixed on a new basis, the limit of population being increased from 400,000 to 2,500,000. Where does Prince Edward Island come in on that score? We undoubtedly have a strong claim in this matter that cannot be controverted, because it is overwhelmingly obvious that Prince Edward Island has not benefited to the same extent under the Confederation as the other provinces have done and should claim consideration. I submit that this question is one that should receive the most careful attention. I do not wish to take up too much time of the House, but I am fully in accord with what has been said by hon. members from British Columbia, that when the question is opened up it should be given sympathetic consideration and that a fair and equitable adjustment of the whole matter ought to be made, having regard to the peculiar claims of every province. I believe that our friends have a right to their natural resources, and I suggest that they should be equally fair to other provinces, especially to Prince Edward Island, the little sister of Confederation. On the question of natural resources, as on the question of the tariff, I take exactly the same position as I took during the recent campaign.

Mr. C. H. DICKIE (Nanaimo): In my first address in this House, Mr. Speaker, I purpose being very brief; but I cannot let the opportunity pass without extending to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your elevation to an office which I know you will fill, as you are so eminently fitted to fill it, with dignity and satisfaction. I also desire to congratulate the younger men who moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. They acquitted themselves splendidly in their maiden speeches, and in the discharge of a difficult duty.

As regards the lady member who represents Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail), I hope she will find political life pleasant and will exercise a refining influence on our assembly. Some mention was made of the fact that the Conservative party had extended the franchise to the women of the country. I may say that a great many of us in the West did not at one time view with pleasure the granting of the franchise to women. We had, as we still have, a profound respect and regard for them, and we thought, perhaps in an old-fashioned way, that it might detract from their charm if they entered the field of politics. We believed that the sex for whom we have so much admiration and love were temperamentally not fitted to cope with the intricacies and the intrigue of public life, and at that time we would rather have seen them engaged in an occupation less open to unpleasant influences.

But I come from a part of this great Dominion which has, perhaps, a greater proportion of British-born people than any other; and while I am not going to "wave the flag," I may say that when the call came from the Motherland, our country was denuded of its male inhabitants. Even men as old as I am dyed their hair and moustaches, locked their doors and boarded up their windows, and went to the war, without any flag-flapping. The younger women went as nurses, and those that remained at home donned the clothes that their fathers or their husbands had left, went to work in the fields, and even performed the hard task of cleaning cowsheds. I have seen women of gentle birth, Sir, toiling all day long in the fields in male attire, and, at night, making bandages and knitting socks for the men who were away. When we witnessed these things we learned a tremendous lot about our women folk

of which we had no conception before, and we concluded that there was nothing that we would not willingly concede them. We therefore gave them the franchise unreservedly. In contradistinction to this class of people, we have in our Western country a disturbing element of Socialism. We have men waving the red flag, men without any patriotic instincts, men without regard for country, frustrating our efforts; and while these noble self-sacrificing women did all they could to further our cause, these other people put every obstacle in their way. If therefore you can give such men the vote, then by all the rules of the game, the ladies ought to have it.

I was much impressed with the eloquent remarks of the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Manion) in his appeal for tolerance and a better feeling among the people. That is what we feel in British Columbia. We have no sectional animosities there. In the district I come from there are many French Canadians, who are among the best men I have known, and they work as heartily as the rest of us do. They did all they could to promote the great things that happened a few years ago. We have the best wishes in the world for them, and I wish we had thousands more like them.

Now, as you know, we have in our province of British Columbia a little railway trouble such as exists in other parts of the Dominion. We have a railway known as the Pacific and Great Eastern, and I understand that quite recently the Premier of British Columbia paid a visit to Ottawa to try to induce this Government to round out in some way the national system of railways so as to take over our road. We in British Columbia were led to believe that this was one of the reasons of his visit; but so far as we were able to learn, he went back with his Pandora's box intact. I have not heard that he accomplished what he sought to have done. As a resident for many years in British Columbia, although I might look at this matter purely from a parochial standpoint and might contend that it might not be in the best interests of that province that the request of its Premier should be acceded to, at the same time, considering the matter in a broader light, from the standpoint of the whole of Canada, I would offer no objection to the Dominion Government's taking charge of the Pacific and Great Eastern railway. The railway policy has been dealt with by men who are better qualified to speak upon it than I am. I intended to say somewhat harsh things in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I have been in a way disarmed by the remarks of the member for Skeena (Mr. Stork), whom I have known for a long time. I have known his city since its inception, and its people have striven hard to advance its interests. No one who has not been in that northern country knows what men have to confront there, the obstacles they surmount in their supreme optimism and the great efforts they make to develop the potentialities of that country into a realisable asset that will benefit the whole Dominion.

5 p.m.

The Grand Trunk Pacific was a tragedy. However, geologists tell us that the great Laurentian plateau is the greatest mineral-bearing area in the world, and it may in time make all these railroads profitable. You can see what has resulted from the little development that has taken place in Northern Ontario, and the Laurentian plateau embraces the largest body of pre-Cambrian rocks in the world, in which we might expect to find greater mineral deposits than anywhere else in the world. There may come a time, Mr. Speaker, when that northern unknown section of Canada may be our chief asset. There is every reason to believe that we have wonderful potential riches in that country, and who can say whether or not the Grand Trunk Pacific railway will become one of the most important railways in this great country of ours at some distant date? We certainly hope it will.

I may say, however,—and in doing so I am not going against any of the tenets of the Conservative party—that I hold very strong views with respect to government ownership of railways. I do not think it is possible for a great railway system to prosper under government ownership. I have seen a great deal of it in my time, and I know you do not get the same loyalty from the officials of a government-owned road; you do not get a hundred different things that are necessary to the success of a railway and that are found in efficiently managed private enterprises. I will not go any further into that question for fear I should say something which would embarrass the people who occupy higher positions than I do. But if the time ever comes when these roads can be turned over to some other competent management, I say, let them go. We in Canada are big enough to exercise proper supervision over any corporation, no matter how big it may be. Parliament is supreme in the land,

and can say: "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further." If every part of Canada sends to Parliament its broadest and most able men, we need not fear monopolies or anything else in that line; we can look for what is great and good and best for all the people.

Our manufacturers, without whom we cannot exist, seem to be entirely ignored by the good people to the left of me. And I am not going to sugar-coat any pills for these gentlemen, as is done by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I have not heard from members of the Progressive party a word of anxiety for the welfare of our great manufacturing class, and our great labouring class, who depend upon those manufacturers for their livelihood. Hon. gentlemen to my left seem to say: "If we can get our machinery a little cheaper, we do not care what becomes of the manufacturers." Let me tell you that if the tariff were completely abolished on all mining and agricultural machinery—we have in mind the doleful picture which members of the Progressive party have presented of themselves—they would not be made prosperous. The whole country is almost in the throes of despair, and in the United States it is the same. Hon. gentlemen say we have restricted markets. Well, what have we to do with the restricted markets? They are due to the action of just such a body of men as my hon. friends to my left, except that they are on the other side of the imaginary line. The Fordney tariff is designed to protect farmers; it was forced on the United States Government against the wishes of the consuming classes by a great body of just such earnest gentlemen as my friends of the Progressive party are. And I admit that they are very honest and very earnest gentlemen. Why, one hon. gentleman, speaking this afternoon, blamed the late government because men out west could not ship their cattle, owing to the restricted market for cattle. What have we to do with that market? How can we control the situation? We should be pleased to send our cattle across the line, but we have nothing to do with the Fordney tariff. You may come back and say: Well, the Conservative party is to blame for not accepting reciprocity when it was introduced by the gentlemen whom we all admire and who are now in office. But there was a proviso in that pact to the effect that it would be terminated in two years, I believe, on the wish of either party.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will permit me, he is quite mistaken; there was no proviso of that character. It was not a treaty at all; it was an agreement for mutual legislation, which either party could abrogate at any time. No particular time limit was mentioned.

Mr. DICKIE: I thank my hon. friend for the correction, but that makes it all the worse.

Mr. FIELDING: It is all the better.

Mr. DICKIE: I have spent many happy years with our friends across the line. I know them and respect them. You can deal with American corporations and with American individuals amicably and pleasantly; they are among the most pleasant people in the world. But when you submit to that great country a pact or treaty which has to go before their Senate, you are confronted by the most cold-blooded men in the world, men who talk in United States terms and United States terms alone. Unless therefore, your pact or treaty was such as to be regarded favourably by that Senate, I do not think it would amount to much. I am sorry indeed that such troublous times prevail in the West, but you hear the same story from the farmers in the United States. The farmers are as hard up there as they are in our Northwest.

The manufacturers of Canada are not making any profits. People cry out and say: This and that concern; this manufacturing interest, is away over-capitalized. What, Sir, does it matter whether the capital is $1,000,000 or $10 if no profits are being made? Very few corporations in Canada to-day are operating at a profit.

Now, I wish to say just a few words with respect to the province in which I reside. I thought when I came here that hon. members would speak as representing the whole of the country, but I find that each man is talking for the particular district he represents. Hon. gentlemen from the Maritime provinces—that weird, spooky land—have spoken of nothing relating to matters beyond their own confines. I could not help thinking, when listening to some hon. gentlemen from that part of the country, that past eminent statesmen must have turned in their graves and that their shades are walking nightly over that country as a protest against political actions at the present time—which may account for the spooks.

We have in the district in which I live, and in that politically lawless region of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), the most important coal mines in the West. Unfortunately, owing to the nature of the geological formations, the mining of our coal is an extremely expensive operation. It could be mined at a profit until petroleum or fuel oil came down to $2.75 a barrel. Three barrels of fuel oil represent in heat units one ton of coal, and our coal cannot be mined and put on cars at less than $8 a ton. The result, therefore, is detrimental to the development of our coal mines. I realize that the use of fuel oil is of great advantage on steamships, and I should hate to see the duty upon it placed so high as to keep it out of our country, much as some of my constituents would like to have that happen. I remember some years ago in a trip across the Pacific that one day we were going very slowly. I happened to be well acquainted with the captain, and I said to him: "What is the matter; we are not making time?" He said: "I am not running this ship, Dickie; the Firemen's Union of San Francisco is running it." That is what was happening on that ship; when the firemen wanted to work a little harder they could speed her up, and vice versa. I understand that the same condition applies in many cases to coastwise vessels. if you go down into the engine-room or stokehole of a steamer on which fuel oil is used, everything is clean and in order, and no effort is required to keep the ship going at full speed. Now, when that Quebec manifesto was given out as to what the Prime Minister was going to do with other matters, it was stated that fuel oil was to be placed on the free list. My opponent in Nanaimo, the editor of a paper, immediately took the matter up with the present Prime Minister. You can understand that the announcement created a great deal of anxiety among the coal mining population of twenty thousand people; because if the duty were taken off fuel oil all these people would be idle, and the result would be a menace to the country. Mr. Booth undoubtedly wired for some consolation on the subject, and the hon. Mr. Mackenzie King replied as follows:

> Replying to your wire I would say that in any revision of tariff under a Liberal administration in the interests of producers and consumers as proposed, our first consideration will be the position and needs of our own industries as related to competing industries of the other countries. This applies, of course, to coal mining operations on Pacific coast in relation to fuel oil industry, as well as to all other branches of industry in Canada. Tariff revision under a Liberal policy will take due account of both consumers and producers and such revision as may be necessary will be effected only after most careful investigation of the probable effects in every direction.

Well, this telegram was spread broadcast. We simply laughed at it and remarked that it did not say anything,—which was pretty nearly right. Another message apparently came here, and another wire was sent in reply by Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King, in these words:

> Your wire received respecting statements being made by supporters of the present Government that if the Liberals are returned duties will be removed on fuel oil thus destroying the Nanaimo coal industry. Such statements cannot be too vigorously denied and you have my full authority to give them the most explicit denial. I have repeatedly stated in the present campaign that no legitimate industry earning a legitimate profit need have any fear of the consequences of a Liberal tariff revision.

That was right straight from the shoulder, Mr. Speaker, and it allayed the fears of that coal mining population, and undoubtedly added to the votes which my opponents received, but it gave us a better feeling all round, because, although we have decided views on politics, we want to see done that which is best for the country. If that coal mining industry had been prostrated it would have been most disastrous to our western country, for we were at our wit's ends with fellows waving the red flag and crying out for this and that, and I do not know what might have happened.

There is another matter I wish to speak on very, very briefly now I see the genial face of our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe). As you know, we have on the Pacific coast immense fisheries. I can remember years ago when I used to go to Alaska and knew the coast very well, from Alaska down; you would see nobody but Indians fishing, and they were fairly good fishermen. A little later the white men came along, and they and the Indians did all the fishing, making good big pay at the work. Whether or not they became lotus eaters in that mild climate I do not know, but they did not exert themselves quite as hard as they might have. Later on we used to see a few Japanese at each cannery. But now you can go in that north land, as my hon. friend from Skenna (Mr. Stork) has said, and you will see nothing but Japanese. They control absolutely the fishing all the way down the coast. You may look at the returns and say that they have not all the

fishing licenses, that there are fishing licenses given to white men. But the comparison does not disclose the actual condition: the Japanese absolutely control the fishing on our coast, which is a very serious thing when we come to take into consideration the thousands of white men we have out of employment.

I am not speaking against the Japanese evil from the standpoint of Labour leaders or of any other class. I am speaking against this evil from the standpoint of all the white people in British Columbia. I have made a close-up study of the Japanese. I have been in their country and have seen the myriads of men in the streets of their cities, and the thousands of bright eyed children going to school; I have seen men come in and take away the filth on their back and pack it up to the terraced spaces on the snow-capped mountains. They have a crowded population, and they must expand in some direction. You are treated with civility wherever you go in Japan, and the people are just as law-abiding as our own people, notwithstanding what some travellers may say. These Japanese came to our country as they had a right to do, but now they are pouring in and are increasing all the time although we do not know just where they come from. I know at the present time they are negotiating the purchase of immense timber holdings; I know they are negotiating the purchase of one of the largest sawmill plants in British Columbia; I know they are interested in our fruit lands and are buying more land everywhere. This is a shame, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is a case for the diplomat, not for the demagogue, and it must be settled one way or the other and settled quickly. Our discontented white people cannot see these Japanese making money and rearing families while they themselves and their dependents are starving for the necessaries of life.

It is a sad admission to have to make, but the white man on our Pacific coast in the fisheries and some other occupations cannot compete with the Jap; he is a virile little fellow and will live on one-third of what the white man requires and yet do just as much work. It is impossible for the white man to compete with him under these conditions, and, moreover, the Jap is very industrious. You can easily see that with a little agitation what might take place on the Pacific coast to-day. Therefore I was very sorry indeed to hear my hon. friend, the eloquent member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill)—where political questions are formulated on the ouija board—I was very sorry indeed to hear him advocate that the Mounted Police be taken away from our province. We have a big socialist population—I have four thousand red flag fellows in my constituency, and he also has a large number—and we all know that but for those brave fellows working quietly, with their finger on the pulse of those fellows all the time, there would have been a very serious condition of affairs in British Columbia when we were at war across the sea: I know it.

Another matter that must be gone into very thoroughly is the condition of the returned soldier. We have heard from the farmers that they cannot succeed in the Northwest, and they are all good practical men—you can see it by looking at them. I am not saying it to get their votes, because eight out of ten of them would be Liberals if they were not Progressives. But when those gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, are a unit in saying that it is impossible to succeed in the Northwest country that they are familiar with, and they are young and virile, how can you expect to put returned soldiers on the land anywhere in the Northwest and have them succeed? That condition prevails pretty much in British Columbia. We have tried, God knows everybody has tried, to do what was right for the returned soldier, for he is dear to the heart of everybody. We have those poor fellows there who came back looking in the best of health, but now they are beginning to fade away with this miserable tuberculosis due to their having been gassed. We are doing the best we can for them. We have settled them on land under the same conditions, but they cannot succeed. Why should they when trained agriculturalists cannot succeed? There is an era of everything bad sweeping over this country at the present time, it embraces those engaged in manufacture, in mining—as I have been for many years—and everything else. The depression is not confined to this country. I do not know any of those men who are making money, unless it is the colonies of Danes we have in there, good law-abiding men, but they work harder than we would like to see our men work, and they are used to living very poorly in their own country. Without exception they are succeeding in the chicken and strawberry business.

There is just another point I wish to make in respect to the Japanese. I had to

pay a visit to a district outside the great city of Seattle in the state of Washington. There were fine farm buildings everywhere and good farms, but every farm was occupied by a Japanese. The farmers that formerly lived there had leased their lands to Japanese, and were making more money out of their leases than they could by cultivating the land. I saw farms on which those Japanese were raising strawberries and whitemen were picking these strawberries. Can you not see what that means to our country? Can you not realize what the influx of such a nationality, with a birth rate such as they have, means to us? Can you not understand what will happen a few years from now, providing we do not have action in the meantime on the part of an unsettled element in our province that will precipitate international trouble? We want no trouble with Japan because that country at the present time affords a splendid outlet for our lumber and we have big dealings with it. If only our diplomats could go to the very decent and notable representative that Japan has in Ottawa and could talk matters over with that gentleman he, wise and subtle as he is, would understand that conditions cannot continue in British Columbia as they are at the present time without working to the detriment of Japan as well as of Canada.

We cannot gloss over the facts and I must speak frankly, although perhaps in doing so I may incur the hostility of some big interest in British Columbia. I do not know that I will do so if everybody out there takes a broad view of matters. After all no body could take any objection to the statement I am now making unless perhaps it might be the cannery men. I have talked plainly with the cannery men as to the existing conditions. Last year was to be one of the big years for our canners. As you know the salmon run every fourth year is supposed to be a big one. Last year it was a complete failure; and I may say that nine cannery men out of ten lost money; next season we expect the same thing. You will see, therefore, that just as soon as the cannery men can sell out their canneries to the Japanese they will do so. The Japanese will make the canneries succeed where white men cannot, by resorting to different methods and working for less profit.

Our salmon fisheries are practically being depleted. I remember the time they were so prolific that we could supply the world. Salmon when coming in from the Pacific ocean to the Fraser river go very close to the coast of British Columbia. Then they cut out into deeper water and touch Point Roberts in American Territory. The Americans erected big traps there and the salmon would come round the point and enter those traps—there was no escape for them. We protested and held conference after conference with those gentlemen asking them to abolish the traps for unless they did so it would mean that the Fraser river salmon fishing would go like that of the Sacramento and other rivers to the south. However we could do nothing with them. Then we made representations to the authorities here in Ottawa and said: "These Americans are catching all our salmon. Why should we in British Columbia be deprived of that privilege?" So traps were allowed at this point I speak of, the coast of the Island, part of which I represent. This resulted in immense catches of salmon; so between the traps and the Japs the salmon will be so nearly extinct that it will not be a profitable industry to try and can the sock-eye salmon from this time forward. So we are told by our Fishery Commissioner Mr. Babcock, and I think there is no man who is more familiar with piscatorial life in Canada or elsewhere than is that gentleman. So we see what has been the result of intensive fishing by traps and by Japanese.

There is another fish in our province whose importance I would like to draw attention to—what we call the ground fish. In all our island waters there are cod fish, salmon and other choice fish. Only a few years ago poor people who came down to the coast to spend the hot weather could get a living by going out fishing and catching these fish in abundance. Now you can go there and you would not catch one. That is the result of fishing operations carried on day after day by the Japanese. I have been there and seen them fishing the bottom of the sea just as carefully as they would pick strawberries on the soil. They would fish at one point and then by just a movement of the oar move to another place and would use live bait. If the Minister of Fisheries were here I would tell him it was one of the curses of that method of fishing to use live bait. The result is our cod banks and other fishing banks have been completely cleared out. Whereas formerly hundreds of people could provide themselves with valuable food fish and live a great deal better than many other people in the world, none of those fish can now be obtained. That is another thing the Jap

has done in our country. I appeal to you gentlemen when this question comes up for consideration, as it will come up on a more appropriate occasion, to give it your best judgment. It is a matter upon which I feel very, very strongly, and I can safely say I represent the sentiment of nine people out of ten in British Columbia.

There is another question to which I desire to refer although I do not consider myself very competent to deal with it. As you know we have a dry dock in our country. There has already been expended upon it about a million and a quarter of money, and when completed it will be one of the biggest dry docks in the world. That dry dock is in my constituency and if work on it is suspended now it will mean that at least 500 people will be prevented from obtaining the necessities of life. When I last came through the port there were actually at work 280 persons. We have had the fear that perhaps operations on the dock would be suspended after the last of the present month. I certainly hope that in the interest of economy, to say nothing of good politics, work will not be discontinued on this dock at the present time with the unemployment situation as it now is. On a distinct promise that the dry dock would be constructed an important shipbuilding firm was brought out and they are extending their operations from day to day so that they may be in a position to do work on any ship that floats on the Pacific. For it must be remembered that there are many vessels operating on the Pacific which cannot be accommodated in our dock at Esquimalt. It must be remembered too that there are sixteen docks farther down the coast in American territory; and if ships needing repairs cannot enter British Columbia docks they will cross to the docks on the other side. Ships like the Manila Maru have been obliged to leave our ports and seek the other side of the line for dock accommodation which has meant a loss of thousands of dollars to Canada. Under the circumstances I ask you gentlemen to consider very seriously before endorsing the discontinuance of operations on the dock in question. I have had very many requests for money to be expended in needed directions in my constituency but I have replied that the time is not opportune to make public expenditures for such purposes. My position has been: Let us get the country on a paying basis in some way before we ask to have any money expended that we can possibly get along without. Therefore I am not going to ask the Government to expend money on a great many undertakings. I suppose I shall disappoint a great many people by that course, but I hope that I shall never be willing to sacrifice national interests to political expediency. The work on the dry dock in question should however be proceeded with at the present time.

Now in respect to the Progressives. I think, perhaps, I have said all I can say for and against these gentlemen, but I have this further utterance to make: Some statements that have been made on this side appear to have been received by the Progressives with disrespect. I have heard good arguments advanced by our party jeered at by the Progressives. I hope my hon. friends will not jeer at anything that I say. I have worked just as hard as any hon. member among the Progressives. I have never been a farmer but I have lived and worked in the mountains and it seems to me that life up there gives men a broader outlook than does life upon the plains. I hope that in my consideration of questions in this House I shall view them from a national point of view rather than from any mere narrow local outlook. I would advise our good friends from the prairies to take a trip through the great manufacturing plants of Canada and see the thousands of workmen to which they give employment. In the province of British Columbia we have some 500 manufacturing industries that I can assure hon. gentlemen would not exist for one month if we removed the duty now levied upon goods coming from the United States. That is our position in British Columbia. I do not know whether we want the Laurier-Fielding tariff exactly, but we certainly want nothing less than it provides for at the present time. I can tell my hon. friends that as a mining man and a man familiar with lumber we have been very hard hit by the duty on implements. We have to pay the duty on grain, and have to buy expensive logging machinery and other things. These machines are manufactured in the West, but they are for a particular kind of logging, which does not exist in this country. However, we would rather pay more for our machinery, and we do pay more, and many thousands of dollars go out of the western country both for logging and mining machinery. I think we are broad enough out there—because I have heard no serious pro-

test—to realize that we have to stop this flow of gold across the line into the coffers of United States manufacturers, if we are going to succeed. We are willing to be handicapped, even considerably, if the manufacturing industries of this country can be made to succeed, and I think they should succeed. There is no reason why they should not manufacture the implements cheaply, and if they are not doing so, I think the Government should say to them "Thus far shalt thou go and no further." I can assure hon. gentlemen that the Government has very effective machinery for dealing with manufacturers who make excessive profits.

Mr. J. ARTHUR DENIS (Saint Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, representing one of the large sections of the metropolis of Canada, I deem it my duty to express my feelings and especially my views on the all important questions referred to in the Speech from the Throne. For some—fortunately the small number—little is found of much importance to satisfy their curiosity; for others—and they comprise the greater number—it is the enunciation of a policy essentially Canadian of a nature to bring about beneficial results as regards the future of our dear Canada.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to join with those who have preceded me in this debate—and to extend to you my most sincere congratulations for the honour just bestowed upon you when selected Speaker of this House. It is an honour which reflects on all the citizens of the province of Quebec, moreover it is an homage paid to our race, of which you are one of the most distinguished and esteemed citizens. Your long experience in political life and profound knowledge of the rules and regulations of this House are a sure pledge that you will fulfil with dignity and impartiality the important duties which now devolve upon you. I must also convey my congratulations to the hon. members who moved and seconded the motion to the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne; they acquitted themselves of their task with an eloquence, ability and clearness worthy of the most tried parliamentarians. Although young, they have shown that courage is not born with years. To our colleague from South-east Grey (Miss Macphail) I wish a cordial welcome.

I shall now discuss, Mr. Speaker, the important questions which are to be considered by the hon. members of this House. Unemployment is one which specially needs

our consideration. I congratulate the Government for having helped to relieve the hardships which were brought on by the lack of work. I trust they will carry on so that in the near future, our poorer classes may obtain work so as to allow them the means of providing for their families. Hard times are here and we must act. Representing a division made up of workmen, this question is of the utmost importance to me and I shall be greatly obliged to the Government for whatever they may do toward helping the working classes.

Incidentally, I come to the question of immigration, referred to in the Speech from the Throne. If we do not wish to increase unemployment, I believe we should, for some time to come, restrict immigration. What we are in need of at present is settlers, good settlers to clear our land which only requires strong arms to produce rich harvests. I shall now take up the tariff question. I have listened with much interest to the several speeches which have been made on the subject. Some lean towards a high protective tariff, others favour free trade. May I, Mr. Speaker, express my humble opinion? I believe that these two theories will not promote success nor help in the progress of our country, and if we truly wish to see Canada prosperous, we must give it a tariff consistent with its needs and with the necessities of its commerce and its industries; it must have a tariff for revenue, shaped on the whole upon the one which the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, of happy memory, gave to this country. It is the Laurier-Fielding tariff, the same which the leader of the present Government intends to adopt by applying it to the needs of the day. I place my trust in the Government, and this confidence is the more strengthened by the declaration which the Prime Minister made in this House, that he intends to govern this country with a truly Canadian spirit and that he does not wish to have his policy dictated by people across the ocean. Mr. Speaker, there are still other questions that I would have wished to express my opinion upon, but knowing that the Government will give them its special consideration and that its policy will rally all parties in the general interest of the country. Such is the hope expressed by the member from St. Denis and by the 34,000 electors whom he has the honour of representing in this House.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps, necessary for me to offer an apology for rising to speak at this time, because this debate is nearing the point where most of us would like to see the end of it in order to take up other business. I have, however, a few observations that I desire to make. I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on having been chosen to fill the position of Speaker of this House, as I think there could have been no better choice. I was very much impressed with the remark you made when you took the Chair, that: "At this moment I cease to be a party man." I was glad to hear you say that, and I am sure every one who heard you believes that you meant just what you said. I desire further to congratulate all my colleagues, because I consider it one of the greatest privileges that a man can have to come to this House to serve his country. It seems to me that greater satisfaction and pleasure could come from that position than could come from any other position that a man might be chosen to fill.

There is a reason why there has been such a large increase in the ranks of the Progressive party. The people of my constituency felt that they wanted to see their member come to Parliament as free and independent as it was possible for him to be. Considerable interest was aroused in the campaign, and throughout the campaign this political view was held and presented, that they wanted their member to come to this House to serve them, to assist in the administration of the affairs of this country and in passing such legislation as was necessary in the interest of the people. They gave me to understand, all the way through that campaign, that they did not expect me to spend my time here talking politics and working for party interests; they expected me to serve them, and they were very free in telling me all the time that they would attend to the electing part and that, when the next election came around, if I had served them properly, they would see to it that I was elected again. They wanted that job themselves; they did not want to see me spend my time here setting up a machine that would get me back into office again. No doubt there are many in this House who would not agree with that point of view; but we have been thinking new thoughts, and we have been trying to do new things. Our idea of doing new things is growing and after the next election, Parliament will either be more Liberal in its view along party lines, or have Progressives enough in it to take control of this House. That is my honest conviction.

During this debate a great deal has been said from all points of view. The Farmers have, I think, presented very well what they have had to say, and they have, I believe, spoken as clearly and logically as any hon. member, on the other side of the House or to my right, who has taken part in this discussion. This debate has, perhaps, served to acquaint us with each other and, as a result, we shall know each other better.

I have tried to listen as best I could to the speeches that have been delivered; I have tried to take every one's point of view and to consider it, and it seems that some hon. members feel that the farmers would not be satisfied no matter what they got or what the conditions were. We have, however, some idea as to what we want. I reside and have resided for practically a quarter of a century in a community where, as regards natural conditions and the handiwork of our Great Creator, wonderful opportunities have been afforded for people to live and thrive; but after a quarter of a century amongst those people, I am amazed at the condition that some of them are in, although there has never been a year in which we did not have enough for man and beast as well as something to ship out. When such a condition prevails in a country like that, there must be something radically wrong.

We are not asking for any special privilege; we object, and we intend always to object, to special privilege. The farmers have had to put up with a condition that has been almost intolerable. A great deal of the time they have been just able to make a fair living; and they have not been able to accumulate any great wealth. There are many reasons why the farmers have not prospered better than they have, although they are industrious, work longer each day than any other class of people, and work throughout the year. In the community in which I live they follow the mode of farming which is supposed, and which I believe, to be the best, namely, mixed farming; the raising of a certain number of cattle and hogs. Possibly our conditions are similar to those that obtain in other parts of the country, but I say

this because we have good reason to believe that the farmers have not had a square deal compared with the advantages that have been enjoyed by some other classes in Canada.

We have a freight rate that absorbs so much of the profit to-day that it takes more to ship grain to Fort William than the farmer gets out of it himself. Our hogs and cattle are subject to about the same conditions. Our people are getting quite discouraged, and personally, I do not believe it is in the interests of other classes in Canada that the farmers should carry the burden they have to bear to-day. Perhaps this is an old story; nevertheless it is absolutely true. There has been a suspension of the Crow's Nest Pass agreement in order that the Railway Commission could fix a higher freight rate than could be charged under that agreement. We hope that this suspension of the agreement will be revoked; it has nearly everything in Canada in the air at the present time. Business cannot settle down, and transportation will not pick up unless people can ship at a profit; and while conditions are such as exist to-day people certainly cannot buy enough to pay the manufacturer what he is asking. We hope that the Government will weigh the matter seriously before disposing of this question of the Crow's Nest Pass agreement, because we believe that freight rates can come down to pre-war level at least if the agreement is once more put into effect.

Now, we have an immigration problem in Canada which demands careful consideration. It is a very important problem. I think that the whole welfare of Canada is bound up in the immigration policy which we pursue. We have too few people in Canada to exploit our natural resources, and unless we can develop the country we cannot pay off the heavy debt which we have. I quite agree that in considering the immigration question regard must be had to the proper sort of immigrant. We want people who not only know how to farm, but who will farm. But there is among the farmers a condition that is not very conducive to the encouragement of this sort of immigration to the country, and this condition must be ameliorated. The Government must realize that the first step towards securing proper immigration is to better conditions for the farmers who are already in the country.

When I came to this country, nearly a quarter of a century ago, there were coming into Canada a class of people against whom there were some complaints, and I myself rather questioned the advisability of admitting them. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, however, that I have been among those people and have observed the progress which they have made, and I have come to the conclusion that they are good settlers. They have proved a good asset to Canada. Of course, I do not say that, once in a while, there is not an objectionable one among them, but those who came here twenty or twenty-five years ago and settled on new land have done as well as farmers could be expected to do under the circumstances they have had to cope with; and it is due to them that Canada has reaped so large a profit from the soil. There was an element about the election of 1917 that was not very satisfactory. Those people were berated, and many of them were condemned without personal reasons. Now, Sir, I can quite conceive the feelings, under such condemnation, of any man or woman, who has taken the oath of citizenship in this country. I took that oath myself. I made the pledge that I would be a good citizen of the Dominion of Canada and that I would do the best I could to uphold its dignity and promote the welfare of all its people. I think, therefore, that any naturalized citizen who has observed the laws of the country and has played his part in developing its resources is entitled to the consideration of its citizens.

In the election of 1917 many Canadian citizens who are just as good as I am were disfranchised. I do not say that we should throw our doors open to the extent of allowing into this country people who will not be patriotic, who will not be faithful to Canada and her traditions. But I want to tell hon. members of this House that when I became naturalized it was as an individual, not as an American. Everyone who becomes naturalized in this country does so as an individual, and if he keeps his pledge; if he is a good citizen, honest and honourable, it is no credit to Canada to take the franchise from him. I am not complaining, but I myself came very nearly being disfranchised at that time. One of the improvements that we ought to bring about in this country is to make our naturalized citizens feel that they share all the privileges common to the other good citizens of Canada. When I became naturalized I felt that the Canadian people were giving me all they had to give; that henceforth I should be on an equality with every other Canadian or Britisher in whatever part of the Empire

he might have been born. I felt that I got that privilege, and I want to feel that I still have it. That is one thing the Government must do: make a man feel that he has good cause to be patriotic; that he has ample inducement to be a worthy and useful citizen.

Once we have the foundation prepared, then an immigration policy should be embarked upon that will bring as many good people to this country as can be assimilated; as many as we can find homes for. But we want the ground well prepared; not until those who are already on the land are living under the best possible conditions can you hope to bring in people from other countries, no matter whether they are farmers or labourers. If you pour water into the middle of a basin, it will spread out and find its level. If you make conditions on the land attractive to those who are now working there, others will be very glad to take up farms and produce. All we ask is that something be done along this line, and that the Government do the best it can to find markets for the produce of the farms. We do not ask that we be paid more for our produce than it is worth, but we do ask the privilege of getting it to a market and getting out of it all that is possible, less transportation to that market. We believe that it is possible for the Government to obtain for us some sort of regulated market, to inaugurate some sort of co-operative, consolidated marketing scheme through which we may sell our produce without being fleeced as we have been in the past.

Speaking before the Kiwanis club of Montreal, or Toronto—I have forgotten which—Colonel Dennis, immigration agent for the Canadian Pacific Railway company, said that it was up to this Government to inaugurate an immigration scheme and get all the immigrants that it was possible to bring into the country. I agree with Colonel Dennis to this extent: we want these immigrants after we have the foundation laid. You cannot build a structure unless you first lay the foundation, and I have pointed out what that foundation must be. But if the Canadian Pacific would forego part of their guaranteed ten per cent dividend when the rest of us are making nothing, it would be as good an immigration policy as I know of. I am not suggesting that the Canadian Pacific should do business without profit, but many of the rest of us have been doing business without profit for quite a while, and at such a time we do not like to see the Canadian Pacific earning ten per cent and more.

I want to say something further about the tariff. Our friends on the right are a pretty good-looking bunch of men, and I believe they are reasonable fellows. Let me say to them: We are not asking for any privilege; we are simply asking that they and their friends get off our necks. If they are helping their friends, the manufacturers, because they are patriotic enough to keep the manufacturing of Canada going, that is all right. But we are not asking for tariff; it can do nothing for us except keep us poor. Of course, if we got too rich we might be just a little bit too hard to manage. The manufacturers are asking for special privileges. Their raw material is not on the free list, but they get a ninety-nine per cent drawback on it. We simply ask that our raw material, farm implements, be placed on the free list. We are not asking for special privilege; we are asking for equality.

But I want to say further to my hon. friends on my right that we will support them in a protective tariff on one condition. The country needs revenue, we want the country to have revenue, and if they are patriotic enough to help us to this end we will stand for a tariff. I am only speaking for myself, but I think I can speak for my colleagues also when I say that if my hon. friends on my right will stand for an excise duty on all goods manufactured in Canada, as well as a tariff on all imports, we will support them in a protective tariff, but we want the Government to get that duty instead of the manufacturer; that is what we want. Now, if those hon. members are patriotic enough to get protection on those terms and so give the treasury the money needed to meet our national expenditure, we will stay with them. I did not intend to talk tariff at all when I started in, but my hon. friend who was sitting behind me before we adjourned brought this into my head, and I want to tell you what I think. I think if our manufacturers continue their present protection policy there is going to be a sentiment strong enough to say to them: If you have protection you are going to pay the excise duty. And I will help make them do it. Then the country will get the full benefit of that duty instead of its going into the pockets of a few manufacturers.

In order to show the difference in condition between the farmers and the manu-

facturers, I am going to repeat a statement that I made all through the campaign which was not refuted; and I do not believe it can be refuted. Among our farmers 16,652 paid income tax amounting to $611,735. Now, that is not very many farmers when you take into account the total number. That was for the year 1920 when we had a fair crop in most parts of the Dominion. During the same year 277 manufacturers paid an average income tax of $29,087 apiece. If you take the amount of income on which their income tax was assessed compared with the income on which the farmers were assessed, you will see the great disparity, and you will also see who has been getting the money away from the farmers.

I wish the hon. member that brought these things into my head was here. I should like to tell him that he may some day be thankful to the farmers for stopping special privileges before it shall have caused the waving of more red flags in this country. The waving of the red flag I think has been caused more by special privilege than any other thing that I can remember. The hon. member, it seems to me, hinted that the Farmers were waving the red flag. I want to tell him and other hon. members that we do not see it. We want to be absolutely sure, and we are absolutely sure, that we are not asking for anything that is not best for the whole Dominion. We are not asking for special privileges that will cause the waving of the red flag. We are anxious to have better conditions, but we are not asking for those better conditions for ourselves alone; we are just as anxious for all the people to share in them.

Without going into any detail I am trying to review a little of what has been brought before this House by my hon. friends to the left. We have a banking institution that is going to be talked about, and it is going to have to be dealt with during the next year or so, and I hope this Government will see fit to amend the banking laws in such a way as will permit of the money of the country serving our people as the first consideration. That is what it was created for, to serve the people of Canada. If it is used to enrich the corporations that are doing our banking business, then I say that we are only willing for them to have a fair amount of return on the business they do and for the service they render. We want a banking system that will serve our people; that is to say, a banking system so that we can trade with all the other nations and have them feel safe to trade with us. We do not want to upset our banking conditions, but since I have been in this country on two occasions I have seen our money, or our credit, go across the line for speculation in Wall Street when we needed that money to do business. I do not believe it is conducive to the welfare of Canada to allow trading in futures and in short call loans in another country when we need that money here to carry on our business.

I have just one more suggestion to make. I referred a short time ago to taking the franchise away from a part of our people. We had an Election Act that lent itself to the most unfair conditions in 1917. Although amended for the last election, it was not yet satisfactory and it brought hardship on a great many people. We want to discard that act. I have tried to figure out how we could amend it to make it satisfactory, and I have made up my mind, after carefully studying this piece of legislation, that the best thing to do is to throw it away and enact a new measure. I believe we can have an Election Act that will permit every individual who is eligible and entitled to vote to cast his or her vote without any undue difficulty and trouble such as the present act causes, and I believe at the same time that we can embody in this new Act such restrictions as will curtail fraudulent voting and still give every citizen a chance to vote under conditions fair and just to every one.

I have talked at greater length than I intended, and it is time I brought my remarks to a close. Let me say in closing that the opportunity afforded every one of us to serve the country has never been surpassed. I believe we have problems to solve and that we should apply ourselves forthwith to the solution of them. That being the case the sooner this debate is brought to a close the better it will be.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WARNER: The manner in which hon. gentlemen have received that statement looks like an invitation for me to resume my seat.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, go on.

Mr. WARNER: We are here to do the business of the country and I feel that in speaking at such length I have imposed upon the patience of the House, but I pro-

mise to do better in future. On resuming my seat I wish to thank hon. members for the attention with which they have listened to me.

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to discuss some of the subjects which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, I desire to associate myself with preceding speakers in extending congratulations to you, Sir, on your elevation to the high position which you now hold, and to say that I am fully of the opinion you will discharge the duties appertaining to the chair with distinction to your self and to this House. I also desire to express my regret for the cause which has necessitated the absence of the Prime Minister from the House at this time.

Public ownership and operation of the national railway system is a question of outstanding importance which is now engaging the thoughts of the House and of the country. The Government proposes to continue the policy of public ownership and operation, and has stated that the policy will have a fair trial, carried out under the most favourable circumstances. One of the most favourable circumstances demanded, I think, is the confident and undivided attitude of the Government that will stand behind the policy. This, I take it, is lacking. It is an inherent weakness and therefore it appears to me that there is not proper justification for using with respect to this trial the term "under the most favourable circumstances." Mr. Speaker, public ownership and operation of the national railways should be viewed from a strong, broad national standpoint. The interests of all sections of the country are to be considered; and the very breadth of the Dominion adds to the difficulties in meeting the diverse requirements of the various sections of the country. What adds to the prosperity of one section adds to the prosperity of all; what creates adversity in one portion of the country has its effect on the rest. Therefore there is an interdependence, a community of interest, involved which should stimulate us to arrive at the most perfect arrangement which can possibly be reached so that all portions of the country shall receive equitable treatment.

This being the case, I deem it my duty to my constituency and to my country to draw attention to the uneasiness and dissatisfaction that now exists in the Maritime provinces concerning the railway question. This, I may say, is not due to local feeling; it is not sectional; their vision is not restricted. I am glad to be able to affirm that no portion of the country is freer from narrow prejudice or sectional feeling, or more truly inspired by patriotic and national ideals, than are the Maritime provinces. It will be admitted that for the administration of the country to be successful all portions of the Dominion must receive equitable treatment. But a feeling of uneasiness and dissatisfaction exists in the Maritime provinces; it prevails among people of all shades of politics and is reflected in the press representative of all political views—in a word it is general. Much regarding this matter has appeared in our newspapers; and the comments of the press of other provinces, principally of the Liberal press—the press supporting the Government—have been such that the condition of uneasiness to which I refer has been greatly increased.

There are two phases of the railway question on which I desire to make some remarks. The Government has taken over the Grand Trunk railway and a portion of that line runs to Portland, Maine. The question that arises is what shall be the policy of the Government regarding this portion of the Grand Trunk which runs to the seaport of Portland? Shall governmental control, to the extent that it can be made available, be directed toward the development of our own ports, or shall it partially or completely assist in the building up of Portland, or other foreign ports, to the detriment of the cities on our own coast? This is a question that is now engaging the attention of our people, especially the Maritime provinces, because it is a matter of vital interest to them and it also greatly affects the interest of the country at large. I propose to read to you extracts from some of the newspapers dealing with this subject wihch will illustrate public opinion; and I shall quote from papers supporting the present Government for the reason that they cannot be credited with any desire to embarrass the present administration, and also for the reason that hon. gentlemen opposite will give more attention to the utterances of those journals than they will to expressions of opinion by other newspapers. I propose first to quote from some of the Liberal newspapers in the Maritime provinces on this subject, and I shall now read from the St. John Globe

of March 7, an article in reply to an editorial in the Toronto Globe which has not viewed the situation in the same light. It is stated here:

On another page to-day will be found a Toronto Globe editorial on Portland and the Canadian ports. The article, intended as a reply to the insistent demand of this paper that in working out the national railway problem the ports of the Maritime Provinces must be protected against government operated competition through Portland or any other foreign port, takes the broad general ground that if the government does not do this business somebody else will.

This refers to the Toronto Globe editorial:

The answer is obvious. Let them try, but do not use the resources of Canada to help them. The Dominion of Canada by and through a government commission must not own and operate a railway designed to carry to and from a foreign port trade that could and would go through the ports of the Maritime Provinces if the national system was devoting all its energies to the building up of trade through those ports. The long haul on which our Toronto contemporary lays so much stress is by no means the important factor it is represented to be. Gradients on the national system to New Brunswick are so much better than to Portland by the Grand Trunk that mileage advantage is nullified. That national system was built to keep Canadian trade in Canadian channels, but will be made to do so only if the administrators of the road are very plainly told what must be. Only a few weeks ago, when a United States Congress committee was considering a proposal which would have compelled the use of American shipping for the American carrying trade representatives of British steamship lines now doing business with the Grand Trunk at Portland declared they would have to transfer their ships to Maritime Province ports. Is it not the business of Canada to study ways and means to help them to do that very thing? The Maritime Provinces can be built up and developed only if there is Canadian co-operation. Competition by the Canadian National Railways system through Portland, with Canadian money spent to improve the terminals there, to encourage trade there, and with every Canadian National Railway employee from Montreal west to the Pacific an agent for Portland business, means stagnation in the Maritime Provinces. Canadian National co-operation with the C. P. R. in developing trade through the home ports means continued prosperity and steady development. The national idea must ever be kept uppermost in mind in the working out of the national railway scheme.

Then the same paper on March 4, says:

The fact that business has been done through St. John and Halifax is the proof that it can be done. What share will the Maritime Provinces have in Canada's trade if under the National Railway system Portland is made the national winter port? Neither the long haul nor the shipper's routing is a matter of the great importance which is so often suggested by the special pleader. It will always be for the shipper to route his freight as he likes. What is required in the Maritime Provinces is full protection against the government agents—the railway officials—routing via the competing port. The question of real importance is whether Canadian government interest is to centre in the development of home or foreign ports. Everything in reason must be done to prevent the Canadian development of a foreign port in competition with the ports of the Maritime Provinces, and everything in reason must be done to keep Canadian trade in Canadian channels.

And then it says,—and it is a Liberal paper:

That was the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier which must not be departed from by any Canadian Government.

Might I say it was also the policy of the Conservative party. The Daily Telegraph, of St. John, a well-known Liberal paper—in its issue of January 4, says:

There is a new government at Ottawa. In the near future it will be developing policies in connection with the great system of railroads under public control, and one feature of the railroad situation of sharp interest to St. John and Halifax is the Portland complication in connection with the Grand Trunk. Existing conditions would seem to demand strong co-operation by the Maritime Provinces, which are now well represented at Ottawa, in order to present the need for systematic development of Maritime ports in accordance with the policy of all-Canadian transportation.

I therefore, desire to draw the attention, especially of the Government, to the views expressed in various papers supporting their policy. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of Canadian trade for Canadian ports be confirmed, and that the Government, so far as it is concerned, shall not be instrumental in carrying trade to foreign ports to the detriment of our own. This is vital to our interests and our prosperity.

The second phase of the railway question which I desire to deal with is that regarding the Intercolonial. We have heard speeches from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and other members on this subject. The railway was built as a condition of Confederation, and it is so stated in section 145 of the British North America Act. It surely will be conceded that in the construction of this railway is involved its operation, and its operation under favourable circumstances, so that the provinces may do business with each other and with other portions of the Dominion. The very high freight rates which now exist are so many barriers against the profitable operation of the railway. In many cases they restrict the trade, and in some cases even prohibit it. I shall read another extract, dated February 7, which deals with an article which appeared in the Toronto Star written by an

Ottawa correspondent. The Daily Telegraph says:

> Political blackmail is the description applied by the Toronto Star's Ottawa correspondent to representations made by maritime members of Parliament to the Government in connection with Intercolonial freight rates, and the relation of that railroad to the development and prosperity of this part of the country.

I think I should state that we are informed through the press that a deputation of Liberal members of parliamemnt from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick interviewed the government recently with a view to establishing headquarters of the railway in Moncton. I am not aware of the exact request that was made, but, in general terms, I understand that it was a request that the headquarters be restored to Moncton. Then the Toronto Star's Ottawa correspondent makes some comments. The article reads as follows:

> The Star's correspondent lectures the Maritime M. P.'s at some length, and then proceeds to threaten this part of Canada with the expansion of Portland at Canadian expense—expense to which we would contribute—for the purpose of reducing the people of the Maritime division to what some people in Toronto regard as a proper state of subjection. Having declared that nearly every community in the world is to-day complaning of industrial depression and high freight rates, and having dwelt upon the need for national thinking and national unity, The Star writer proceeds as follows:
>
> "Furthermore, the Maritime Provinces should be the last to begin the game of political blackmail in Canada, for they are the worst equipped for playing it with success. After the next redistribution their political power will be considerably less than half the strength of either Quebec, Ontario or the West, and their proportionate weakness will steadily increase. If they set this fashion, the West or Ontario may imitate it with demands which the Maritime Provinces acutely dislike. What if Ontario and the West combined to insist that in order to save paying heavy freight rates, Portland should be made more use of as a winter port?"

There is something further that I shall not detain the House by reading. I do not know what the Liberal representatives from the Maritime provinces who waited on the Government think of this article from the Toronto Star, a paper supporting the present Government, has written regarding the nature of their views and actions. I would think questions of such moment should be discussed in a reasonable, tolerant way, so that the matters could be fairly and equitably dealt with.

The fact of the headquarters of the Intercolonial railway being situated in Toronto, a distance of something like 800 miles from the seat of operations, has proved anything but a success. I would have my hon. friends from Toronto understand that the objection is not any more to the headquarters being in Toronto than it would be to their being in Hamilton or any other town in that vicinity, but it is to the distance which separates the headquarters from the field of operations. They are simply not in touch with the wants and needs of the people using the railway. The proper place for the headquarters of a railway system is in the midst of its work. What then do the people desire? I take it that their desire is the restoration of something like what formerly existed; that is divisional control at Moncton, in order that officials might be in close communication with the business people and the industries of the locality, so that business might be done in an understanding way and that difficulties that always arise might be promptly adjusted.

It is important for us to remember that the right hon. Prime Minister of the preceding government (Mr. Meighen) made a pronouncement on this situation. He stated that, on the reorganization of the national railways, his policy would be to found a grand division of the national railways for the Maritime provinces, with headquarters at Moncton. That, I believe, would satisfy the people of those provinces and would add greatly to their prosperity. I would commend the policy of the right hon. the Prime Minister of the preceding government to the careful attention of the Government which is now in power. So much for these matters.

I wish to refer very briefly to the question mentioned in the Speech from the Throne of granting their natural resources to the three Prairie provinces. There can be no objection to that; it would seem a proper thing; but it is stated that there will be an accounting and other investigations in reference to this matter and that, on the completion of that, a report will be brought down to the House. I regret that apparently no provision is made for there being a reference so far as the other provinces have claims. The other provinces have claims. It seems to me that it is due to the provinces to be granted an opportunity of presenting those claims; and when the report comes to the House, surely it is desirable that we should have a comprehensive report rather than only a partial one concerning the Prairie provinces. I would, therefore, urge that when this matter is taken up, it be taken up in a thorough and comprehensive way, so that all questions bearing on it may be con-

sidered properly and a comprehensive report made to the House.

I have just one subject further to refer to, and that is the question of the returned soldier, and more especially the disabled soldier. It is a matter of great gratification to all Canadians to be aware of the fact that Canada has led the world in its care of returned soldiers; but we also understand that there can be no finality in a measure of this kind, because experience is of value and experience teaches that new problems arise occasionally to be settled, and naturally, from time to time, these will, I take it, come before the House for such readjustments as are found necessary and proper. In all cases and events, I assume that these matters will receive the very sympathetic attention of members of the House.

Mr. MILTON N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in expressing to you my congratulations on your elevation to that high and honourable office that you now hold. In congratulating also the mover and seconder of the address, I wish to state that I heartily concur in the remarks of the hon. member for NorthWinnipeg (Mr. McMurray) regarding the inequalities in the franchise. Let me say that if we are ever to make good Canadian citizens of the many races that come to our shores, we must frame our institutions to command their respect and appeal to their sense of justice.

I regret exceedingly that, through an incomplete knowledge of the French language, I am not in a position to discuss the speech of the hon. member who seconded the address (Mr. Mercier), and who spoke in French. It is one of the principal regrets of my life that I have not a full and complete knowledge of the French language, and I think the time has arrived when we of the Anglo-Saxon race must give to the French language the prominence that it deserves in our national schools. I would like to live to see the day when every school child in this Canada of ours would have at least a reasonable knowledge of the tongue of our brethren of Quebec.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. members of this portion of the House, particularly our honoured leader (Mr. Crerar), for the high moral tone, the mild and conciliatory nature of their remarks and the lack in their speeches of that acerbity, so noticeable in those from the other benches. But I may assure you that a legion of avenging angels with flaming swords will not be more terrible in their wrath than will this mild and domesticated looking group if no relief is granted the farmer during this session of Parliament. Like the dame of the nursery rhymes, who went to the cupboard in search of food for her starving canine, we have come from the rural districts to see what the legislative cupboard contains for our suffering and impoverished tillers of the soil. I tender no apology to the farmer of the prairie for comparing him to that much abused, long suffering and highly intelligent animal of domesticity, for at the hands of those possessed of power, and lacking in appreciation and sympathy, the treatment accorded him has very often been singularly similar.

I do not believe that the financial position of the western farmer is fully appreciated in Eastern Canada to-day. Never in the history of the country has his burden of taxation been higher, and never before has the purchasing power of his products been lower; and I would point out that a reduction in tariffs and freight rates, and better marketing conditions, are not only necessary for a return of prosperity to the West and, incidentally, to the whole country, but are vital to the very existence and continuation of the farming industry in the Prairie provinces to-day.

Each increase in freight rates during the past four years has added a 5-degree angle to the backs of our farmers, and, in all, has moved the West a thousand miles further from the East. Tens of thousands of acres of grain stand rotting in our fields to-day because, after threshing, it would not realize the freight to ship it out. The farmer's overhead expenses have been heavy, and for the past two years he has operated at a tremendous loss that in a great many cases has meant complete ruin; and many thousands to-day, after a life time of hard work, self-denial and privation, have not sufficient assets to equal their liabilities. To the hon. members of this House, I would say: that their hands are extended in supplication to you to-day and I trust that history, in this case, will not repeat itself, but that the family cupboard will contain some small morsel essential to the preservation of the life of that most important of all industries.

I must apologize to this House for any distinction I may draw between the East and the West. I would be the last to raise any geographical discriminations. But nature has created them, our Governments have fostered and intensified them, and it

is only by a reduction in the tariffs and freight rates that the work of man can be undone; and we will be left with only nature's handicap, under which we are quite satisfied to labour to the end of our days.

The question of freight rates brings into the limelight the whole railway situation, which is a problem so great as to be staggering in its immensity; and I would say to the honourable leader of the Government, (Mr. Mackenzie King) that the place that will be accorded to him in the future history of this country will be largely determined by his ability to lead us out of this railway wilderness.

Perhaps it will be considered presumption on the part of an obscure and inconsequential individual like myself to offer suggestions to this House as to how this difficulty could in part be met, but I have the word of President Wilson that the suspicion is beginning to dawn in many quarters that the ordinary man knows the business necessities of the country just as well as the extraordinary man, and emboldened by this suggestion, I now go so far as to risk some proposals of my own.

I do not wish at this particular juncture to inflict on this House a lot of wearying facts and figures. I will leave that for a future time; but I am convinced that handled in a business way, our railways can be made to pay, and I heartily agree with many hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject before that to this end our first duty is to consolidate, under one management, the existing roads held by the Government in order to eliminate to the fullest extent any duplication of service, either passenger or freight.

From my personal observations, and I may say that I am a practical railroad man, I am convinced that the whole system is overmanned and overstaffed, particularly at the official end, and a ruthless wielding of the pruning knife, and the total elimination of all deadwood and surplus timber, is absolutely essential to put these roads on a paying basis.

Attempts have been made to convince the public that the increases in freight rates were made necessary on account of the wages demanded by the men; but in so far as the wage of the men in charge of the rolling stock is concerned, freight can be moved more cheaply to-day than twenty years ago on account of the heavier types of engines in use, and coal consumption is less by about 70 per cent on account of improvement in the modern locomotive.

Now it is not my desire to inflict my opinions on the Government, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a more scientific handling of freight could eliminate a lot of waste and loss on the Government railways to-day. Any practical railway man will admit that from April 1st to November 1st freight can be handled for less than half the cost of moving it during the winter months, and in revising our freight rates we should give the summer customer the benefit of at least a part of this saving and have in effect a winter and a summer tariff which will encourage the handling of our heavy freight during the summer season. From this source alone many millions of dollars that are sacrificed to nature could be saved to humanity. By creating more steady employment this plan would also materially assist in solving the wage question. I am not unmindful of the many difficulties in the way of holding part of our grain until the following spring, but to effect the saving, farmers would soon provide extra storage, and credit conditions would in time adjust themselves to the change. We need the most competent railroad manager that North America can provide, and no salary is too big for the right man. We went to the United States to get a Van Horne; let us not stop outside the planet Mars for what we need for this big man's job. It is needless to remind you that this type of man will brook no political interference and must be given a free hand. A Roman emperor once said: "It is the fate of princes to be ill spoken of for their good deeds," and whatever policy is followed by the Government they must expect criticism. But the organized farmers are not destructionists, but constructionists. Their mission is not to destroy but to build up; and I can assure hon. gentlemen that the criticism that shall come from this portion of the House shall not be hurtful but helpful, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that in the handling of this gigantic problem he shall also have the co-operation of the group to your immediate left.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech of the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), and had I been dozing or been sitting behind a screen I would have thought that the hon. member was a Progressive. At all events, he gave a Progressive speech, and I am sure he is Progressive in sentiment. I therefore take this opportunity of advising him —I am sorry he is not in his seat, but this

remark will no doubt be brought to his notice—that if at any time he finds the atmosphere of the Government benches rather frigid, and the surroundings not quite as congenial as he would like, there will be a light in the window for him in this portion of the House, and the latch string will always hang on the outside. In fact, we have been seriously considering the advisability of making room at this end of the chamber for the whole Maritime group. I was also greatly interested in the speech of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). I regret that he, too, is absent. It was very eloquent and very lucid; in some respects it was one of the finest speeches we have listened to during this session. One thing I must give the hon. member a great deal of credit for is his frankness with regard to his stand on the tariff. There is nothing particularly wrong in that, Sir; I admire the man who will come out and tell you just where he stands, whether he is against you or not. The hon. gentleman's opinions happen to be diametrically opposed to mine, but that makes no difference. But in hearing him through I was quite convinced of the truth of what one of the hon. members of the official Opposition told me in the corridors the other day: that the hon. member for Brantford had been elected because he was more consistently protectionist than the Conservative candidate. I was surprised to hear the hon. member quote from John Bright. If I understand John Bright correctly, he would have had little sympathy for the high tariff and protectionist doctrines of the hon. member for Brantford.

I was also very much interested in the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), particularly where he described the conditions under which the Maritime provinces entered into Confederation. It is something, Sir, that I have always known but which I had earnestly tried to forget, because I wished to pass on to my children the idea that the Fathers of Confederation were actuated by higher and nobler aims than those described by the hon. member. If you will excuse a personal reference, Sir, I may say that I, too, come from the Maritime provinces; my parents still reside there, all the cherished traditions of my boyhood days cluster round the land of Evangeline, and, if you will pardon my unpoetic language, the land of the potato and of the herring. What the hon. gentleman told us was, in a few words, that in entering Confederation the Maritime provinces sold their birthright,—otherwise their fiscal freedom—for a mess of pottage, —otherwise a railway built for military and not for commercial purposes. British Columbia has a similar tale to tell and that province was on the point of withdrawing from Confederation when the promised railway was not built within the time prescribed and guaranteed by the Dominion Government. Quebec and Ontario conceived the idea of having "colonies", as one hon. gentleman described it,—I hate the word, Sir, in that connection, but I feel that I must use it,—colonies in which they could sell their manufactured goods under a protective tariff. After sizing up the situation from every conceivable angle we must frankly admit that the whole structure of Confederation was erected not on the solid rock of national unity but on the yielding sands of provincial selfishness, and I have seen enough, Sir, in the short time I have been in this House to convince me that this spirit dominates our public life to the same extent that it did in 1867.

I wonder if all hon. gentlemen actually realize the financial position that this country is in at the present time. The hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) in his speech the other evening mentioned the fact that our national debt is now $2,300,000,000, but I would add to this the debts of our provinces and the bonded indebtedness of our towns and cities, which brings it up to the enormous and staggering total of over $4,000,000,000. It takes about $15,000,000 more to pay the interest on our national debt to-day than it took to run the whole country before the war. Our railways are losing us, or were until recently, nearly a quarter of a million dollars a day. I was doing a little figuring while one of the hon. members for Toronto was speaking in the House the other evening—he spoke at a considerable length—and I came to the conclusion that during the time he was speaking in this Chamber the interest on our national debt had accumulated to the extent of about $125,000. I trust, Sir, that the hon. gentleman will be presented with a bill for that amount and be asked to settle it before the end of the session.

Hundreds of our schools are closed to-day for want of money to run them. Tens of thousands of working people are walking the streets without work and without any immediate prospects of getting it, while their families are insufficiently provided with food and clothing, boots and shoes.

Thousands of our farmers do not know where their seed is coming from; many thousands more do not know where they are going to get the supplies necessary to put them through until the next harvest. And yet, Sir, there is a tendency on the part of the best intellect and statesmanship of this House to waste time in pugilistic, and, shall I say, gladiatorial exhibitions for the amusement of the galleries. We are fiddling to-day, Sir, while Rome is burning, in a manner worthy of Nero himself. Let us away with these petty animosities. Let us turn our backs on the past and set our faces toward the future; and may the fate of Lot's wife befall him who looks behind.

I have in my hand a letter addressed to the Progressives in Parliament from one of the grand old men of the organization to which we belong and whose insignia I am proud to wear on my lapel. I refer to Mr. E. A. Partridge, of Sintaluta, Saskatchewan, who with the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), called in 1901 that historic meeting at which was formed the Territorial Grain Growers' Association, the forerunner of all that we represent at the present time. In part, this is what he says:

> Does this Progressive movement now propose to take on all the characteristics of a parliamentary party, dub its nominal chieftain, "Official Leader of the Opposition", and proceed to perpetuate the old party struggles under new party names? If it does, the clock of progress will be set back at least a quarter of a century, a most unseemly act for men calling themselves "Progressives". With solemn earnestness let it be urged that the Progressive members go to Ottawa prepared to treat the Premier-elect, not as a political opponent to be harassed and thwarted at every turn, but rather as the regularly elected chairman of a convention of two hundred and thirty-five delegates assembled to find solutions for grave national problems, chief among which is the problem of providing every honest citizen with the opportunity of making a decent living.

Further he says:

> There are exceedingly grave conditions to be dealt with by the Fourteenth Canadian Parliament.
>
> Unemployment is rife and increasing.
>
> Farm products are selling below the cost of production.
>
> Many retail merchants are in financial difficulty.
>
> Debts, public and private, are piling up, because outgo exceeds income.
>
> The cost of decent living is beyond the means of a majority of the people.
>
> Interest rates are so high, an involved debtor must remain a debtor or become a bankrupt.
>
> Freight rates have gone so high that commerce has been in many cases crippled and in others actually killed.
>
> Home markets are narrowing. Seemingly the same people possess both the goods and the money. The majority of would-be customers are too poor to buy. It is a case of under-consumption, not of over-production.

"Dirt" Lord Palmerston said, "is only matter out of place. The good food from your dinner table becomes dirt when it touches your clothing; it is simply matter misplaced." I would ask you if we have any statesmanship left in this Canada of ours? Have we any of it in this House? I am quite convinced, Sir, that we have an abundance of it, both on the Government benches as well as on those of the Opposition, but it is misplaced and misdirected and its efforts destroyed. Let us display some of the spirit manifested by our boys in France when they went over the top. They did not wait to ask whether the next fellow was from Nova Scotia or British Columbia, whether from Prince Edward Island or Alberta. They did not waste their time in petty animosities, but, animated by a single idea, they went over the top and they emblazoned the name of Canada on the heavens of fame, where it will remain as long as the Anglo-Saxon and Gallic races shall last. If we have any of this spirit—and I am assured that we have—let us get down without delay to a solution of our grave and serious domestic problems. The situation is not hopeless, Sir. We have the intellect; we have the ability, we have the statesmanship, but like our railways they need consolidation. Let them be consolidated and made one great driving force for the good of the country; then we need have no fears for the future.

We can make of this Canada of ours the happiest, the most prosperous and the wealthiest country on the face of the globe. Let me quote from a speech delivered in the British House of Commons over a century ago which, although referring to a different country and to different conditions, is equally applicable to Canada to-day:

> God has blessed Canada in soil, position and in climate; He has not forgot his promises nor are they unfulfilled. There is still the rain and the sunshine, still the seed time and the harvest, and the affluent bosom of the earth yet offers sustenance for man. But man must do his part—we must do our part, we must retrace the blunders, I might even say the crimes of our past legislation, and then, and only then, will we find that Labor, hopeful and remunerative is the only sure foundation on which can be reared the enduring edifice of union and of peace.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): Mr. Speaker, at the request of the hon. mem-

ber for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) I rise at this late hour in order to relieve the pressure on the necks of hon. members to my left. Let me say that I am not unfamiliar with the art of riding, but I never did feel that I could get anywhere with a mount that persisted in travelling in a circle.

I wish to associate myself, Mr. Speaker, with the many kind and complimentary things that have been said in connection with your elevation to the high office which you now occupy, and which have been expressed by other hon. members in a much more eloquent manner than I could hope to do. I will only say that I am most heartily in accord with the sentiments they have given expression to.

So many hon. members have prefaced their remarks by stating that they were new members and craving your indulgence on that account, and then have delivered such excellent and eloquent addresses, that I hesitate, Sir, to declare myself a new member lest too much should be expected of me. But I am a new member and, of course, am under the disadvantage of that ignorance of parliamentary procedure which is natural to a new member. However, I sincerely desire to extend credit where credit is due, no matter with what party that may be associated, and in this connection, despite some references to the contrary, I should like to compliment hon. members on the Government side for their prompt action on two questions that are of pressing moment to this country; I refer to the extremely critical railway situation and the tariff policy. My congratulations are the more hearty and sincere because so far as we have been enlightened, —I refer to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) and others—they evidently are going to carry out the policy of the late government.

Some time has been spent during the last few days in attempting to give a definition of party names. This practice has been indulged in by members on both sides of the House. I have been very much charmed with some of the definitions offered, but I noted that while hon. members opposite seemed to be willing to name those in this corner Tories, there was no reference made on either side to any similar name that hon. members on the Government side were once known by. I was very much pleased with the definition given, I think by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin). He described the elements of sweet charity that were to be found in Liberalism, but I must observe that those elements are much more conspicuous in his definition of charity than in his demonstration of its qualities. Now, Sir, I believe that what we on this side of the House are most concerned in, indeed, I think I can safely go further and say what the majority of the people are most concerned in, is not the definition of the name, but the policy of any party and the way in which that policy is implemented by legislation. I believe this is what the country is calling for to-day,—a party not of a certain name, but a party that is known by its performances and the way in which it keeps its pledges; not a policy that is like the wind, subject to change without notice. And I might say that in some respects the policy of hon. members opposite has been similar to the wind in another important respect, and that is that while for months past we have heard the sound thereof we do not yet know whence it cometh or whither it goeth.

I have been struck by the reference made by hon. members on my left to certain matters, and I must say that I am very much in sympathy with the statement of their situation. I can appreciate that situation very well, although not a western farmer. The situation that they so eloquently described is the more easily understood by me because I happen to be a farmer myself. I am much more familiar with the handling of a plough or a herd of dairy cattle than I am with the Rules of this House. I believe that hon. members to my left have presented the situation just exactly as it is, and I sympathize very much with them. I should like to point out, however, that the farmers in Ontario—and I believe most of the references have been to the farmers of the West—the farmers of Ontario, and I speak from experience, during the past year, have been operating their farms also at a loss.

Now, perhaps because I am a farmer it may seem to hon. members to the left that I could not be a protectionist. Well, Sir, I think I can explain my position in a very few words. I am a protectionist for this reason: I have given some study to the question, and the conclusion I have arrived at is applicable to conditions now prevailing. Since coming to this House I have been confirmed in my conclusion because the leaders of all three parties have ex-

pressed themselves along the line that at least some basis of protection is necessary. Some difference of opinion has been expressed as to how it should be described; whether it should be called a protective tariff, a tariff for revenue only, or a tariff such as I believe the leader of the Progressive party would characterize at the present time as a tariff of necessity. No matter what name it masquerades under I prefer to call it just what it is; and so long as the tariff is fixed at a certain rate it matters not whether you call it a protective tariff or a tariff for revenue only. As I view it at the present time that is the main difference between our policy on this side and the policy of the hon. members opposite—but it is a difference in name only. As an Ontario farmer I am a protectionist and possibly I take a selfish view because my constituents, owing to their geographical location, are mainly protectionists. Perhaps the views entertained on this question by hon. members from the Prairie provinces are due to the same influence. I have no quarrel whatsoever with any person who holds such views; I believe it to be the duty each hon. member owes to himself and to his constituents to fairly represent their views.

During the debate reference was made to the cause of the defeat of the former government; but very little has been said respecting what I believe to be, in the opinion of members on both sides, the real reason. It is a matter of history, and a well known fact that hardly any government ever passes through the period of a devastating war without later suffering defeat. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that during that great struggle the strain under which the members of the late government laboured was simply tremendous; and those who indulge in criticism should recollect that burdens were placed upon the shoulders of the members of the Cabinet greater than were ever borne by any previous administration in Canada. I would like to say too that I do not believe any group of men in this House or elsewhere, or any group of self-constituted critics, could have carried the public administration through those trying times more creditably to themselves than did the late administration, and in my belief no government would have fared any better at the hands of the electorate when the election took place. In my opinion it is only fair to give credit where credit is due.

In connection with the work of the late government, there was one man who, more than any other in Canada, sustained the burden and the heat of the day—I refer to the right hon. gentleman I have the honour to acknowledge as my leader (Mr. Meighen). From all sides have come expressions of satisfaction at his return as a member of this House; and I believe, Sir, that the majority of people in Canada, no matter to what party they belong, share in the satisfaction that this capable leader, who went through those trying times with such distinction, is still in a position to give his services to Parliament and to the people that are so proud to claim him as a fellow citizen. We on this side have unbounded confidence not only in his ability, but in his candour, his courage and his desire to serve his country to the limit of his power.

A good deal has been said in this debate with respect to economy, and many expressions on the subject have been uttered by hon. members to my left. That is one question, Sir, upon which we cannot lay too much emphasis. Economy under present conditions should be practised not only in the home but also by the municipalities, by the provincial authorities, and in the federal arena. I am bound, however, to say with respect to certain hon. members on my left who have talked somewhat on economy that they do not extend the application of this principle to the department of the King's Printer.

Allusion has been made to the cattle embargo. That question is one in which members of the House in general are intensely interested. Unfortunately the decision of this question is in the hands of the British Government and not in ours. Were it possible for us to raise that embargo I believe we would unanimously agree to do so. Let me point out, however, that efforts to have the embargo removed have not been confined to the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario. To those hon. members who have expressed themselves as so well satisfied with the work of the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario towards removing the embargo, I would suggest that the provincial minister be also sent to Washington there to make an effort to bring about the removal of the Fordney tariff.

Much has been said on the existing railway situation in Canada. I do not propose for one minute to take up time

in endeavouring to solve such an intricate question, one of the most important issues before the people of this country to-day. There is one thing however that I would like to point out, and before doing so I must make a confession that were it possible I would be inclined to favour private ownership rather than public ownership. But there are many things to be considered and the situation to-day in Canada is the result of private ownership. I am not an authority on the railway question but I believe this phase must be carefully considered for this reason. Immediately after my election I became the recipient of certain papers—I may say they were published in Montreal—containing articles on the railway question showing the awful consequences that would come to the country from public operation. No doubt other hon. members received copies of these articles which were marked in pencil so that the reader should not overlook them. I have also received various circulars, apparently emanating from the same source, all dealing with the awful results consequent upon public ownership. Now, Sir, are we to suppose that this propaganda is being financed and directed by some great-hearted benevolent and patriotically minded citizen who is doing it all for his country's good? If so, I expect that we shall receive pamphlets and other literature, from the same source pointing out the horrible consequences that will flow from private ownership by reason of the situation that has developed in connection with the Merchants Bank. Now, Sir, while I do not profess to have mastered the railway situation I believe I am safe in saying—and I commend the thought especially to hon. members on my left.—that all this propaganda must have something behind it, that it is more than the work of a mere patriotic citizen, and should be taken with more than the usual grain of salt.

Allusion has also been made in this debate to racial differences. That such should exist is a surprise to me but let me say that condition will exist just as long as hon. members of this House, or people elsewhere, continue to use the question for selfish or political purposes and no longer. I trust hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will rise above any such suggestion. Now I reach a point which, possibly more than any other, was the cause of my taking part in this debate, although there has not been very much said in regard to it yet. I have felt, Sir, that since the war we, as a Canadian people, have been so troubled with the many perplexities and difficulties that have arisen out of that great struggle, that we have forgotten our duties and responsibilities as Canadian citizens and that we have developed a sectional and provincial spirit rather than a national one. This has been exemplified by the debate in this House. Almost every question that has been brought up has been discussed almost entirely from the point of view the particular member represents. I appeal to all hon. gentlemen in this House that, at this stage of Canada's existence, while it is quite right to have our personal convictions, it is only possible for us to progress if we are able to approach the questions of the day in a spirit of compromise and unity. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Parliament, having aired our views in a political way, shall manifest that spirit of unity and compromise, in order that we, as representing the Canadian people, may help Canada to achieve that destiny that she, by reason of her great natural resources and the indomitable spirit of her people, is justly entitled to attain.

The motion of Mr. McMurray for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General agreed to.

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the said Address be engrossed and transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the Hon. Privy Council.

SUPPLY

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House will, on Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House will on Monday next resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Friday, March 24, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 9, respecting The Canada Trust Company.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate Canadian General Insurance Company.—Mr. Lanctôt.

Bill No. 11, respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord. —Mr. Lafortune.

Bill No. 12, respecting The Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company. —Mr. Parent.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ethier.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 2, to incorporate British Empire Assurance Company.—Mr. Sinclair (Oxford).

Bill No. 3, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 4, to incorporate Canada's Sons. —Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Knox.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. MacKelvie.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

ELECTION OF MR. G. N. GORDON, WEST PETERBOROUGH

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Rule 13 of the House provides that a Chairman of Committees shall be elected at the commencement of every Parliament as soon as the Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's Speech. I beg, therefore, to move:

> That Mr. George Newcombe Gordon, K.C., member for the electoral district of Peterborough West, be appointed Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

The hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Gordon) was a member of the last Parliament. Although he was not present for the enire Parliament, he quickly acquainted himself with the rules and procedure of the House, and I think that all hon. members who have had the pleasure of knowing him will agree that he possesses the ability, temperament and attainments necessary for the discharge of the responsible duties of this important office. I hope, therefore, that the House will support this motion.

Motion agreed to.

ESTIMATES, 1922-1923

A message from His Excellency the Governor-General transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1923, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), and read by Mr. Speaker to the House.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The Estimates are submitted in both French and English, and at the next sitting of the House I shall make the customary motion that they be referred to the Committee of Supply.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE

SALARIES ACT AND SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 14, to amend the Salaries Act and the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM: To conform with another bill that I wish to introduce, it will be necessary to have this bill become law, in order that certain salaries in connection with the new Department of Defence may be paid to the head of that department rather than to the head of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

BILL RESPECTING DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 15, respecting the Department of National Defence.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM: In brief, the object of this bill is to bring under one head the various departments of defence in this country, including the Naval Service Department, the Air Service, Militia and Defence, and the Canadian Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I shall make a more extended explanation on the second reading of the

bill, but that is the substance of its contents.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 16 to amend the Immigration Act. He said:

This bill has to do with the amendments to the act made in 1919. As the House will remember, at that time, shortly following the war, when there was considerable hysteria with regard to what was taking place in the country, certain amendments were made to the Immigration Act, the effect of which was to deprive those who were not born in Canada of the right to trial by jury and to subject them to deportation without trial. The purpose of this bill is to repeal those sections of the act, so that every man in this country, whether a Canadian by birth or one who has lived in Canada, will be assured of the right of trial by jury.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17, to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Criminal Code was modified at the same time as the Immigration Act along somewhat similar lines. The legislation is all of a kind, and if the bill which I introduced a moment ago becomes law, it will be almost necessary to pass this bill in order to make the law at all consistent.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

HALIFAX TERMINALS

Mr. DUFF:

1. What is the cost of the ocean terminals at Halifax to date, including cost of land expropriated, breakwater, docks, station accommodation, cost of excavating and laying tracks from Waverly to the present station and terminals?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: $16,646,396.20.

WOODEN SHIPS

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many, if any, wooden sailing ships were built at Victoria, B. C., in which the Government was or is interested?
2. What are the names and net tonnage of said ships?
3. What was the cost of each?
4. What amount did the Government advance on each of said ships?
5. How is the Government secured for advances on said ships?
6. Is the Government still interested in these ships?
7. What is the market value of each of said ships at the present time per registered ton?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. One completed, construction suspended on two hulls; part material on yard site for fourth hull.
2. Completed ship named " S. F. Tolmie" Net tonnage of the "Tolmie" is 1497.08 tons.
3. The Department of Finance advanced and expended $639,131.49 on the four ships to end of February, 1922.
4. The amount advanced and expended was not apportioned to each ship but applied to the four ships.
5. Secured by mortgages.
6. Yes.
7. No present market.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the total amount expended in connection with the Civil Service Commission for the year 1921?
2. How many employees are on the staff of said Commission?
3. What is the total amount of salaries paid to the employees of said Commission?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. $344,880.65.
2. The February paylists show 221 employees. There were ten released during the month of February, and further reduction is to be made during March.
3. $20,587.60, February pay lists.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince):

1. What was the total cost of the administration of the Civil Service Commission during the last fiscal year?
2. How many officials and employees are in the offices of the Civil Service Commission, and what is the annual salary of each?
3. What is the annual salary and travelling expenses of each of Commissioners?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1.

Civil Government salaries	$103,540.33	
Temporary employees' salaries	103,599.59	
Printing and stationery	40,537.37	
Travelling expenses	2,951.77	
Examinations and sundries	28,948.78	$279,577.84
A. Young & Co., final payment of fee bills	28,452.33	
Members Board of Hearing (honorarium)	4,800.00	33,252.33
		312,830.17

2. The payroll for the month of February, ultimo, shows 221 officials and employees in the offices of the Civil Service Commission, their annual salaries being as follows:

3 Commissioners: 1 at $7,000, and 2 at $6,000.

1 Secretary at $5,100.

1 Chief, Organization Branch at $3,840.

1 Assistant Secretary and Chief of Examination Branch at $3,660.

1 Head French Examiner at $2,940.

1 Senior Investigator at $2,880.

4 Head Clerks: 1 at $2,760, 1 at $2,640, and 2 at $2,400.

6 Investigators: 2 at $2,520, and 4 at $2,400.

4 Senior Civil Service Examiners at $2,400.

1 Civil Service Printer at $2,280.

1 Junior Investigator at $1,920.

5 Principal Clerks: 2 at $2,040, 1 at $1,920, and 2 at $1,800.

7 Junior Civil Service Examiners: 2 at $1,920, and 5 at $1,800.

1 Assistant Civil Service Printer at $1,920.

26 Senior Clerks: 1 at $2,800, 2 at $1,740, 1 at $1,500, 6 at $1,440, 3 at $1,380, and 13 at $1,320.

57 Clerks: 1 at $1,260, 7 at $1,080, 1 at $1,020, and 48 at $960.

1 Junior Draftsman at $900.

1 Packer and Helper at $780.

90 Junior Clerks: 3 at $900, 1 at $840, 1 at $800, 4 at $720, 7 at $660 and 74 at $600.

9 Office Boys: 1 at $360, 6 at $330, and 2 at $300.

3. The travelling expenses and salary of each of the Commissioners for the present fiscal year, is as follows:

	Salary	Travelling Expenses
W. J. Roche	$7,000	$123.00
M. G. LaRochelle	$6,000	152.70
C. Jameson	$6,000	169.62

TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS

Mr. DUFF:

What amounts have been expended by the Public Works Department for each of the years from January 1, 1912, to December 31, 1921, on work at Toronto harbour?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY (for the Minister of Public Works):

Total expenditure to 31st December, 1921: $6,376,149.72 as follows:

Fiscal Year	Expenditure
1911-1912	$ 1,037 55*
1912-1913	107,649 67
1913-1914	168,183 15
1914-1915	806,056 17
1915-1916	219,443 47
1916-1917	596,589 21
1917-1918	876,381 61
1918-1919	324,897 63
1919-1920	723,694 15
1920-1921	1,651,763 99
1921-1922	900,453 12†
	$6,376,149 72

†1st April to 31st December, 21.
†1st April to 31st December.

COURTENAY BAY

Mr. DUFF:

What amounts have been expended by the Public Works Department for each of the years from January 1, 1912, to December 31, 1921, on work at Courtenay bay?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY (for the Minister of Public Works):

Total expenditure to 31st December, 1921: $7,354,504.31, as follows:

Fiscal Year	Expenditure
1911-1912	$ 942 60*
1912-1913	415,987 05
1913-1914	688,999 50
1914-1915	1,053,488 07
1915-1916	862,428 52
1916-1917	749,692 43
1917-1918	281,813 14
1918-1919	226,193 62
1919-1920	955,395 19
1920-1921	1,096,190 83
1921-1922	1,023,373 36†
	$7,354,504 31

†1st April to 31st December, 21.
†1st April to 31st December.

INCOME TAX

Mr. MARTELL:

1. What amount was collected by the Government of Canada or any department thereof during the fiscal year 1920-21 as income taxes?
2. (*a*) What was the total amount paid by the Government or any department thereof as salaries of officials and employees; and (*b*) for all other expenses in connection with or in any wise appertaining to the collection of the said income taxes for the said fiscal period?
3. How many persons were employed throughout Canada in connection with the assessment and collection of said income taxes?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Business Profits War Tax Act	$40,841,401.25
Income War Tax Act ..	46,381,806.64
Total revenue collected..	$87,223,207.89
2. (a) Salaries, including salaries paid at Head Office, Department of Finance, Ottawa	1,272,183.58
(b) Expenses, including Head Office expenses..	437,400.62
Total expenses	$1,709,584.820

3. 1580. The Business Profits War Tax Act and Income War Tax Act are administered by the same staff, therefore the cost of administration cannot be allocated.

CANADIAN AIR BOARD

Mr. DUFF:

1. What amount was paid by the Government during the year 1921, in connection with the Canadian Air Board?
2. How many officials and employees are employed by the said board?
3. What was the total amount of salaries paid to said officials and employees during the year 1921?
4. What is the total enrollment in all ranks of the Canadian Air Force?
5. What was the total expenditure during 1921 for the said Air Force?
6. What was the total amount of military and civil flying carried out during the said year?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Financial Year 1920-21:	
From Air Board Appropriations	$1,656,355.59
From Demobilization	351,371.97
From Cost of Living Bonus	30,545.28
	$2,038,272.84

353 on Feb. 28, 1922.

For Financial Year 1920-21, $279,587.81.

2,622 officers and men.

For Financial Year 1920-21, $842,068.89.

5,187 hours 16 minutes, or approximately 424,000 miles.

[Mr. Murphy.]

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the total amount paid by the Canadian Government during the year 1921, in connection with the so-called Canadian navy?
2. How many officials and employees are connected with said navy in the city of Ottawa?
3. What was the total amount paid in salaries to said officials and employees?
4. Are there any cruisers, destroyers and submarines in connection with the said navy?
5. If so, where were they stationed during the past four months?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The amount paid out of Parliamentary Appropriation for Royal Canadian Navy for the fiscal year 1921-22 up to February 28, 1922, was $1,793,655.97.

2. There are seven officials and employees in the Naval Service Department at Ottawa paid out of Naval Appropriation.

3. $33,374.45.

4. One cruiser, two destroyers, two submarines.

5. Cruiser and Destroyers: 10th November, 1921, to 10th December, 1921—Halifax.

Arrived	Departed
Bermuda ....13 Dec., 1921	12 Dec., 1921
St. Kits .....31 Dec., 1921	3 Jan., 1922
Dominica.... 4 Jan., 1922	6 Jan., 1922
Barbadoes ... 7 Jan., 1922	16 Jan., 1922
Grenada ....17 Jan., 1922	19 Jan., 1922
Trinidad ....19 Jan., 1922	21 Feb., 1922
Demerara ...22 Feb., 1922	1 Mar., 1922
Trinidad .... 4 Mar., 1922	Still at Trinidad

Submarines

Halifax to 23 November, 1921.
Bermuda 27 November to date.

JUDGES AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many Superior or High Court Judges are there in the province of Ontario and in view of Section 34, R.S.C. 1920, why are these Federal Judges allowed to serve on Provincial Commissions?
2. How many days during the years 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922 were Honourable Justice Sutherland, Honourable Justice Riddell and Honourable Justice Latchford absent from their judicial duties serving on Provincial Commissions?
3. What was their remuneration from these several Commissions and were they paid two salaries while so acting?
4. What were the names of the Commissioners, the number of days employed, the salary and rate per day and pay?
5. Are there too many Superior Court Judges in Ontario?
6. Who replaced the above-mentioned Judges while they were absent from the Superior Court Bench, and did not their absence from duty cause a congestion of litigation?

7. Is it the intention of the Government to enforce Section 34, R.S.C., 1920, in the future and to introduce legislation with penalties in this regard?

8. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session that a Judge serving on these Commissions shall automatically vacate his judicial office from the Government of Canada, or will legislation be introduced to the same effect?

9. Does the Government intend to ask for the resignations of the Judges aforesaid?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. Nineteen including the Chief Justices. The question whether this section has the effect of preventing Judges from receiving remuneration for executing Commissions to which they were appointed prior to the coming into force of the section was submitted by the Government of Ontario to the Supreme Court of Ontario, and, according to information received from the Attorney General of the province, answered in the negative.

2, 3, 4. The Government has not been informed.

5. Not so far as the Government is aware.

6. The Government has not been informed.

7. The Government intends to enforce the existing law, but not to enact penalties.

8, 9. No.

MERCHANTS BANK CASE

*Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has any application been received by the Minister of Finance for the merger of the Merchants Bank with the Bank of Montreal, and what action has been taken in this regard?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to hold a proper and adequate enquiry into the affairs of the Merchants Bank of Canada?

3. If so, what form will the enquiry take and where will it be held?

4. What loss has been sustained by the shareholders of the Bank as a result of negligence or inefficient management?

5. What does the Government propose to do further to impose penalties on directors, auditors and others responsible for mismanagement in the affairs of banks or other financial institutions?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

In reply to the first question: The fact that such application was received and has been approved by the Government has already been made known. As to the second and third questions: Instructions have been given for the prosecution of those who are being held liable for supplying false returns to the Department of Finance, and the necessary steps are being taken in the city of Montreal to-day. We have no information which would enable us to definitely answer the fourth question. Everything depends upon the price at which the shareholder bought his shares. If he bought them at anything like par he has sustained no loss; if he bought them at a high figure on the market he sustained a substantial loss. The House will see that it is not possible for us to give an exact answer to that question. The subject of the fifth question would be a very proper one to be considered when we reach the question of the revision of the Bank Act.

LIFE SAVING STATIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What was, and is the policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as to life saving at the ocean ports and inland lakes and rivers of Canada, and what stations, if any, does the Government maintain?

2. (*a*) Has the Government discontinued active aid to life saving and life saving stations at Toronto, and (*b*) other places on lake Ontario and other inland waters, and what stations, if any, have been closed?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to provide adequate life saving stations at Toronto, Hamilton ,Niagara and Port Dalhousie and other lake Ontario ports, and what report did the wreck commissioner make on the subject of life saving?

4. (*a*) Why have the Toronto civic authorities been forced to provide life saving crews at a cost of $160,000 for 1922, and (*b*) what is the policy of the department in future on the Great Lakes?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to provide by regulation and the maintenance of stations at isolated points as adequate a life saving service as may be possible in connection with merchant shipping and fisheries. Stations are being maintained at the following places: Little Wood Island, N.B.; Bay View, N.S.; Bamfield, B.C.; Clayoquot, B.C.; Long Point, Ont.; Point Pelee, Ont.; Cobourg, Ont.; Port Stanley, Ont.; Southampton, Ont.; Cape Tormentine, N.B.; Escuminac, N.B.; Baker's Cove, N.S.; Blanche, N.S.; Canso, N.S.; Clark's Harbour, N.S.; Devil's Island, N.S.; Duncan's Cove, N.S.; Herring Cove, N.S.; Scattari, N.S.; Seal Island, N.S.; Westport, N.S.; Entry Island, Magdalen Islands, P.Q.; Cascumpeque, P.E.I.; Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Souris, P.E.I.; Alberton, P.E.I.; Priest Pond, P.E.I.; Goderich, Ont.

2. (*a*) Active aid has been discontinued to life saving stations at Toronto.

(*b*) Stations on the Great Lakes are maintained at Point Pelee, Long Point, Cobourg, Port Stanley, Southampton and Goderich.

3. There is no definite determination by the Government as to where stations may be provided in the future

The following is the report of the wreck commissioner:

His Worship Mayor T. L. Church brought to the attention of the court his impressions with regard to the establishment of life saving stations at the ports of Niagara, Port Dalhousie, Oakville, Grimsby and other places on lake Ontario, similarly to those which the United States Government is maintaining on its side of the lakes which I beg to bring to the attention of the Dpartment of Marine for its consideration.

4. (*a*) No information. (*b*) See answer to No. 3.

POSTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What were the total receipts of post offices of Montreal, Winnipeg, Toronto, Victoria, Quebec, Vancouver, Ottawa, Hamilton and St. John, respectively, for the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920?

2. Why does the Government not restore one-cent drop letters in Toronto, and is it their intention to do so in the near future?

3. When does the Government propose to build a new post office in the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

Total receipts of Post Offices of	1917	1918
Montreal. ..	$2,340,464 01	$2,353,045 65
Winnipeg. ..	2,170,681 09	2,452,902 96
Toronto.. ..	4,049,093 00	4,137,678 14
Victoria.. ..	214,826 48	222,375 91
Quebec.. ...	325,868 16	311,642 88
Vancouver ..	615,170 63	667,280 27
Ottawa.. ..	414,570 62	446,441 50
Hamilton. ..	450,867 09	463,749 62
St. John.. ..	221,846 10	225,882 11

Total receipts of Post Offices of	1919	1920
Montreal. ..	$2,398,185 32	$2,738,298 40
Winnipeg. ..	2,303,205 63	2,585,450 52
Toronto.. ..	4,458,970 44	4,896,480 48
Victoria.. ..	235,906 17	252,451 08
Quebec.. ...	342,063 34	380,527 64
Vancouver ..	732,363 38	826,141 73
Ottawa... ..	462,488 94	470,104 83
Hamilton. ..	470,960 84	489,570 61
St. John.. ..	231,677 74	250,831 53

2. Because of the unsatisfactory financial conditions in which the Government finds the affairs of the country on taking over the administration.

3. When expenditure on new works can be resumed, matter will be considered.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY

Mr. MORIN:

1. What number of miles of railroad were operated by the Canadian Northern Railway in each Province of Canada when it was purchased by the Government?

2. What was then the bonded indebtedness and the date, term, rate of interest and amount of each issue and which of the issues were guaranteed by each Province of Canada?

3. What were the other liabilities including stocks, which were assumed or paid for by the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: 1. Total mileage 9,433.4, located as follows:

Province of Nova Scotia.. ..	370.5
Province of Quebec..	636.6
Province of Ontario..	2,253.3
Province of Manitoba..	1,984.4
Province of Saskatchewan.. ..	2,194.3
Province of Alberta..	1,244.6
Province of British Columbia..	531.9
State of Minnesota..	217.8

2. Funded debt of the Canadian Northern Railway Company; guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Dominion Government of Canada.

	Sterling	Currency
3% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock..	£1,923,287	$ 9,359,996 72
3½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock..	1,622,586	7,896,588 26
4% Dominion Guaranteed Debenture Stock..	3,500,000	17,033,333 33
Guaranteed by Government of Manitoba—		
4% Consolidated Debenture Bonds..	2,555,600	12,436,279 98
4% Ontario Division Bonds..	1,180,600	5,745,586 66
4% Winnipeg Terminal Bonds..	616,438	3,000,000 00
4% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock..	587,671	2,859,998 87
Guaranteed by Government of Saskatchewan—		
4% 1st Mortagge Debenture Stock..	1,650,000	8,029,999 99
Guaranteed by Government of Alberta—		
4% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock..	1,147,945	5,586,665 64

	Sterling	Currency
4% Perpetual Consolidated Deb. Stock	9,234,867	44,943,019 40
4% Land Grant Bonds (1909)	380,700	1,852,740 01
4% Land Grant Bonds (1899)		2,000,000 00
5% Land Mortgage Debentures	1,500,000	7,300,000 00
5% Secured Notes	2,000,000	9,733,333 34
5% Secured Notes	450,000	2,190,000 00
5% Two Year Collateral Notes		11,500,000 00
5% One Year Secured Notes		2,500,000 00
6% Secured Notes		6,000,000 00
5% One Year Notes		1,750,000 00
4% Minnesota & Manitoba R. R. Bonds		349,000 00
4½% Prince Albert Branch Bonds		300,000 00
		$162,366,542 20

Funded Debt of Affiliated Companies

	Sterling	Currency
The Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, Guaranteed by the Dominion Government—		
3½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	£ 647,260	$ 3,149,988 66
The Canadian Northern Western Railway Company, Guaranteed by the Government of Alberta—		
4½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	1,320,000	6,424,000 00
4½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	575,342	2,799,977 73
The Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, Guaranteed by the Government of British Columbia—		
4% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	3,372,329	16,412,001 13
4½% Terminal Debenture Stock	1,770,000	8,614,000 00
The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, Guaranteed by the Dominion Government—		
3½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	7,033,561	34,229,996 87
Guaranteed by the Government of Ontario—		
3½% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	1,615,068	7,859,997 59
4% Perpetual Consolidated Deb. Stock	1,866,499	9,083,628 46
The Central Ontario Railway Company—		
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	194,300	945,593 33
The Bay of Quinte Railway Company—		
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds		780,000 00
The Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company—		
4% Perpetual Consolidated Deb. Stock	1,078,843	5,250,369 26
Gt. Northern Ry. of Canada 4% Bonds		3,505,750 00
The Quebec & Lake St. John Ry. Co.—		
4% Perpetual Debenture Stock	895,688	4,359,014 93
The Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway Company—		
4% 1st Mortgage Debenture Stock	1,473,353	7,170,317 93
Less: Collateral Security to Loan	32,670	158,994 00
	1,440,683	7,011,323 93
Duluth, Rainey Lake & Winnipeg Railway—		
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds		$ 2,000,000 00
The Halifax & South Western Railway Company—		
3½% 1st Mortgage Bonds		4,447,000 00
The Niagara, St. Catharines & Toronto Railway Company—		
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds		1,098,000 00
The Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company—		
4% Guaranteed Debenture Stock	£1,037,961.6.0	5,051,411 66
Less: Treasury Stock	6,549.0.0	31,871 80
	1,031,412.6.0	5,019,539 86
Mount Royal Tunnel & Terminal Company, Limited—		
5% 1st Mortgage Bonds	460,000	2,238,666 66
		$125,228,878 41

3.

Liabilities as of June 30, 1917

Capital Stock—Common		$100,000,000 00
Capital Stock—Affiliated Companies	$75,429,500 00	
Less: Held in Treasury	69,482,400 00	
		5,947,100 00
Five per cent Income Charge Convertible Debenture Stock		25,000,000 00
Funded Debt:		
Can. Nor. Ry—Schedule "A"	$162,366,542 20	
Affiliated Cos.—Schedule "B"	125,228,878 41	
		287,595,420 61
Equipment Trust Obligations		14,846,500 00
Demand and Short Term Loans Secured by Collateral		56,829,769 51
Due to Other Companies on Construction Account (Secured)		24,341,882 25
Current Liabilities:		
Pay Rolls	$ 1,996,062 19	
Audited Vouchers and other Floating Liabilities	13,786,946 12	
		15,783,008 31
Coupon and Dividend Warrants Due on 1st July (since paid)	$ 2,275,855 87	
Accrued Interest on Bonds, Loans and Equipment Securities—		
Operating	$2,396,839 80	
Construction	407,024 09	
	2,803,863 89	
		5,079,719 76
Reserves—		
Steamship Replacement Fund	$2,050,033 20	
Equipment Replacement Fund	1,416,756 51	
Insurance Account	638,800 27	
Taxes Accrued	450,000 00	
		4,555,589 98
Affiliated Companies—Advances Account		9,320,714 15
Surplus:		
Land Account	$37,195,355 42	
Railway Account	126,590 66	
		37,321,946 08
		$586,621,650 65

LIGHTHOUSES AND WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the attention of the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries been called to the following press article, relative to experiments made by the British Admiralty with a view to replacing old lighthouses by wireless stations:

ARE LIGHTHOUSES DOOMED?

British Admiralty experiments with what are known as wireless beacons naturally give rise to the question, "Are our lighthouses doomed?" The London Daily News understands that these experiments are believed to have met with success. If the principle of the wireless beacon is accepted by Trinity House, it will, of course, be an untold boon to all coastwise shipping. The number of wrecks will be reduced.

The chief advantages of the wireless beacon is that in any weather, by day or night, in fog or blizzard it can be picked up by a ship fitted with wireless as easily as a lighthouse in clear weather.

Should the wireless beacon replace the lighthouse it would be essential for all ships to be fitted with wireless. In this way the safety of coastwise shipping in all weathers would be enormously increased.

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to investigate this matter?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The experiments now being carried out with a view to utilizing wireless stations as aids to navigation are being carefully watched by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

2. Any developments that appear to be of value will be promptly taken into consideration.

ROYAL CANADIAN ARTILLERY

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make changes in the administration of the Royal Canadian Artillery?

2. If so, where will the headquarters be located?

3. Where have the headquarters of the said Royal Canadian Artillery been located since its foundation?

4. What rank is held by officer in charge of this Corps?

5. What is the name of the officer second in command of this Corps?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The matter is under consideration.

2. The headquarters for administration are at present at Kingston, Ont.

3. From 1871 to 1883 at Kingston; from 1905 to 1914, Quebec; from 1914 to 1917, Halifax; from 1917 to 1919, Ottawa; 1920, Quebec; 1921 to 1922, Kingston.

4. From May 1st, 1905, the rank held was that of Colonel. The Corps is now administered by a Lieutenant-Colonel.

5. There has been no officer designated as second-in-command.

ILLEGAL FISHING IN PRINCE COUNTY

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince):

1. What are the names of the persons who were fined for illegal fishing in the County of Prince, Prince Edward Island, during the years 1920 and 1921?

2. What were the respective amounts of said fines and how many have been paid in full?

3. Were prosecutions brought against any persons and no fines collected?

4. If so, what are the names of said persons?

5. What are the names of the officers who brought the charges?

6. Were any fines or part thereof refunded to said persons?

7. If so, to what persons were refunds made?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

1920

Name	Fine and Action	Name of Officer Laying Compalint	Fines or Portions of Fines Remitted
Irving Ramsay	$ 10.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
P. W. Leard	10.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jno. Profitt	10.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jno. Champion	10.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jno. Bernard	20.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Hebert Fraser	30.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jno. A. Jones	*100.00—Defendant left Province before date of trial	C. R. Palmer	None
Antoine Clements	*100.00—Defendant left Province before date of trial	C. R. Palmer	None
J. J. McDonald	*50.00—Fine not paid. Warrant issued for his arrest	Sgt. Blakney	None
Jos. Ramsay	50.00—Paid in full	Sgt. Blakney	None
Bert Dickey	25.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Jno. A. Gallant	25.00—Owing to extreme poverty Judge allowed defendant to go on suspended sentence	E. P. McCarville	None

* Inspector Gallant states there is nothing further to report in connection with these prosecutions as the whereabouts of the defendants, Messrs. Jones, Clements and McDonald have not been ascertained.

1921

Arsene Perry	$ 1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Alfred Waite	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Michael A. McDonald	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Jno. T. Milligan	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Wm. Hogg	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Edmund Paugh	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Ray Paugh	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Robt. McKinnon	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
G. A. McKinnon	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Solomon Milligan	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
David Milligan	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Jas. Wagner	1.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Alton Vincent	25.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Gabriel Morrsion, Jas. McIntyre	25.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Percy Morrissey	25.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
a Michael Perry	25.00—Sentence suspended	C. R. Palmer	None
Perle MacNeil	25.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jno. C. Matthews	25.00—Paid in full	C. R. Palmer	None
Jos. McInnis	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Augustine McInnis	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Romey Harper	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Charlie Gavin	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Edward Gavin	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Jos. Ramsay	25.00—Given until May, 1922 to pay fine	C. R. Palmer	None
Colin Ramsay	10.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
Percy Morrissey	25.00—Defendant very poor and given time to pay fine. It is hoped by Inspector Gallant to collect this in May or June, 1922	C. R. Palmer	None
Ed. McPherson	10.00—Paid in full	E. P. McCarville	None
b Jas. Fitzgerald	25.00—Payment suspended	E. P. McCarville	None
Chas. Strongman	100.00—Paid in full (Moiety to Jas. Skerry)	*Jas. Skerry	None
Robt. Strongman	100.00—Paid in full (Moiety to Jas. Skerry)	*Jas. Skerry	None

* Not an officer.

a Defendant owns no real estate, is married and has a large family of small children. The collection of this penalty would mean a great hardship to him. Under the circumstances the Justice suspended payment of penalty with a warning that a further infraction would entail collection of it.

b Owing to extenuating circumstances the Judge decided to suspend payment of fine during good behaviour.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

*Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation for uniform daylight saving for the whole of Canada?
2. If not, will the Government through its post offices, customs houses and other federal agencies, adopt hours of daylight saving in municipalities which adopt daylight saving hours?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: It is not the intention of the Government to introduce legislation requiring uniform action in the matter of daylight saving, but the Government in regard to its official service will adapt itself to the determination of each local community.

LONG BRANCH RIFLE RANGE

Mr. CHARTERS:

Is it the intention of the Government or any department thereof, to sell any portion of the property in the township of Toronto, known as the Long Branch Rifle Ranges?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The matter has not yet been considered.

THE RIORDON COMPANY

Mr. KNOX:

What amount, if any, has been collected by the Taxation Department on the notes tendered by the Riordon Company in payment of their taxes?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: None.

GOOD ROADS—ONTARIO

Mr. SIMPSON:

1. What amount of the grant of $20,000,000 made by the Dominion Government, for good roads, has been paid to the legislature of the province of Ontario?
2. What portion of the amount paid to the province of Ontario has been spent on roads north of the Severn river or that portion of the province commonly called Northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. To date the sum of $1,317,508.61 of such grant has been paid to Ontario.

2. The province has not filed for approval under the Federal Highways Act any project for highway construction north of the Severn river. Roads in Northern Ontario are built and, where necessary, maintained by the Colonization Roads Branch of the Ontario Government, which is distinct from the Ontario Highways Branch.

QUESTION STANDING AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. McBRIDE:

What amount of money has been spent by the Federal Government in harbour improvements of all kinds in each of the ports of Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, New Brunswick, Victoria, Vancouver and Prince Rupert, during the years 1900 to 1921, inclusive?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

NEWSPAPER EXTRACTS BARRED FROM QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to the question relating to Lighthouses and Wireless Telegraphs I wish to convey the information to new members of the House that it is not permissible to quote press extracts in questions. In the present case the extract was originally much longer but was reduced by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau). The usages of the House, hon. members will understand, require that extracts from newspapers should be eliminated from questions.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. MARTELL:

For a copy of all letters telegrams, petitions, accounts and all other documents in possession of, or under the control of the Government of Canada, relating to the musical instruments of the 112th Battalion Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Department of Immigration and Colonization or any of its officers or employees, and W. A. Rae, and Mr. Crandall, representing the department, or between said department and any one else relating to the case of Lee Holland and the question of his deportation.

Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec or any of them, since the taking of office of the present Government.

Mr. MARTELL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, Orders in Council and all other documents in the possession of or under the control of the Government, relating to the application or request made for a lease of the lands and premises of "Fort Edward" (so called), in the town of Windsor, Nova Scotia, for a public play ground, or for the right of use of the Windsor Golf and Tennis Club.

Mr. MARTELL:

For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams, memoranda, Orders in Council, and all other documents in the possession of or under the control of the Government, relating to the establishment of a Department of Fisheries for the Dominion of Canada, to be presided over and administered by a Minister of Fisheries and officers independent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between the Departments of Justice and Marine and Fisheries and the Compagnie du Parc St. Charles, Limited.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all petitions, letters, memorandum and other documents in any way referring to negotiations carried on for the last three years between the Government of Canada or any department thereof, and the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, concerning the purchase of said road by the Government.

SIR ROBERT BORDEN

APPOINTMENT TO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE—CORRESPONDENCE

Mr CASGRAIN moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, concerning the appointment of Sir Robert Borden as Canadian representative at the International Conference for the limitation of armaments at Washington. Also a copy of any Orders in Council in this connection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In relation to this motion, I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman would agree, that it be amended by adding after the word "document" the words "and all correspondence passing between officers of the Government and Sir Robert Borden".

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): As the fiscal year is about ended, and we shall be entering immediately upon a new year, it is very desirable that we should have an Interim Supply Bill. I have already communicated with my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and while, of course, until the Estimates were brought down, no arrangement could be made, I would desire that, at the next sitting, the House agree to vote one-fourth of the Estimates. It might be convenient to vote one-fourth of the whole; but if any hon. gentleman would like any particular service reserved, we would be quite willing to discuss and consider the matter. The main point is to obtain the necessary supply for salaries of officials in the different departments of the public service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend will recognize that it is hardly possible for me to say anything to-day as to the attitude that ought to be taken as regards the proposed vote.

Mr. FIELDING: I quite agree to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not had an opportunity of looking at the Estimates; but from the length of time it has taken to prepare them, I judge it will take some time to consider them, and the time between now and Monday would be rather short for that purpose. Perhaps my hon. friend could give me, between now and Monday, new and cogent reasons why interim supply should be voted. I confess to being at a little difficulty in the matter, because, amongst other things, I have very great respect for my hon. friend and for the precedents which he has from time to time set. At the last session of this House, apparently, those precedents which he gave us in the past were wrong and a certain course was adopted, that being a course which said that there ought not to be an interim supply vote; that consent would not be given; that it was a moral wrong to make these large interim votes without proper consideration of the items, and so on, and so forth. Perhaps my hon. friend will be able to show us that the attitude taken last year by the then Opposition was entirely in error, and that he was not free to make a new precedent for us to follow.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend will find that there is no inconsistency between my attitude of last year and my attitude of to-day, but I do not want to discuss that. My right hon. friend is quite right in saying that he should have a reasonable time to consider this matter, but I cannot give him any reason further than that we desire to make provision for the public service chiefly, owing to their not being able to wait until the money is voted. That is the only reason.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid that the same reason obtained last year.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it intended that we adjourn at a quarter to four? Surely we should have some business to go on with. If there is nothing ready, I would suggest that we go back to the debate on the Address, when we could give the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) an opportunity of making the speech promised by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Railways and Canals will make the speech at the appropriate time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Monday is Private Members' day. We will take up the Orders as they appear on the Order Paper, and then, if there is time for some of the Government measures, we will go on with some of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What Government measures?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What Estimates?

Mr. FIELDING: I think, we shall take up, first, Civil Government. If it were important to mention a particular department, I would do so; but, perhaps, the right hon. gentleman will agree that while the votes for civil government are under discussion we shall be free to take up any of the items, with the understanding that if any item is objected to, it will be left over.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

Monday, March 27, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the name of Mr. Boivin was substituted for that of Mr. Kyte on the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I desire to draw the attention of the Government to an article which appears in the press of Canada this morning, evidently despatched by the Canadian Press from London, England. It refers to an article in a British paper of the standing of which I have no knowledge, but inasmuch as the article has doubtless, through the Canadian Press, received very wide circulation—possibly world-wide circulation—and as, in my judgment it is defamatory to the honour of Canada I wish to call it to the attention of the Government and ask what action they propose to take in the matter. The article in question refers to the late arbitration on the value of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and I shall quote a short sentence which reads as follows:

[Mr. Meighen.]

> It is not more than two years since the manipulators of Ottawa, by daring and unscrupulous trickery, befooled this railway organization into an arbitration.

Later it refers to one of the arbitrators, Hon. Mr. Taft, as "a man not likely to be amenable to Canadian political and financial pressure," thereby implying that the Board of Arbitrators was subjected to political and financial pressure in the discharge of an onerous duty. Further on the article says:

> If some Central American country swindled British investors out of not less than $48,000,000 by methods which were used in Canada, we think collision with the Monroe Doctrine might be risked in an effort to do something about it.

Whatever may be thought of the merits or demerits of the policy of acquisition I am sure that all the members of the House—of this House and the last—are agreed that nothing but honourable methods on the part of Canada were adopted as between this country and the British shareholders—nothing but the most honourable and fair methods throughout. A newspaper article defaming individuals may perhaps be lightly treated, but such an article defaming a nation, and circulating throughout the world, is not a matter we can afford wholly to ignore. A Government exercises some supervision over such matters in so far as they may impugn the honour of another country. The British Government has its obligations in this regard, the same as the Government of any country. I have not had the opportunity of mentioning the matter to the Prime Minister, nor to the Government, but I call their attention to it now and ask that they advise us now if possible, if not, later, what they propose to do with regard to this article that has gained such world-wide circulation.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It is a little difficult to know exactly what course it is most advisable to take in regard to newspaper articles, even articles apearing in one's own country, to say nothing of articles appearing in the press of another country. However, I am sure that the remarks of my hon. friend will be quoted abroad, and in so far as they go to indicate that the methods of this country in its transactions have been honourable I wish to associate myself entirely with him. I think that will be sufficient for the present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to say that, although the reading of newspaper extracts on the Orders of the Day is not, strictly

speaking, permissible, yet I am in the judgment of the House in holding it as proper that, on a subject of public importance, especially when the honour of the country is affected, an hon. member may be allowed some latitude in calling the attention of the Government to the matter.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Bill No. 12, respecting The Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company. —Mr. Parent.—

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

GERMAN REPARATIONS

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Has Germany paid to the Allies up to the end of the year 1921, the sum of $1,620,000,000?
2. If so, what proportion, if any, of the said sum has been or will be paid to Canada?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Germany has paid to the Allies to the 30th November, 1921, the sum of 6,424,000,000 gold marks ($1,528,912,000 par of exchange) in cash and by transfer of property; of this sum Great Britain has received 470,000,000 gold marks ($111,860,000 par of exchange), out of which sum £29,500,000 was paid over on account of the British claim for cost of occupation up to 1st May, 1921.

2. The Canadian Government has received from the British Government the sum of $6,314,500 on account of the Canadian cost of the army of occupation. No further payment than this has been received.

BRITISH PREFERENCE GOODS IMPORTED VIA UNITED STATES

Mr. LOGAN:

What was the value of imported goods, subject to British Preferential Tariff, brought into Canada via ports of the United States during the years 1919-20 and 1920-21?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: The Statistical records show the value of goods imported from each country via ports in the United States but do not show the value of goods, subject to British Preferential Tariff, brought into Canada via ports of the United States.

SALES TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. MORRISON:

What amount has been collected each month from the Sales Tax, since its inception?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Statement showing amount collected each month from the Sales Tax since its inception (to 28th February, 1922):

Month	Amount
1920—	
June	$1,906,581.24
July	3,684,718.19
August	4,129,041.60
September	4,916,576.79
October	5,020,474.88
November	4,497,501.66
December	4,202,006.60
1921—	
January	3,276,396.98
February	2,987,297.01
March	3,413,823.36
April	3,014,799.73
May	4,185,920.71
June	4,476,949.67
July	5,416,071.82
August	5,959,828.69
September	5,466,338.47
October	6,075,037.87
November	5,618,056.80
December	5,991,772.35
1922—	
January	5,611,241.80
February	4,472,708.94
	$94,223,145.16

RICHIBUCTO REPAIRS WORKS

Mr. LEGER:

1. Did the Department of Public Works purchase a motor boat during the years from 1911 to 1921, for the use of the foreman on the repair works at the North and South Beaches, Richibucto, Kent County, New Brunswick?
2. If so, is it still owned by the Government, and in whose possession is it at present?
3. Has this boat been disposed of by the Government?
4. If so, to whom and on what date?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes, for use by the district engineer and staff.

2. Yes, still owned by the department.

3 and 4. No. Tenders were called for, but sale was not completed.

COAL ROYALTIES

Mr. KNOX:

What is the amount of the coal royalties collected by the Dominion Government in each of the fiscal years from April 1st, 1906, to March 31st, 1921?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

DOMINION LANDS

1st April, 1906, to 1st April, 1907	$ 4,456 80
1st April, 1907, to 1st April, 1908	9,169 35
1st April, 1908, to 1st April, 1909	6,052 23
1st April, 1909, to 1st April, 1910	155,371 86
1st April, 1910, to 1st April, 1911	221,246 12
1st April, 1911, to 1st April, 1912	107,322 07
1st April, 1912, to 1st April, 1913	147,219 57
1st April, 1913, to 1st April, 1914	149,341 53
1st April, 1914, to 1st April, 1915	106,374 73
1st April, 1915, to 1st April, 1916	69,800 29
1st April, 1916, to 1st April, 1917	151,684 82
1st April, 1917, to 1st April, 1918	148,687 30
1st April, 1918, to 1st April, 1919	178,880 71
1st April, 1919, to 1st April, 1920	184,215 12
1st April, 1920, to 1st April, 1921	193,249 21
Total	$1,833,071 71

SCHOOL LANDS

	Saskatchewan	Alberta
1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907	$ 299 50	$ 58 50
1st April, 1907, to 31st March, 1908	358 40	192 40
1st April, 1908, to 31st March, 1909	459 55	356 03
1st April, 1909, to 31st March, 1910	320 10	19,424 99
1st April, 1910, to 31st March, 1911	1,115 75	7,955 01
1st April, 1911, to 31st March, 1912	680 50	1,156 10
1st April, 1912, to 31st March, 1913	827 57	3,811 71
1st April, 1913, to 31st March, 1914	787 45	4,877 87
1st April, 1914, to 31st March, 1915	712 71	1,051 20
1st April, 1915, to 31st March, 1916	736 27	2,793 44
1st April, 1916, to 31st March, 1917	1,919 20	2,275 65
1st April, 1917, to 31st March, 1918	1,574 05	26,122 25
1st April, 1918, to 31st March, 1919	564 24	18,857 04
1st April, 1919, to 31st March, 1920	1,370 37	19,133 83
1st April, 1920, to 31st March, 1921	4,370 83	40,800 26
1st April, 1921, to 31st Dec., 1921	4,964 05	13,442 84
	$21,060 54	$162,759 12

Saskatchewan	$ 21,060 54
Alberta	162,759 12
	$183,819 66

RURAL AND URBAN POPULATION

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain):

1. What are the figures, by Provinces, for the rural and urban population of the Dominion of Canada, as shown by the last census?
2. What were these figures in 1911?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Final figures of 1921 census classification as rural and urban not yet available.
2. Rural population in 1911, 3,925,679; Urban, 3,280,964.

DOMINION LANDS—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain):

1. What is the total acreage and value of lands sold by the Dominion Government in Saskatchewan from September 1st, 1905, to December 31st, 1921?
2. What is the total acreage and value of lands sold by the Dominion Government in Alberta from September 1st, 1905, to December 31st, 1921?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

As school lands sales are not in the same class as other sales, the money collected being held in trust for the provinces, they are shown separately in the following statement:

	Province	Area Sold	Approximate value
1.	Saskatchewan	5,538,878	$16,619,107
	School Lands Sales "	1,457,274	26,967,218
2.	Alberta	3,944,318	11,773,264
	School Lands Sales "	954,082	13,204,209

MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue the services of the Mounted Police in the different Provinces of Canada?
2. If so, when?
3. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The reorganization of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be fully considered when Bill No. 15, an Act respecting the Department of National Defence, becomes law.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. MANION:

1. Has the Committee appointed to report upon the St. Lawrence Great Lakes Canal made a report to the Government?
2. If so, has this report been tabled?
3. Will said report be printed and distributed to the members?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The report referred to I have just presented and laid on the Table.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. It is entirely for the House to say if it wishes to have this report printed. It is rather a bulky report, and would be expensive to print. In the meantime I have asked the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs to distribute to members of both Houses copies of the report as printed by the Government of the United States. Through the courtesy of the United States government copies of the report as printed at Washington have been obtained in numbers sufficient to supply hon. members of both Houses. If the House wishes to have further copies printed, all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are enough copies of the report for members of both Houses?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents in any way referring to the superannuation of John C. McQuarrie, section foreman at West Bay Road, Inverness County.

Mr. HANSON:

For a return showing the names of all persons dismissed from the Sorel Shipyards since the 29th of December, 1921, together with the cause of dismissal in each case. Also showing the names of all persons taken on at the said shipyards during the same period, showing the cause for employment of each person.

Mr. MARTELL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, memoranda, informations and warrants, minutes of evidence and convictions, and all other Court proceedings relating or in anywise appertaining to the trial and conviction of Clyde Heath and Gurney Young of Tancook, Nova Scotia, for a violation of the Migratory Birds Convention Act. Also a copy of the Order in Council dated on or about the 19th day of November, 1921, authorizing and empowering the remission of all fines and forfeitures occasioned by the conviction of said Clyde Heath and Gurney Young.

QUEBEC FISHERIES

On the Order:

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of the correspondence and all other documents, regarding the transfer of fisheries to the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see no reason why this notice should appear among the Notices of Motion. I think it should appear among the Orders as a notice of motion for the production of papers. And I see no reason why it should not pass.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) desires to speak on this motion—at least so he told me—and I desire to speak also.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It may stand until Wednesday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I will not raise any objections.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And perhaps my hon. friend desires to speak to it.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Memorandum laid before the House on March 23rd instant, regarding the Re-establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

He said: When the memorandum referred to in the motion was brought before the Government the first minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) intimated that every expedition would be given to the request to have this matter taken up and possibly referred to the Committee on Agriculture. This suggestion seems to meet the wishes of the Council of Agriculture, but they made a request that the matter be expedited in every possible way, and we are proceeding to comply with that request.

Mr. CRERAR: I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), or the Government, if it is the intention that the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture will take this matter up and press it immediately that committee gets to work.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did my hon. friend ask if it was the intention of the Government to request the Committee on Agriculture to proceed immediately to consider this matter?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish to delay the carrying of this motion, but I do not want to waive a right. It seems to me that notice must be given to the House that it shall go into committee on the motion. I am quite willing to have the rule waived in this case, as, indeed, I am in favour of having the motion carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that notice of this motion was given in the Votes and Proceedings under rule 40.

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. FIELDING: In accordance with an intimation previously given, I desire to move now this resolution on which will be based an Interim Supply Bill covering one-quarter of the present Estimates:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $76,499,-371.88, being one-fourth of the amount of each of the several items to be voted as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1923, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of Parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1923.

I am asking for one-quarter, which will cover Supply for three months. In some cases only one-sixth has been taken; and if my hon. friends opposite prefer that the Interim Supply be limited to one-sixth, I shall have no objection; but we shall be making, as it were, two bites of a cherry. The time is not far distant when we shall have to have a second motion, and if it be agreeable, I shall take one-fourth. At a previous sitting, there was some discussion as to the procedure as regards this matter; but I think there will be a rather general recognition of the propriety of the motion, so I assume that it will go through without opposition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid I am very much where I was the other day. The only difficulty in connection with this matter is my hon. friend himself, his hon. leader, (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his party. We had an idea that the King's business had to be carried on in a particular way, and one of the ways which, as we then thought, were necessary, was this very question of interim supply. When the matter was under discussion the other day, I told my hon. friend that he could possibly remove a good many objections which we might have to this matter, if he would indicate wherein he was wrong last year and whether or not the practice which, as we pointed out last year, had obtained from time—well it is not immemorial, because we have not had a Parliament for that length of time, but practically from time immemorial, so far as Parliament is concerned—was wrong and whether the practice insisted on last year was right; whether it is wrong, immoral and improper to do this sort of thing or whether, for the purpose of obtaining campaign literature, it was thought to be a good thing to force a government, that required this interim supply to carry on the public service, to employ the closure. If the latter be the reason, we are not following my hon. friend in any of those tactics. If it be right that the public business should go on—and we used to think that it was—and the real motive of last year was something along the line which I have described, there will be no difficulty this year, because what the Opposition wants to do is to see the public business carried on. I desire, however, to point out to my hon. friend that last Friday he stated that his position then and his position now were not at all contradictory. If my hon. friend's position is: Last year, because the House had had ample opportunity to consider the Estimates, and did consider them, and knew something about them, it was a wrong thing to pass interim supply; and this year, because the Estimates have not yet been reached and we have not yet considered them, this proposal of interim supply is proper—if that be the position, my hon. friend is not inconsistent. But I desire to point out to the House that last year on the 8th of March the Estimates were tabled, and on the 15th of March we started going into committee on the Estimates. We were in committee on the Estimates practically all the time from then on until the 7th of April when this question of interim supply was brought up, with the result that we could receive no accommodation. On the 13th of April the item was passed after a good deal of discussion and after several rather heated arguments as to the way in which supply was being blocked by the then Opposition. Last year, the interim supply vote was put through

only on the 13th of April, so that every opportunity was given to the House to go into the Estimates, and every member knew exactly what the Estimates were and what they meant. No attempt was made to rush the House. On the other hand, the then Opposition refused to accommodate the government in the conduct of public business after having had full six weeks' time for consideration of the Estimates and of the demands which the government were putting forward. I have pointed out that there is a great deal of difference between the attitude then taken by my hon. friend and the attitude which is being taken to-day. My hon. friend's attitude of last year is really the chief point of difficulty which we have on this side of the House as regards giving consent. It may be that my hon. friend believes he is consistent because he thinks, with a ministry which is blessed and honoured by his presence, he has the absolute right of interim supply without delay, whereas, on the other hand, any other ministry is to be denied it. If consistency be advanced on that ground, I entirely agree with my hon. friend, but I hardly think he is going to advance that. I invited an explanation before our consent was further asked, but my hon. friend has given no explanation. He says that the business of the country requires this vote. Last year he held the view that the business of the country was requiring too many votes; that there was too much business. If volume of business to be done with the burdens that were then upon the country, many of which burdens have since disappeared, and if urgency and pressure constituted the real reasons, there would have been no trouble with my hon. friend giving consent to interim supply last year. We realize that business has to be carried on, but our difficulty is to square what my hon. friend is doing this year with what was declared to be a settled policy of his party last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If what my hon. friend says is correct, I do not think there should be the slightest difficulty in our coming to an arrangement. The position taken by the Opposition last year was that the Government should not try to force the Estimates through the House of Commons by closure, and that there should be no attempt to pass a one-sixth vote without any opportunity of conference between the two sides of the House. The whole point was that a conference between the Government and the Opposition should be held before the House was asked to vote an interim supply; the Opposition were quite willing after a conference to give the Government whatever was needed to carry on the business of the country. I have by me the remarks I made in the House last year, and I may quote from them for the benefit of my hon. friend. Speaking on April 12 in reference to a statement made on April 7 I said:

> I pointed out at that time that we of the Opposition had no desire to embarrass the Government in the matter of any amount which might be necessary to pay salaries and wages, and, indeed, to carry on the public service to the extent that might be absolutely necessary. I pointed out that it was customary, when interim supply was desired, for a conference to be held between both sides of the House, and I left the door open very wide to hon. gentlemen opposite to meet the Opposition in a friendly and courteous way in that connection.

Elsewhere in the course of my remarks on April 7 I said:

> But in taking this stand we have no desire in any way to embarrass or penalize the Civil Service because of any neglect on the part of the Government. We will be perfectly willing to consider any arrangement with a view of providing what may be necessary in the way of salaries both for the inside and outside services. As respects other expenditures, however, we contend that except as agreed upon, this Parliament should have the full right of examining in the closest detail every item of the Estimates before voting any portion of them.

I said further in conclusion:

> May I repeat, in a word, the position which we take? We are ready at any time to meet hon. gentlemen opposite in conference, to agree to give them what is necessary in the way of meeting salaries and wages for employees of the public service. We are prepared to go further and to give them what is needed to carry on the public service of this country in a manner which will not embarrass public business, which will help to maintain the good faith of the Government, and its credit, which will enable the Government to carry out commitments to which my hon. friend has referred; but this must be as a result of a conference between both sides of this House, surrounding whatever may be granted with such conditions as, in the public interest, seem to be absolutely necessary at the present time.

That was our position, and if my hon. friends opposite will take the same attitude on this occasion there should not be the slightest difficulty in our coming to an agreement as to what portion of the Estimates are to be permitted to pass as an Interim Supply. We are asking of our friends opposite nothing more than we when in Opposition, were prepared, to concede to the Government of the day. I may, however, point out to my hon friend this circumstance, which I think is an important

consideration: The Government of the day fixed the time at which the general elections should be held. The date was fixed as December 6. As a consequence it was not humanly possible for the present Government to prepare the business of Parliament in shorter order than we have despatched it. I might also remind my hon. friends that when we were discussing the question of the Interim Supply last year, the Government of the day had not at the time brought down the Auditor General's report in full. We, on this side, laid the Auditor General's report in full on the Table of the House the very day the House opened.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Volume 4 is missing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was under the impression that all the volumes were brought down; volume 4 was the only volume then, that was not brought down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Volume 4 is the only important one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend has what he wants. However, all we ask is that hon. gentlemen opposite shall not embarrass the public service; and if they prefer a conference before we press for this Interim Supply, we are ready to meet them and discuss matters, and withhold any part of the Estimates which they would like to have reserved for further consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister, on this question, is in the fortunate position, in which he will often find himself in the House, of being able to quote himself on either side of the question, whichever happens for the time being to be the side that he wishes to advance. It is true that last session, after the motion was introduced for one-sixth of the Estimates to be voted in bulk, the Opposition took the stand that there should be a conference between themselves and the Government, and that they were ready to confer on the question as to the voting of salaries to the civil servants. That was the first proposal, after the introduction of the motion for one-sixth of the Estimates: But the session before, the leader of the Opposition peremptorily notified Parliament that in the session to come, namely, last session, the Opposition would unconditionally oppose all bulk Estimates, whether a quarter, a sixth, or any other proportion. No conditions whatever were attached; we were simply notified that that was the last of bulk Estimates that were to go through this Parliament except over the heads of, and by closure on, Opposition. Well, in the face of that notification, would it have been courteous for us to have gone to the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and ask him whether he had recanted? We did not feel that that would be complimentary to the hon. gentleman, and we did not do it. We did him the honour of taking him at his word. I have this quotation from the speech the hon. gentleman made the year before. We introduced our Estimates and submitted them to Parliament; and we were told—not the day that we brought down our Estimates, not before a single member of the House knew anything about what the Government was going to request, not before a single item of the Estimates had been considered, but a month after they had been presented to the House, and after Parliament had had an opportunity to consider them for days and weeks together—we were told that we should have a conference with the Opposition and that they would be ready to vote salaries so that the civil servants might not go without their pay. That was the second position the Opposition took. Well, it was pointed out that if salaries were voted, and there was no money to work with, there would not be much use in keeping the civil servants employed. The Opposition were pledging their willingness to allow the officers of the Pension Board and all the staff to be paid their salaries, but they were taking the position that no pensions should be paid. They were willing, for example, to support the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and pay the thousands of men and women employed therein, but they were not willing that any soldier settlers should get help. When that was pointed out the Opposition changed their attitude. They shifted their position and said: Well, we will let the salaries go through, and if you will confer with us we will let the necessary services be voted. The Government then took the stand that the Opposition had had the Estimates before them for at least five weeks. It was then, not the 27th of March but the 7th or 8th day of April, eight days after the fiscal year had closed; and we said that, having had the Estimates before them for that length of time, if they could show us any items that should be reserved, as respects which they thought the one-sixth should not apply, we would confer with them on any one of those. Now that seemed to me to be reason

able last year, and it seems to me to be reasonable to-day. But what is the circumstance this year? The Government introduced the Estimates one day and now, on the next day, they demand one-sixth. They said: We will let you study the Estimates over Sunday and we will be back on Monday, when we want this portion voted. How different hon. gentlemen are to-day from what they were a year ago. No; what they wanted a year ago was merely to be able to go to the country and say that the Government had forced its hand into the Treasury and extracted millions of money, using in this House the power of the closure, so that the Opposition, representing the people, were not given a chance to discuss the votes.

They declared. "We were broken through, overcome by closure, the voice of the people was stifled and the money taken from the Treasury." That was all they were asking for a year ago, and that they got, and hon. gentlemen to my left and the people they represent listened to the tale of woe about the extortion of money by closure. The actual circumstances were simply the circumstances I have just disclosed. All manner of time was given for discussion.

Now I do say this. The last thing I want to do is to imitate the tactics of the Opposition last year. But I want to discharge as best I can the duties that now appertain to me as leader of the Opposition. I do not think we know enough about these Estimates to vote in bulk at all; I do not think it is necessary yet to vote them in bulk. We did not take the vote last year till 13th April. The payments made at the end of March can be taken out of the Estimates passed last year. The next payments will be coming due about the 15th April, and I say we ought to know more about the Estimates—we ought especially to be able to go over them carefully and see whether there are not items that should be exempted from this bulk vote—before we are asked to vote it to-day.

Furthermore, we ought to have information not only as to what the Estimates were last year, but what amount was spent last year. The Government have sought in bringing down these Estimates—which, anyone who knows the slightest thing about public affairs would easily understand would necessarily be very much smaller than last year's Estimates—to convey the impression that the axe has been unmercifully wielded and that the people of this country, as a consequence of the economy of hon. gentlemen opposite, are going to save all sorts of money in taxation. They compare the main Estimates this year with the whole Estimates last year, and forget to advise the public that there will be Supplementaries this year the same as last. The fact of the matter is that, notwithstanding we are a year farther away from the war, notwithstanding the fact that all war services are necessarily and rightly contracting, and have been contracting every year since the war, we are asked to vote main Estimates this year amounting to fifty million dollars more, I do not doubt, than the whole expenditure of last year.

Comparing the main Estimates this year with the main Estimates last year there is a difference of $113,000,000. Of that $113,000,000 difference $81,000,000 odd is made up of advances necessarily made last year on account of the Canadian National railway betterments, because we had just taken over one great system and had to vote $89,000,000 to put it in shape. The advances made last year for the railways of this country are not needed this year, for the most obvious reason in the world,—that last year the railways of this country were put into condition which was necessary in order that the people might get from the system the service they were entitled to. Instead of $50,000,000 being required this year on account of the Canadian National railway only $42,800,000 is required; the Canadian National railways are showing improvement; these railways that, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, had brought the country to the brink of ruin so that they had to come in and arrest the hand of nationalization,—yes, force back the hand of nationalization— in order to save this nation from bankruptcy and despair. The railways are showing improvement. The Grand Trunk last year, having just been taken over, required $89,687,633, not for a year, mark you, but for a year and a quarter, because the moneys voted for the railways last year covered fifteen months from January 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922. They took care as well of the Grand Trunk on its being taken over at a time when there were large outstanding obligations that had to be provided for if the railway was to stand up at all. Necessarily that $89,000,000 is not required this year; the vote for that system therefore is only $25,750,000. The Grand Trunk Pacific, which also had been taken over just the year before, required last year $26,000,000 in assistance. This year the vote is $15,900,000. There is no individual in Canada who in honesty of mind, would attribute for a moment any intention to

economize on the part of a government in relation to advances to assist, when those advances, having been made, are necessarily not required to be made again. That accounts for $81,237,000.

Then there is the Soldier Settlement Board. I wonder if the Government are economizing with the soldier settlers. Last year the vote was $35,017,000, and this year it is $12,000,000, a difference of $23,017,000. That can hardly be attributed to economy. It is because of the fact that we took care of the soldiers when they returned, obviating the necessity of taking care of them later on and having them look after themselves in the meantime. I do not at the moment question that the vote asked for this year will be sufficient to take care of the situation. Indeed, it turns out that of the $35,017,000 voted last year, something less than $12,000,000 was required, because large sums of money came in from the soldiers themselves and took care of a large amount of what was required.

Then also, as we recede from the war the number of men to be taken care of in the Government institutions naturally diminishes, and as it diminishes the requirements of the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment decline. Last year's vote was very many millions—I do not know the exact figure—less than the year before. This year the vote is $4,956,500 less than last year, and that can be saved, I do not doubt at all, without very much necessity of the economical pruning knife of the Minister of Finance. The vote last year, I understand, was $21,000,000 less than the vote of the preceding year, and this year the decrease is $4,956,500.

The housing appropriation, which is not spent, but merely loaned to provincial governments, naturally goes down as we recede from the war and war conditions. The decrease there is $2,449,920. It is not a matter of economy in the slightest degree. Those items account for $111,660,000 of the $113,626,000.

The shipbuilding programme brought down in 1919, and never added to since, was completed altogether, I am inclined to think, or within a few dollars. I do not know that it will be suggested that it is an exercise of very great wisdom not to build the ships over again. They are built already. The money does not need to be spent over again. That accounts for $10,000,000 odd. So, aside from those items to which the word "economy" has no application whatever, the Government is $8,000,000 over the Estimates of last year, and is approximating $50,000,000 over the expenditure of last year all told.

That is an outline of the situation. Consequently, the argument advanced last year that, the expenditure being more than was required ten years before they could not be asked to give the same liberal consideration to a vote on a bulk estimate, has no application whatever. Indeed, it turns against hon. gentlemen opposite, for in every respect in which economy can be exercised to public advantage hon. gentlemen opposite are already $8,000,000 and more over the vote of last year.

I notice a decrease of $235,906 in the vote for the Imperial War Graves Commission. That is accounted for, of course, by the fact that the war graves have been attended to and do not require to be attended to twice over. I do not presume that hon. gentlemen would claim to exercise economy in attending to the graves of our soldiers. It is simply a matter of the work having been done and not requiring to be done again.

Again, last year a vote of $500,000 was required under the Canada Temperance Act for taking the vote in Ontario. That is not required this year. A vote of $500,000 was taken as well last year for the Battlefields Memorial. That is not necessary this year. So the Government, if we leave out those items as to which the word "economy" has no application whatever, is $10,000,000 over last year's main Estimates, with the supplementary Estimates still to come, and approximately $50,000,000 over last year's actual expenditure.

That is a summary of the position today. Consequently it behooves the Opposition, it behooves the supporters of the Government as well, to see to it that these Estimates are scrupulously proven, and before we vote any Estimates in bulk we ought to at least have a sufficient opportunity to go over the votes one by one and make up our minds whether or not there are items as respects which the bulk vote should not apply. That is all I asked of the Opposition last year; but they were not satisfied. Nothing could exceed the unreasonableness of the attitude they took—except perhaps the representations, or rather the misrepresentations they made in the course of the campaign. I do not want to follow their example; but I do ask that this vote stand for a few days, at all events, in order that we may have an opportunity to go over the Estimates

with care, and then to confer with the Government concerning such items as in our opinion should be exempt from the bulk vote we are asked to pass.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, I am much more interested in getting this appropriation made in the proper way than I am in reviving the discussion of last year. But I am surprised that my right hon. friend has deemed it expedient to enter at this stage into a general discussion of the Estimates. He says we have been claiming great economy. When? Where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the press.

Mr. FIELDING: Not a single word. We brought down the Estimates and laid them on the table; no member of the Government said a single word about them. My right hon. friend seems to have got the notion that the people may themselves see something in the direction of economy. I hope they will, but if they do, it will have to be of their own motion; it will not be due to anything that has been said by any member of the Government. My right hon. friend has invented, as it were, a boast of economy, for we have been absolutely silent on the subject.

The right hon. gentleman says also that we have brought down the Estimates in such a way as to make a comparison with those of last year. Have we not brought them down in the usual form? He also says that the supplementary Estimates have to come. That is true, but has it not been so every year? In what other form could the Estimates have been brought down, so far as comparison is concerned, than that in which they are set out in this blue book? My right hon. friend implies that we have been making exceptional claims for economy. He is drawing upon his imagination. He is alarmed by the thought that the people may on their own account see that there is economy; therefore, he feels it necesary to warn them that there is none.

Mr. Chairman, we have no desire to press these Estimates. The vital difference between the position to-day and that of last year is, as has been stated by the Prime Minister, that the Estimates last year should not have been pressed before the House as they were without a proper conference. I have under my hand correspondence which I have had with my esteemed friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). Even before the present Estimates were brought down, I wrote to him, informed him of our intention, and said I wanted his co-operation. I intimated that while it might be convenient to have a general vote—one-quarter of the whole, or one-sixth, as he might prefer—if hon. members wanted to reserve any portion of the Estimates we were quite ready to do so. There will be no closure in this matter, Mr. Chairman; this vote will be given freely and voluntarily or not at all. If my right hon. friend is trying to lay some plans whereby he may force us to bring on the closure, I tell him at once that his effort will fail. Closure is necessary, in a measure, I suppose, in some things, but it is not the desire of this Government to use it in a case like this. If hon. gentlemen opposite want these Estimates delayed for a few days, I am willing that it shall be so. The leader of the Opposition has said that he has had no time to examine them. Well, he has made quite a criticism of them; if he has not had time to examine them, I do not know where he got the amazing amount of information he had to-day, be it correct or not.

As I have said, my great desire is to have this appropriation made in a fair and proper way; it wil be done that way or not at all. My right hon. friend says he wants the matter delayed for a few days; I at once agree to that. My only desire is to provide for the urgent and pressing needs of the public service. If my hon. friends opposite, now or later, stand in the way of those needs being met, they will have to take the responsibility for doing so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I desire to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his frankness and his fairness. He says he has made no claim for economy. That is right, and he could not fairly have done so. But many claims have been made for him —made to such an extent, indeed, that my hon. friend's own statement, strong as it is, and respected as he himself is, would seem to be unnecessary on the present occasion. He has many influences working for him, and they have been working very well indeed. The claim of economy certainly came from somewhere—a statment to the press making claims for economies amounting, if I remember rightly, to twenty-three per cent in respect of the main Estimates. However, my hon. friend now agrees that there is no claim to be made for economies.

Mr. FIELDING: Not that there is no claim to be made, but that none has been made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good: and perhaps he had better not make any such claim. Here is really one of the reasons why there should be a little delay in order that careful examination of the Estimates may be made. I have been able to give a little more time to the Estimates than my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), and I find that last year the main Estimates amounted to $582,000,000; this year they are $466,983,000 a reduction of $115,079,000. I agree with what the Minister of Finance says as to the procedure in presenting the Estimates; he followed the ordinary course. But for the purpose of comparing votes with votes the usual thing is to look at your main Estimates. There is, as I have pointed out, a reduction of $115,000,000 in those Estimates. But I want to point out that in the railway vote, item 112 of the Estimates, there is a saving of $1,417,000; in the Canadian Northern vote a saving of $7,200,000; Grand Trunk, $63,900,000; Grand Trunk Pacific, $10,100,000, —a total saving of $82,655,627 on railway account alone. Most of this will be found to have reference to construction and betterments which have been carried out; and whether or not the present alleged economies will prove to be ex-

4 p.m.

travagances, I do not know. It is an indication, however, of the fact that the railway property is in a very much better condition to-day than it was. My leader has pointed out the position with reference to the Grand Trunk. Why, Mr. Chairman, there were millions of dollars of deferred claims which had to be got rid of, and when they were paid off they ceased to be annual charges; they were eliminated for all time. So we have in the railway vote a saving of over $82,000,000. Then there is a reduction of $8,330,000 in the shipbuilding items. I am referring to things which are largely outside the sphere of administration by the present Government, items which cannot result from any action taken by them. In the interest on public debt there is a reduction of $2,229,393, the result of the cancellation of bonds purchased by the late committee that was looking after the stabilization of war bonds. We cancelled, if I remember rightly, some $97,000,000 worth of outstanding bonds. Now, the total of the items I have mentioned, including the figures with respect to soldier land settlement and soldiers' civil re-establishment, referred to by my hon. leader, and including also items with respect to Canada Temperance Act, loans to provinces, and war graves, is $124,339,346.

[Mr. Fielding.]

These items, as I have pointed out, have little if anything to do with the cost of government administration proper; they relate to projects that had previously been carried or to liabilities that had previously been met. Of course, I do not know the last state of the accounts; the Minister of Finance knows that. But I want to point out one of the reasons why we ought to consider carefully these Estimates. Down to the 20th of this month, when the last statement was issued, the total amount spent out of the consolidated fund amounted to $307,000,000. Of course it is true the financial year has not yet expired, but the late government did not run above that amount. On the other hand we have requisitions here to the amount of $466,000,000 in the main Estimates. It is true that my hon. friend opposite has a right to set up other claims, although that used not to be done. For example last year, down to 20th March, under the accounting practices of governments of the past, there was a surplus—that surplus representing the difference between Consolidated Fund receipts and Consolidated Fund payments,—of $53,991,334. We adopted the process of writing off investments which cannot be looked upon as active. Payments therefore on their account cannot be deducted from the debt. For example, railway investments and the Quebec harbour investment have been regarded as unremunerative; but the fact remains that even if we take all the public works capital, all the railway capital, all the investments in railways and in the Quebec harbour, and the cost of the few items that still remain of the war, the whole payments down to 20th March last, only amount to $372,000,000. But here, in the face of a claim for a reduction of $138,000,000 in the Estimates, we have estimates calling for a total expenditure of $466,000,000, and if the railway guarantees given during the year as of March 20th, of $50,000,000 are added to the total expenditure for the year down to March 20th, would stand at $422,889,000. I do not think we are at all unreasonable in our demands under the circumstances. We now find ourselves in this situation. The Government have brought down estimates showing a saving of $138,000,000 and yet their total costs of operation down to the 20th of March, as nearly as I can make out amount to $422,889,000. Nevertheless in the face of that enormous paper saving the Government requires a substantially larger vote than the whole of last year's

expenditure. I quite understand the dilemma in which the Minister of Finance finds himself. Of course he is not going to put the closure through. How could he do that in the face of his actions of last year? My hon. friends opposite last year said the asking of an interim vote was iniquitous. They did not care then whether the King's government went on or not; they did not care whether wages were paid or not. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says the responsibility is ours to-day, but he is not going to apply the closure. So far as we are concerned, we want to see the public business properly carried on; but we must have time to look into and consider these little things. If my hon. friend says now he is perfectly willing to consider the Estimates with us and have a conference we are perfectly willing to go into a conference with him.

Mr. FIELDING: I have been trying to ascertain to my own satisfaction what was the point in my hon. friend's remarks, and I think I have discovered it. Apparently he is aiming to show, by reference to the expenditure down to 20th March,—I hope he is correct—that when he came into this House the last session he brought forth estimates which were absolutely preposterous and did not represent the probable expenditure of the country. That is the only conclusion to be drawn from my hon friend's remarks. Let me, however, warn him that the expenditures down to 20th March are not to be judged the total expenditures for the year. He knows that in any business transaction when you are cleaning up accounts your expenditures are likely to take on a most serious form. My hon. friend can take to himself any credit that he wants to take to-day as to his economy last year; but he can only establish his economy of last year by proving that the Estimates of a year ago were so preposterous that the Liberal Opposition were well justified in objecting to them. However, it is understood this resolution will remain for further consideration.

Resolution stands.

SUPPLY

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, $30,820.

Mr. CRERAR: Where is that item?

The CHAIRMAN: Item 29, and the details will be found on page 113 of the Estimates.

Mr. STEVENS: We would like to have those details read, so that the item can be considered.

The CHAIRMAN:

Deputy Minister	$6,000
Assistant Deputy Minister and Secretary	5,000
Supervisor of expenditures	5,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why this increase of $500 in the salary of the Supervisor of Expenditures?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment): When the services of officials are recognized by the deputy minister as being very satisfactory, an increase is granted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has not been reading the Civil Service Act. These increases are under the Civil Service Commission, and follow a certain course, as recommended by the Commission. I do not know who the supervisor is, but I know of no rule where salaries go up $500 at a bound—that is salaries of the class of those higher officials of the department.

Mr. BELAND: I do not personally know the Supervisor of Expenditures. I know him by name only. I understand his services are extremely valuable, and he has been of the very greatest service to the department. He was thoroughly conversant with the very important work of supervising an expenditure of over $40,000,000, and I assume that, for such services as he rendered the department, a salary of $5,000 would not be considered excessive. I have not the details of the matter at the moment. If I had I might be able to give the hon. gentleman all the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not question the ability of the holder of the office. I presume the hon. minister is right in his description of the man, because the gentleman was carefully selected and appointed by the late government.

Mr. FIELDING: Do not hold that against him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not now within the province of the Minister to say that this salary or that salary should go to this or that officer. Under the present system that is subject to the supervision of the Civil Service Commission, and I want to know how that system works out to give this officer an increase of $500.

Mr. MICHAUD: I would ask the hon. minister who has charge of this estimate to move down towards this part of the House, so that we would understand what is going on. At the moment we are unable to follow the debate.

Mr. BELAND: I think I will make the hon. gentleman hear me, without moving any nearer to him. If my hon. friend will put up with me for a few moments, perhaps I can satisfy him entirely.

Mr. SHEARD: I would also re-echo the statements which have been made—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder, louder.

Mr. SHEARD: Well, all right, you will hear what I have to say, and much comfort may it bring to you. Here is an estimate providing for an increase of $500 to an official. I want to be assured by the hon. minister that that $500 is strictly in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission, and I do not propose to vote that money until the minister can give us that assurance. We have worked out all the details of the arrangement of the Civil Service, we have scheduled the salaries, and we want to know as to any additions to salaries, if they are in accordance with those schedules and with the provision of the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I could help the minitser in this regard, and I am surprised he has not learned the facts. I have never had the department under my charge, but I am advised the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is not under the Civil Service Commission, nor under the act.

Mr. BELAND: I am aware of all that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presumed it was, but I find it is not.

Mr. BELAND: The increase was granted to this gentleman because of his important and very able services in the control of a very large expenditure.

Mr. STEVENS: Here is a department which is being reduced. A large number have been laid off during the past year because of the falling off in employment in the department. The Estimates show that the expenditures this year will be much less than last year and there is a continual reduction in work, in the number of employees and in the amount of expenditure, and yet there is an increase of $500 to the Supervisor of Expenditure; the less work he does the more he is paid—is that the principle?

Mr. CHAPLIN: And furthermore, I notice that a number of the smaller officers have been let off while all the big fellows have been kept on. If the organization is dying why not lop off some of the larger-salaried men?

Mr. BELAND: None of the officials to whom the hon. member refers can be dispensed with at this time.

Mr. MEWBURN: I do not know if this is an appropriate time, but I would like to call attention to a matter, so that if possible some early action may be taken in regard to it. I do not want to see the vote for Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment cut down in a way which will cause our soldiers to suffer in any way. But I should like to call the minister's attention to a suggestion, which is in no way a criticism, and I would urge the Government to take into serious consideration. Suggestions have been made and during the last election, I think, the Prime Minister, members of the present Government, and hon. members who ran in the interest of the present Government, made many promises to the returned soldiers. One matter, that is very close to my heart, and, I believe, close to the heart of every hon. member, is the problem cases which we have to deal with throughout this country. I believe it has been suggested that another committee of the House, similar to that which sat during the last two sessions, be continued again this year. That may or may not be necessary. We know the great care which that committee of which the minister (Mr. Beland) was an honoured member, devoted to the various problems that came before it. I have, however, a suggestion to make which, I think, might meet the situation more expeditiously, instead of months and, perhaps, almost a whole year being wasted before the problem cases can be reached and dealt with. I would respectfully suggest that the Government appoint, if necessary, a royal commission, composed of either four or five members, one being a very highly experienced medical man,—preferably one who has served overseas—another a business man who has sympathy with the returned soldier, and two returned soldiers; that they visit all the large centres of this Dominion, and that the visit of this commission to any large centre be advertised, perhaps two weeks in advance, so that all problem cases will have an opportunity of being heard. Those men should be compelled, prior to coming before the commission, to send in their names and full particulars, so that the members of the commission may have before them at the time the proper files relating to his service. We all

know that there are hundreds of problem cases throughout the Dominion. It is well known that during demobilization the great anxiety of the men was to get their discharge as quickly as possible, and in hundreds of cases men discharged as one hundred per cent fit, are now suffering from disease contracted as a result of war service. It is unfair simply to have a parliamentary committee sitting at Ottawa, for many of these cases cannot be heard by such a committee. I believe a large number of our problem cases could be satisfactorily dealt with if this commission of which I have spoken could go through Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific and allow these men to come face to face before it, and, if necessary, to have a medical examination by the medical officer on the board. I would even go so far as to give the commission power to meet these urgent cases that come before it. I know that in the last Parliament, hardly a day passed when some poor unfortunate man did not have to come before one of the representatives of the Government or a member of Parliament to try to get his case heard. The Pension Commissioners are not to blame; they are tied down by hard and fast regulations, and that is quite right. There is no elasticity in the Pension Board or their regulations, or in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, to deal with these problem cases. I can instance hundreds of cases; probably I have had to do with more of them than the average man has. As long as I live, it will be my great privilege and endeavour to help the returned man wherever I can, and I am sure that is the desire of every hon. member.

Let me give one or two instances. A man served overseas for some years; he was gassed; he came back; he was demobilized and passed out class A; and later on he developed tubercular trouble. The late government was in charge then, but this is no political matter. Every effort was made to have the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment deal with this case, but they turned up the man's file, his medical history sheet showed no case of disability. An expert in tuberculosis examined the man and declared that his complaint was caused by active service. After a great deal of difficulty we got him into a sanitarium at the public expense—in another similar case the man was got into a sanitarium at his father's expense. Then I took the matter up with the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the officers there, after weeks of correspondence, replied that the man to whom I first referred was not entitled to treatment or pay. In the meantime, however, the man was in the sanitarium and he died there. I then wrote to the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, to ask if the department would help to defray his funeral expenses. Two weeks afterwards, with all this correspondence before them, they replied stating that the man's file did not show that his illness was caused by active service, and that they could not give any treatment—and this although the man had been dead for two weeks. If a commission is appointed with power to deal with these problem cases, a great deal of this trouble will be avoided, and I ask the minister to take the matter into his serious consideration. I am bringing this matter up while the minister's Estimates are before us, so that the Government will have time to consider it without further delay, the claims of these men can be dealt with, and the promises made by hon. members now on the government side may be carried out.

Mr. MANION: Having had the honour, for a very short time unfortunately, to preside over the department over which the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) presides at the present time, I should like to say just one word, and that is to the effect that the fact that the expenses of this department are cut down—and I am sure the minister will be the first to admit this—is because the medical attention, vocational training and so forth, which have been given to returned soldiers, have been lessened. One of the first things that I learned on going into that department was that it was then in a position to lay off nearly 1,000 employees. At that time, I took the stand—I thought then it was the wisest stand, and I have no reason now to change my opinion—that those employees, 1,000 in number, should be laid off gradually, because of the rather severe unemployment conditions which prevailed in Canada then. That has been done, I presume, although I do not know that the 1,000 employees have all been laid off yet. I point this out, in justice to the late government and to the management of that department, before I took it over and during the time I supervised it, because the reductions in expenditure in that department were due mainly to the facts which I have named. I have nothing to say re-

garding the increase in salary for this officer; I do not remember being acquainted with the gentleman at all; but as regards the officers in general of that department, they were a very capable, able group of men. I should like also to point out that, to my mind, this is the one department of all others that should be given every attention and every sympathetic care. If there is any other which should be given the same sympathetic care, it is the department of Pensions, and I am sure the minister may feel quite certain that this party in this corner of the House—and I am sure the same is true of all parties in the House—will support him when he brings forward his Estimates for that department, so that the men who have returned from overseas may receive fair treatment. I am quite sure my hon. friend and the party with which he is associated, would not claim any particular economy in regard to that department because of the reductions.

Mr. HOCKEN: Increases are given to seven of the ten officials in this vote, one increase amounting to $500. The minister of this department will learn from the Minister of Labour that wages are on the decrease in every trade and calling in Canada. Why, therefore, should we make such enormous increases as we find in this estimate? A salary of $4,500 to-day is equivalent to $5,500 a couple of years ago, and will increase in value until wages strike the bottom. If the Government intend to economize they might very well start with the salaries of the civil servants, especially salaries as high as $4,500 a year. I have had very few minutes to look over the Estimates, but what we find in connection with this department is true in the case of nearly every other branch of the Civil Service. The Government, I submit, should begin with such salaries in any attempt to economize.

Mr. BELAND: This increase of $500 is for the Supervisor of Expenditures. It is about the largest increase for the year, and a few moments ago I gave the reason for it. The Committee will readily realize how valuable and important must be the services of an official who supervises an expenditure of nearly $50,000,000 a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. BOYS: Fifteen millions.

Mr. BELAND: Fifty millions, if pensions and expenditures in connection with the Board of Pension Commissioners are taken into account. The Board of Pension Commissioners and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment are now merged into one department, as my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) knows, since it was the late Government that effected the amalgamation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are under the same minister, but does my hon. friend say that this officer supervises pension expenditures?

Mr. BELAND: He will supervise all the expenditures in the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That supervision will be purely formal.

Mr. BELAND: Now, in regard to the other salaries, there are three increases of $120 each, which are provided by the reclassification, one increase of $60, also in accordance with the Civil Service regulations, and one increase of $40. I do not know of any other increases.

My hon. friend (Mr. Mewburn) suggested the appointment of a royal commission to inquire into the complaints and the needs of ex-service men. The practice up to the present has been to appoint a parliamentary committee every session; that, at least, has been done since my return from the Old Country. It has been deemed advisable to confine the inquiries of that committee within certain limits, and I have been of the opinion, as I think every member of the House has been, that it was a proper course to follow. As my hon. friend has said, it is somewhat difficult for special cases to be brought before the parliamentary committee, especially when the men concerned reside at any considerable distance from the Capital. But if the Government appointed a royal commission to travel, as is suggested, from one end of the country to the other, though it might be able to hear every special case on the spot, still thousands of cases would have to be examined, and the inconvenience would be so considerable as to render the process unsatisfactory. Altogether I do not think there could be any advantage in a royal commission, from the point of view of either the public or the returned man himself. I submit that as a consideration, although I do not want to say that I am opposed to the appointment of a royal commission. The parliamentary committee has dealt, in years gone by, with numberless special cases. I well remember, that there were brought

before the attention of a sub-committee, appointed by the parliamentary committee on Pensions and Re-Establishment, cases which were examined in the presence of the Chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners, two other commissioners, and some of the highest officials of the department. How could it be possible for a royal commission, which should travel from one end of the country to the other, to take all the officials of the departments along with them? How, for instance, could they have the Pension Commissioners with them all the time in Calgary, Vancouver, or Halifax during four, or five, or six months, as the case might be? I fancy it would take a long time to conduct this investigation, and the difficulties that impede the parliamentary committee would exist, perhaps in a larger measure, in the case of a royal commission such as is suggested. Most of the cases considered by the parliamentary committee at the last session of Parliament and the session before were, I think, satisfactorily solved. My hon. friend is conversant with the subject, and, as he has pointed out, there are a very large number of cases which ought to be submitted to some tribunal for a more exhaustive investigation. There is no doubt about that. In the few weeks that I have been at the head of the department, I have convinced myself, from the correspondence I have received, that there are many complaints amongst the returned men as regards their treatment, especially in connection with pensions.

I am not prepared to lay the blame at the door of the late Government for everything that has happened. This committee must remember one thing: A Board of Pension Commissioners has been created by a statute of this Parliament, and that statute provides that the decisions of the Board shall be final; there is no appeal to the minister, no appeal to the Governor in Council. The only tribunal to which the men who are not satisfied with an award may have recourse is a parliamentary committee, or in other words, Parliament itself. I have been two or three months at the head of this department, and I have not yet received any complaint as to the action of the parliamentary committee of last year. I do not know whether my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) has heard of any complaints against that committee. I think the men have had every possible opportunity, through their various organizations of laying their whole case before the committee, and the committee of last year was composed of men who had only in view the reconciling of the public interest with the interest of the returned men, because those two interests must be reconciled.

My hon. friend has referred to the special cases, those known as "problem" cases. Those cases exist in fairly large numbers throughout the country, such as tubercular cases. I am a medical man, and I would not declare offhand in the case of a soldier who has been gassed and discharged as 100 per cent fit, and who subsequently develops tuberculosis three years after his discharge, that the disease was not due to his war service, and I hardly think that any chest specialist would go that length. Those are cases which require the special attention of the committee and of this Parliament. Justice should be done to those men, and if any doubt should exist as to the cause of tuberculosis in any man who has seen actual war service in the trenches, and who has been gassed, he should be given the benefit of the doubt. I think that that was the policy of the late Government; I think it is the policy of this Government; and I think it would meet with the approval of every reasonable and humane man in Canada. The question is, how are you going to establish that such a disability, appearing subsequently, is due to war service?

Mr. BOYS: How can those cases reach the parliamentary committee, or this House, if there is no appeal from the Pension Board?

Mr. BELAND: I would point out that last year the question of these tubercular cases was gone into very fully by the parliamentary committee, and some reports which would be a credit to any country in the world were prepared and submitted regarding tubercular cases. I expect that this question will come before the committee again this year with a view, very likely, to more being done for these tubercular cases.

Mr. BOYS: I am not disputing that at all. I am absolutely in favour of it, but if there is no appeal from the board, I cannot see how you can get a remedy unless the proposition is to amend the act. If that is the minister's proposition, it is well worth considering.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is perfectly right. There is no remedy except

by amending the Pension Act. The board are bound to abide by the provisions of the law.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister favour an amendment along that line?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend may be a member of the committee that is to be appointed. Last year the committee made a number of recommendations to Parliament in their report, and with very few exceptions all those recommendations have been carried out. There were some important amendments to the Pension Act last year, and undoubtedly there will be further amendments this year. As far as these problem cases are concerned they can be dealt with otherwise than by amending the Pension Act. Special legislation might deal with these problem cases, or departmental action might be sufficient following recommendations to Parliament by the committee.

I might say that I did not expect to go into this question at all to-day. I am a very inexperienced minister in the matter of soldiers' civil re-establishment, though I am free to confess that I am extremely happy to have been able to supply this information to the committee. I had expected, however, that the discussion this afternoon would be confined to the civil government estimates. When the general estimates of the department are under consideration, perhaps we may go a little more fully into this important subject.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a provision in the Pension Act which allows the pensioners to commute their pensions. The underlying idea of this privilege of commutation was to give the pensioner an opportunity to capitalize his claim against the country—it had particularly to do with the smaller pensions for minor injuries—so that, on the one hand, the pensioner would be saved a good deal of trouble, and on the other, he would get a lump sum which might be very useful to him, and at the same time the cost of administration would be decreased. I am a little bit afraid that this plan is working out very badly, and that under financial stress and the pressure of circumstances many soldiers, very often under a misapprehension as to the nature and extent of their injuries, have given a complete release to the country. I do not know what my hon. friend's view may be, but it does seem to me that in deserving cases such a release ought not to be considered as having the slightest bearing on a proper consideration of the pensioner's case. After all, he is the ward of the nation in more ways than one. The important thing is that the right thing be done by the soldier, and the mere fact that he has improvidently, and, perhaps, improperly given the country a quittance of all his claims is no reason why he should not again be put upon the roll if, for example, his old trouble comes back in aggravated form.

Mr. CALDWELL: As I understand it, the act provides that if a pensioner sustains a subsequent or further disability, he has the right to go back for re-examination and to be given further pension in respect to that disability. That leads up to one point I would like to make. Having been a member of the Pensions Committee for the past two years, it does not behoove me to say how well its members have fulfilled the purposes of the committee. However, in my opinion our Pension Act is fairly adequate, but it is not being administered sympathetically by the pension commissioners. The large end of the complaint I have heard throughout the country with regard to pensions is that the per cent of disability is kept lower than it ought to be by the examining physicians or by the Pension Board. I know of a number of cases of men whose disability was such that they were unable to work but who were allowed only a ten or fifteen per cent disability. The Pension Committee has no power to deal with things of that kind. They may make recommendations for the amending of the act or for changing some of the regulations, but they have nothing to do with the carrying out of the act. The decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners is final. The minister will find that that is the chief cause of complaint—that the per cent of disability is kept too low. I wish just here to say that I am pleased to see in charge of this department a minister who himself served overseas, a man whom I know to be in perfect sympathy with the soldiers and their claims. I feel that at this time it is necessary not only to give the soldiers justice, but to treat them with a certain amount of sympathetic consideration.

Mr. BOYS: I am much interested in this question of appeal. I know of cases in my own county where men have not, so far as I have been able to judge, received justice. To give every one an appeal to the House or to the Pension Committee might be a mistake, but I would advocate

an appeal to the House on the fiat of the minister, thus safeguarding against the making of appeals for which there is no foundation. I do think these men should have an opportunity of coming before the parliamentary committee when the circumstances warrant their doing so. Possibly some amendment to bring that about will suggest itself to the committee when it enters upon its work. I want to endorse what the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton has just said, that the administration of this department has fallen into excellent hands. I am quite sure that the minister will deal kindly with these men, who require at our hands the most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. CLARK: The hon. minister has intimated that the parliamentary committee can arrive at a satisfactory solution of the various questions involved in re-establishment. I have no doubt that the Pension Committee has done splendid work, and we are all very grateful to it on that account. But many cases have not been satisfactorily dealt with. I notice that this committee has not yet been appointed, and my suggestion is that it be appointed without delay and instructed to give immediate attention to these problems so that action can be taken before the House prorogues. I have not given serious consideration to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Hamilton; it is something new. But many individual cases have to be dealt with, possibly the most common being the refusal of attention on the ground that the disability is not the result of war service. I think, therefore, that the committee should get to work at once so that we may properly arrive at a solution of some of these most pressing questions.

5 p.m.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister has pointed out that the official to whom an increase of salary is proposed supervises the expenditure of over $50,000,000 annually. I can scarcely believe that that statement is correct, having regard to the provisions of the Pension Act, and to the fact, as has been stated here this afternoon, that the powers of the board are absolute and also to the fact that the expenditure of the $33,000,000, which I presume is included in the $50,000,000, is under the board's direct control and supervision; there is no appeal to the minister or to any one else. Furthermore, I observe that the amount of controllable expenditure in the department has been reduced by some $5,000,000. We have the spectacle of the Government increasing the salary of an official—he may be a very good official; I do not know him—by a very large sum, at a time when commercial enterprises throughout the country are reducing to rock bottom the salaries of executive heads as well as of workingmen. The Government is doing quite the reverse, and it seems to me that that is not a policy we should pursue at this time.

I concur in the suggestion made by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), because I know of cases which in my opinion cannot receive adequate attention from or adequate consideration at the hands of a parliamentary committee, no matter how good the work of that committee may be. I know of cases in my constituency where the sympathetic touch of a personal interview through a responsible commission would have a very beneficial effect. I hope the minister will give this suggestion his very serious and sympathetic consideration. Although I am a new member of the House it is my opinion that a parliamentary committee can of necessity deal only with general principles; it cannot in the very nature of things deal with individual cases. Some such machinery as has been suggested by the hon. member for Hamilton should be created by the Government to deal with these cases.

It has been suggested that the Pension Act is adequate but that the working out of the regulations has been carried on in a parsimonious spirit. I would like to say, Sir, that my experience has been of an entirely different character. I have found the members of the Pension Board, within the limitations of the act and of the regulations thereunder, to be most sympathetic; and I am satisfied that if there is in any given case a tendency to restrict the expenditure in this regard, it is not because of any shortcoming on the part of members of the board themselves, but because of the limitations under which they find themselves confined by the act in question.

Some suggestion has been made here in favour of an appeal from the decision of the Pension Board. I hope, however, that the House will go very slowly before it provides for an appeal from a board composed of independent men as the Pension Commissioners are. All of them, I believe, are men of very high standing; all are returned men and in sympathy with the subject matters with which they deal. If you grant

the right of appeal to Parliament it will only be another step in the direction of the spectacle of special acts being introduced here to grant pensions to returned men, who otherwise could not get them, such, for example as they have had in the United States Congress year after year, a procedure whereby men who are not entitled to pensions may get them through special acts.

Mr. BELAND: Regarding commutation, I am informed it is only given in disability cases between five and fourteen per cent inclusive; it is not granted in a disability case of, say thirty per cent. This plan was recommended last year by the parliamentary committee at the special request, I believe, of the veterans' organization. In the case of a man whose pension has been commuted requiring treatment, my impression is that the department grants free treatment in our hospitals to such persons.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is treatment allowed for these men after they have commuted, if their disability has not increased? I think not. If their disability has increased I think they are allowed treatment. If their disability does not increase they are not allowed treatment after having commuted their pension: I think that is a hardship.

Mr. BELAND: Where the disability has not increased a man would not require treatment.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend will pardon me for the correction. I believe that any case of disability which is due to the world war recurring at any time is treated by the department.

Mr. CALDWELL: I may be wrong but I thought it was only if the disability had increased.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The medical treatment for injuries received in the war is always in addition to pension—that is the men are entitled to it so long as they live. It has no relationship to the pension; that is to say the special medical treatment is in addition to the pension. Consequently, it would not lapse because of the commutation of the pension.

Mr. BELAND: That is my impression; I think the right hon. gentleman is right. The deputy minister is not here at the present moment but if he were I think he would corroborate the statement that even in case of commutation if the man's disability were to become such at any time as to cause him to require further treatment he would have a claim on the department for that treatment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he ever received medical treatment at all.

Mr. BELAND: As regards the discretion of the Pension Board, that is given to it by statute. It is I believe, absolutely impossible to frame a Pension Act which would not give to the Pension Board a certain amount of latitude, or certain discretionary powers. Whether the board uses these powers too much in favour of the returned men or insufficiently in his behalf is for each hon. member to judge for himself. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton, (Mr. Caldwell) has sat on the Pension Committee for the past three years and he thinks the Pension Board is not sufficiently broad in its interpretation of the act; while the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) believes that the board is exercising its discretionary powers in the other direction. If I were to rely on the correspondence I receive I should conclude that the board does not use that discretion too much in favour of the returned men. Let me say further that it is my intention, at a very early date, to submit to the House the names of the parliamentary committee who will this session deal with matters of re-establishment, etc.

Mr. MANION: Before we leave this item I would like to say a word on behalf of the Board of Pension Commissioners. I have had, I think, a good deal of experience with them as an ordinary member of Parliament and I must confess that I think, on the whole, they have proved themselves a pretty reasonable group of men. The position they occupy to-day in Canada is perhaps as difficult a position as any men could possibly have because there are many men who come back from the front feeling they have a pension coming to them when they really have not. In justice to the Board of Pension Commissioners be it said that though there is no appeal to this House, there is an appeal back to them; and in cases where the men were not satisfied with the award of the Medical Board which granted them a pension, I have never found any particular difficulty, when I appealed to the Pension Commissioners, in getting these men another. If the Medical Board which re-examines the man changes the award of the previous Medical Board then the Pension Commissioners will come

up to that award; and I have in fact had very many cases, changed.

In regard to the remarks of my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) regarding the permitting of appeals to come to this House I want to supplement what he says—I was thinking of making the same observation when he said it. You would have a terrible condition of affairs, I think, in the House of Commons if every man who felt that he had a right to a pension, or a right to appeal, should bring it before the House most of the members of which are not medical men and cannot therefore judge the real disability of the man. I do not suppose there is any likelihood of the question being thrown back upon Parliament, but if there is that aspect of the matter should be kept in view. Nobody should have an appeal over the heads of the Board of Pension Commissioners back to the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was glad indeed to hear the minister commend the practice that this House followed so consistently for so many years of appointing each session a joint committee, composed of members from all sides of the Chamber, to consider the whole question of civil re-establishment and how far in any direction the country still might go in providing for the wants of returned men or, as he phrased it so well himself, consider how to reconcile their interests and their wants with the interests of the country as a whole. The late Government adopted that course in order that there might be some medium through which the various grievances and desires of the returned men might find expression. and might be co-ordinated and placed before the country, in order that the country could fully grasp just what they asked for and the grounds therefor, and as well, along side of that, the general situation of the country. It was adopted also in order, if possible, to keep out of the arena of party politics the question of the treatment of returned men who had suffered in the war. To a large extent it was successful. It was successful in securing the unanimous approval on each occasion, of that committee. All sides joined and all sides worked faithfully. I thoroughly endorse the words of the hon. gentleman from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) in that regard, but notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding that by means of that joint committee we did secure unanimous recommendations, and we did meet the longings and desires of those men to the utmost possible extent, the opportunity for party advantage presented itself to hon. gentlemen opposite, and, though their own representatives on that committee, session after session, joined with us in fixing the length to which the country could go, they went before the country and complained that we had not gone far enough, and promised the returned men that they would go further, particularly that they would make another cash grant all around to all the returned men of this country. That was to be the chief step in the way of re-establishment that they were to take beyond what had been done before. I read from the pledge they made, and I ask the House to recall that this pledge was made to that class of our population who, of all others, should be treated with the utmost good faith, and should never be misled in any way whatever. The resolution reads:

> Resolved that this convention declares—

That is the convention at which the present Prime Minister was made leader, and this is the resolution unanimously passed, a promise unanimously given:

> That this convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of Civil Re-establishment, such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity, and to any pension for disability resulting from service.

There has been no increase since. That was in August 1919. Hon. gentlemen opposite went before the country, appealed to all the returned men of Canada, and promised that, if returned to power, they would make cash grants to these men, in addition to what had already been done by the Government, and in addition to all that had been recommended by the joint committees of the House. This clause of the platform of hon. gentlemen was paraded on many platforms in the Dominion. It was reprinted and scattered through the streets of our cities. There are hon. gentlemen in this House now who can confirm what I say, and the men had the promise that this would be done. I am not going to charge that it is not going to be done, but I notice the main Estimates are down, and there is no provision for it. Surely, it is not something that is to wait for the supplementary Estimates. However, that may be, I want to impress on the hon. minister the pledge that he made, that his government made, and that his party made, and the character and situation of the men, to whom particularly this pledge was

addressed. I would like him to give an intimation to the House now as to whether the pledge was a mere lure, as to what extent the pledge was honest, and to what extent it was not.

Mr. BELAND: I am very glad the right hon. gentleman has brought this question to my attention. If he wants an answer from me, I will give it to him. The plank in the platform which he has just read was, no doubt, adopted by the convention. At that time it was apparent, at least to the members of the convention, that a general feeling existed in the country in favour of a cash grant. I had myself been able to perceive it in many quarters of the land, though in absolutely none of my public utterances have I once referred to it, and I think I have been speaking in all the provinces of Canada, with the exception of British Columbia. Lately, during the sittings of the parliamentary committees, it has been made plain to me that the large majority of returned men were not favourable to a cash bonus, and at the parliamentary committee last session I do not think in one single instance was the claim pressed for the payment by the country of a cash bonus to returned men. If my hon. friend wants to know what my attitude would be on the subject, it could not be any different from the one taken by the large majority of the returned men themselves, and that is not to grant the cash bonus.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have listened with intense interest and curiosity to the hon. minister's explanation of the plank. May I ask him if the same kind of reasoning will apply to the tariff plank?

Mr. BELAND: If the question were in order, I would have a ready answer, but happily it is not in order, and I do not want to be called to order by the Chairman. But we can rely, I think, on the Minister of Finance to give a proper answer in due time.

Mr. POWER: I would like to say a word with reference to cash bonus. If the ex-Prime Minister will remember, the plank which he read was inserted in the Liberal platform at the convention of 1919. Parliament met in September, 1919, shortly after the convention, and during that session we had a parliamentary committee on pensions and re-establishment. If the hon. leader of the Opposition will remember, that was the year in which the great agitation took place about the bonus. Hon. members from the other side of the House were bombarded with telegrams from all over the country. Those who had announced, in election addresses throughout the country, that they were in favour of a cash bonus for soldiers were asked to remember their promises when it came to implement them by legislation. In spite of this, the committee reported that no bonus should be given to the soldiers, because, if the Prime Minister will remember, when the report of this committee was brought before the House, the leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, moved that the report be sent back to the committee for further consideration on the ground that adequate provision had not been made for the re-establishment of the ex-soldier. This motion was voted down by the majority at the back of the right hon. the present leader of the Opposition. At the following session of Parliament a committee was appointed to deal with the question of pensions and soldiers re-establishment. Shortly after the committee was convened and about to begin its labours, a delegation came from Toronto, headed by one Harry Flynn. He was received by the acting Prime Minister, Sir George Foster, who announced to him that, under no consideration, would the then government discuss with them the matter of a cash bonus to returned soldiers. This having been the definite decision of the government, a committee decided that it was useless to study the question of bonus, since, even if they recommended it, it was the government's policy not to grant it. The bonus question, in so far as the committee on re-establishment was concerned, was then dropped. Since then, a year and some months have elapsed. At the last convention of the Great War Veterans' Association held at Fort William, the question of a cash gratuity was submitted to the convention, and it was decided that it was not the policy of the Great War Veterans' Association to insist on a cash gratuity or on the veterans' scheme any longer. Under the circumstances, I hardly think it is the duty of any hon. member to bring it before the House any longer if the veterans themselves do not see fit to pass resolutions to that effect or to submit such demands to the House or to the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that anything could excel the casuistry of the minister himself, unless it be that of his first lieutenant on the subject. A great party meets; it considers a question of enormous consequence to the country, involving, not

hundreds of thousands, but millions upon millions of dollars, involving the welfare of a vast section of our population, and that section the most deserving of all. It weighs and considers all subjects, all considerations, pro and con. It determines that the Government of the day is wrong, and it determines to pledge its party to do something that the Government of the day refuses to do. That party is returned to power. It is asked if it intends to carry out its pledges made to those men, who saved the honour of this nation, those men who served as no others in our history have done, those men to whom we owe to-day the best that this country can give. What do this Government say? "Oh," they say, "We adopted that, it is true, but a year afterwards the Government opposed to us said that it would not carry it out." Well, in the name of common sense, why would they adopt it if the Government opposed to them was ready to carry it out? It was because the Government opposed to them was not ready to carry it out that they adopted it. If we had been ready to carry it out, there was no need for its adoption; it would have been done. The hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) says:"You, when you were Prime Minister, refused this money." Certainly I did, and I said so to the country; but did hon. gentlemen say so to the country? No, they scattered that platform throughout the length and breadth of Canada right on election day. They have members sitting in this House because they got votes on the pledge made in that platform. Undoubtedly, at the session before last, I very frankly told the House that the Government had shut the door on further gratuities. In face of that, this House was moved for a reference back of the committee's report as a protest of the then Opposition against the stand which I took before Parliament and the country.

Mr. POWER: At the time this House was moved to refer the matter back to the committee, the right hon. gentleman was not Prime Minister. He had not shut the door on bonuses, but the Hon. Mr. Calder had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government to which the right hon. gentleman belonged had. I am glad I am disclosing the rocking foundation on which hon. gentlemen rest. The Government had shut the door. The next year the Government maintained the shut door consistently. They did not seek to deceive the returned men. Did the hon. gentleman state in this House that he had abandoned all claim on behalf of returned men to increase their gratuities? No, he waits until his party is in power before he does that.

Mr. POWER: The right hon. gentleman stated a few minutes ago that every member of this House who sat on that committee had always adopted the reports of the Committee on Re-establishment. That would mean that members on this side of the House had acquiesced in the Government's decision to close the door. In that respect, may I correct the right hon. leader of the Opposition, because I, for one, have never acquiesced in the decisions of the committee, have always kept the door open, and have said so in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, did I not say that the committee was unanimous?

Mr. POWER: It was not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The comimttee agreed; but, as the hon. gentleman points out himself, the members of the committee took the position that they should not press for any further cash gratuities because the Government had made known that it was worthless to do so. I admit that to be true. We did make it known to the world; we took the country into our confidence; we did not seek to gain votes by pretending to hold open the door which really was closed. Then, the next session, when we came back again, we took precisely the same position, and, in view of that the committee did not consider the question of further cash gratuities. All these sessions go by. Hon. gentlemen then go to the country; they go to the country on this platform; they scatter it abroad and they get votes on it. They get the consideration, and hon. gentlemen now laugh, having deceived the soldiers of this country and having obtained, as their reward, seats in Parliament.

Mr. POWER: Supposing what he says is true, does the right hon. gentleman think it is any worse for hon. members on this side to have deceived the soldiers in that respect, than it was for hon. gentlemen on the other side to have deceived the same men when they told them in 1917 that, when they should return, Canada would be theirs and then, when they did return, not to give them what they almost unanimously demanded?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Anything that any member of the government of that day told the soldiers of this country was carried out.

Mr. DUFF: What about the soldiers' votes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Every one of them had a vote.

Mr. DUFF: The right hon. gentleman stole them afterwards.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would not have had votes if the hon. gentleman had had his way.

Mr. DUFF: Is that so? We did not steal the election as my right hon. friend did, sending code telegrams.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Quebec South has almost admitted you did and the minister himself says: "Yes, we promised that; we walked right up to the ballot boxes with that promise in our pockets; we flared it on the billboards; we took the soldier to the booth and we voted him on the strength of it; but now we find the Great War Veterans' Association is against it."

Mr. POWER: It is true that we took the soldier to the polling booth, but we did not steal his ballot nor stuff the ballot boxes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad to be assured that there are depths of infamy into which the hon. gentleman has not yet fallen. Is there any clause in the resolution of 1919 which states that it is subject to confirmation by the Great War Veterans' Association? I suppose, when we come to the tariff, we shall be told that we cannot carry out the tariff policy because the Y. M. C. A.—

Mr. POWER: The Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —or some other organization has failed to approve it since. Imagine a great party determining on its policy on a great subject, more than that, on a sacred subject of public polity, getting into power on the strength of it, and then standing in their places and telling the nation: "Oh, the day of repudiation is come; the day of betrayal is come; we got your votes, and we sit and smile at the success of our trickery."

Mr. DUFF: Very dramatic.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but I think it is very infamous.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, on my right hon. friend's part.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is anything dramatic about it. Is this to be an indication of what we are to expect all this session?

Mr. DUFF: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this apply to the whole of this voluminous document that acquired so much fame, that was used so widely, so profusely, throughout the country? Is this the style of reasoning every time we remind hon. gentlemen of the faith they pledged? Have hon. gentlemen no opinions of their own? Have they no principles of their own? Do they depend for their principles on organizations outside of this House? Or, having advanced them, have they no means of putting them into effect? Have they no intention of doing so? Now let us put the matter in a kernel again.

Mr. POWER: Is that a question? If it is, I will give the answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right.

Mr. POWER: We do not depend for our principles on organizations outside of the House, but I imagine that the Government should depend on recognized organized public bodies to learn the opinions of the members of those bodies. The Great War Veteran's Association, I may remind my right hon. friend, represents possibly the great majority of the soldiers throughout Canada, and it is the Government's duty to consult them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be wise, not to say honest, to get those opinions before making any promise or pledge? How does the opinion of any body outside of the House come in between the pledge made and its fulfilment?

Mr. POWER: It is no longer necessary; the right hon. gentlemen established the soldiers so well that it is no longer necessary to carry out the pledge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we did establish them well; that is what we said. We had gone, we believed, so far as the country, under the circumstances, was able to go. We took into account the circumstances of the country and frankly told the soldiers what we were able to do. We said: "This we can do; more than this we cannot concede. We disdain to ask your vote on a pledge, implied much less expressed, to do more than we intend to do." In that we are proud to distinguish ourselves from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The leader of the Opposition seems to forget that there

are times and places for all things, and that a course which at one moment may be the most advisable may not be the best at another time. When the Liberal Convention held its meetings in 1919 we were not faced in this country with the condition that we have since been obliged to recognize, of huge deficits arising out of railway properties taken over by the government under the administration of my right hon. friend. The financial situation as it then presented itself to the country was entirely different from that with which we are faced to-day, or which confronted the people at the last general election. I think that the Liberal Convention was thoroughly sincere—nay, more, it was thoroughly right—in the position it took at that time. The men were just returning from the war and were about to be re-established and we felt that to have given them a cash grant would have been the best means of meeting the situation that then existed. But to-day we are not in 1919; this is the year 1922, and we have before us a financial problem which is appalling.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? Did he, after he knew what the railway deficits and obligations were, say to the country that this pledge would not be carried out?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am happy to tell my right hon. friend that I did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would reply by asking my right hon. friend, or anyone associated with him, to point to any utterance of mine, on any platform in the country, in which I declared that if the Liberal party were returned to power we would give cash grants?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not asking that. The promise was here; there was no need of a further promise. The hon. gentleman says: "We will not carry out that promise because of the railway obligations." Well, it was his duty to inform the country, in that event, after the railway obligations became known to him, that he would not carry out his pledge. Now, let him point out where he did that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend will allow me to make my position clear, I will repeat what I have said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will not do.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It may not serve my right hon. friend's purpose, but it will serve the purpose of the House and of the country. The important consideration in this matter is the position taken by myself and hon. gentlemen associated with me in the recent campaign, when we asked the people to return us to office, instead of hon. gentlemen opposite; and on no platform at any time during the whole campaign did I in any way, directly or indirectly, promise cash grants to the returned men. On the other hand, I think I am quite right in saying that when I was questioned on the subject, once or twice, I declared emphatically that under the changed circumstances we would not consider cash grants.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never seen the declaration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says he has never seen it. He has watched the papers very closely, if he ever saw any utterance of mine wherein I promised cash grants to the returned soldiers if my party were returned to power, let him quote the statement. If he cannot produce any such, then I say he should be careful in the language he uses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not this platform a promise?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give my right hon. friend all the opportunity he wishes to speak on this subject. He may have all the time he likes, but I think he should accord a like courtesy to those on this side of the House. I challenge him and hon. gentlemen associated with him to point to any utterance of mine in which I promised cash grants to the soldiers. If he is unable to find any utterance of that kind, on the part of myself or any of my colleagues in the last election, he is clearly not justified in saying so far as we are concerned that there has been any betrayal or deception. What I did say was that the government of my right hon. friend was not a representative government, that the following behind him was not representative, and that the returned men were entitled to have all matters of concern to them considered by a committee of a new Parliament which would be directly representative of the people, which could take account of the position of the country as it is, and which I trusted would, deal generously with the proposals put before

them. That promise has been implemented or will be implemented in full shortly, and my own hope is that when the committee meets it will take a generous attitude towards the questions placed before it.

Mr. CRERAR: I think the discussion is getting rather out of order, and I suggest that the committee come back to the consideration of the matter in hand. Does the minister (Mr. Béland) think that it is necessary to have all this supervising staff for whom we are asked to vote this afternoon? There is a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister, a secretary, a supervisor of expenditures, an assistant secretary, a chief clerk, etc. It seems to me that we might possibly be able to get along with a little less supervising expenditure than is asked for. The tendency in government departments is usually to increase rather than to decrease staffs. We must face this fact, however, that if $100 can be saved here or there, it is that much reduction in the national tax bill, and consequently it is a question that should receive the earnest consideration of the House. I have full confidence in the intention of the minister to administer the department as economically as possible. At the same time I know how easy it is to have increases in departmental expenditures, and I do trust that in small matters, as well as in large, not only the minister, but every member of the Government, will exercise the strictest economy in the conduct of the public business.

Mr. HOCKEN: This department is not under the Civil Service Commission, but the minister is increasing salaries as if it were, and that is not to the advantage of the commission. There is no maximum in the department under present circumstances, so that $120 may be added every year indefinitely. The authority of the commission is denied so far as fixing a maximum is concerned, but the department proceeds to make increases just as though the department were under the control of the Civil Service Commission. If this department is not under the commission, it should be; or, in the alternative, all departments should be removed from the control of the commission. If I might answer the question that my right hon. leader put, as frankly as a similar question has been answered in this House before, I would tell him that the reason why that pledge is not implemented is because—"we are here and you are there."

Mr. POWER: May I ask when this supervisor of expenditure was appointed. It seems to me the position is somewhat useless. I share the opinion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that we should economize as much as possible. I understand that the expenditure in the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, irrespective of pensions, amounts to something like $15,000,000 or $16,000,000. With regard to pensions, I do not care who the supervisor is; he has nothing to do. The Pension Act exists, the Board of Pension Commissioners fixes the pension to be allotted to the pensioner, and it is the duty of the Government to pay this pension irrespective of whether there is a supervisor of expenditure or not. The question to my mind is whether the office should exist at all, rather than whether the supervisor should get an increase of $100 or $200. May I ask the minister when, and for what purpose, the office was created. There does not appear to be any supervisor of expenditure in any other department, and I wonder why one is necessary in this department.

Mr. BELAND: I am not in position to give the committee the exact date when Mr Waddington was appointed supervisor of expenditure, but I am under the impression he was appointed some two or three years ago. As to the necessity for the position, I think the committee would be unanimous in appreciating its importance. It is true that the amount of pension to be paid in each case is fixed by the board, but the total expenditure is large, and has to be supervised. The total outlay of the department this year is between $45,000,000 and $50,000,000. Personally, I think the position is an indispensable one. There are very few departments paying out so much money. I do not know Mr. Waddington personally, but from reports I have had from many sources he is one of the most capable auditors and accountants in the country. I confess that I cannot understand my hon. friend from Quebec South when he says that the position could be done away with. I do not believe that it would be in the interests of the department or the country to dispense with the position, for the present time at all events.

Mr. CHAPLIN: As I pointed out some time ago, this office has got rid of sixteen clerks. Now sixteen junior clerks must have had a head clerk over them. Why

is this head clerk retained? Is it to look after the sixteen juniors who have gone? We have to practise economy; that is why I am bringing up this point. This is a department that is finishing its work, and I believe that in letting out men, we should start at the top, instead of at the bottom. We have here a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister, a supervisor of expenditure, an assistant secretary, a head clerk, a principal clerk, a storekeeper, and a departmental librarian. We have a lot of head men left, but the tail has all gone. Let us get rid of some of the ones higher up.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is quite right in his contention that some of the higher officials should be dispensed with. I can assure him that both before I took charge of the department and since, very high positions in the department have been dispensed with, and others will be as time goes on. I have in mind the case of an engineer who is in receipt of a salary of over $3,000 whose services have been dispensed with in our unit in Montreal. All over the country from Vancouver to Halifax we are dispensing with the services of highly paid officials. I submit, when you consider that the number of employees in the department is somewhere around 5,000—I speak subject to correction, but that is about the number, and at one time it was 11,000—it is necessary to retain some of these higher men; but I repeat to the Committee, we are dispensing with highly paid officials all over the country. In Toronto, for instance, a highly paid official with a salary of $5,000 is being released by the department on the 1st of April. I hope that will be satisfactory to my hon. friend.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That gentleman would be outside the department of civil government.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend will, of course, realize that those at the head office have to do with the service all over the country.

Mr. HANSON: The minister has not yet answered satisfactorily why there has been an increase.

Mr. STEVENS: Before the House rises, let me point out to the Prime Minister in answer to an explanation he made a moment ago, that the reason for abandoning this pledge was that subsequent to the making of the pledge by the convention it had been discovered that there were heavy railroad obligations incurred, that he officially, as leader of the party, and with the sanction of the committee directing the affairs of the party, published this handbook which was sent all over Canada and was the bible of the speakers for my hon. friend. He has challenged us to produce something, and I now produce it. This handbook contains in the early pages a repetition of the pledge exactly as read by the leader of the Opposition. A little further over I find several pages devoted to an exposure, according to their view, of the railway indebtedness and obligations. Now we have in this same official speaker's handbook, containing a photograph of the Prime Minister on the front page, and his autobiography on the inside, the pledge of the party for loans to the soldiers, and an acknowledgment of the nation's obligations as well. In other words, in spite of the country's enormous indebtedness, these gentlemen on the eve of the election pledged themselves to the payment of cash grants to soldiers in exactly the terms of the 1919 platform. This is published in the Liberal handbook issued in October last. My hon. friend the Prime Minister will not repudiate that handbook? I pause to give him an opportunity to do so. He says emphatically, no;—he will not repudiate it. There is an answer to my hon. friend's challenge. In 1919 I went home to my constituents; I faced the returned men and said exactly what the right hon. leader of the Opposition had said; I told them very plainly that we felt the country could not stand a cash grant. But in my riding and in other ridings throughout the country my hon. friends opposite persisted in their pledge as a bait to the returned men. They are now on the treasury benches, and we know perfectly well that they have no intention whatever of implementing that pledge. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) said a moment ago that the reason why they did not implement the pledge was because, forsooth, they were prevented from doing so by us; that we blocked them. Will he not call upon his leader now to implement the pledge? Does he not stand to-day exactly where he stood then? I say to the Prime Minister: Either admit frankly that our position was the correct one, or take steps to implement the pledge which was so seriously made by hon. gentlemen opposite at the Liberal convention and during the late campaign.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought it conceivable that when the apology offered by the leader of the Government for breach of a public pledge in this matter was hopelessly riddled by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) there would be at least an attempt to substitute another. It will be remembered that the excuse given was: Oh, when we made our pledge in 1919 we did not know the country's obligations. Since then we have found out and because we owe so much money we cannot redeem that pledge. It has since been pointed out that the obligations had been incurred then; hon. gentlemen opposite knew all about them. It has been pointed out, moreover, that in the campaign a party of which the present Prime Minister is the leader, issued to this country an official document with the imprimatur of the party and the leader, as the programme of the Liberal party, reaffirmed that pledge and declared it to be the aim of the Liberal party. That was issued in the month of October, 1921, more than a month after the elections were declared, indeed after the writs had been issued for the general election. Now, where goes the excuse that at the time it was given hon. gentlemen opposite did not know what our debt was. They knew everything in October, 1921. Then the need for votes arose, and then went forth the affirmation of the pledge to the whole people of this country and candidate after candidate stood upon it, candidate after candidate held out that bait to the electors of this Dominion. I have some of their manifestoes before me. I hold in my hand a document issued uniformly by three candidates of the present Prime Minister—not by one remember, but by three—in the city of Vancouver, with the photographs of the three to the left and this pledge given:

> The Liberal Candidates pledge themselves to a system of cash grants to the dependents of the fallen as the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity or pension.

Could any fault be found with these three candidates for repeating that pledge given on November 19, 1921? No fault could be found with them. They had the confession of faith of the whole Liberal party; they had the pledge of its leader; they had that pledge reaffirmed just one month before this was given; they were authorized to make it; they were authorized to solicit votes upon it. They did make it, they did solicit votes upon it, and they did get votes upon it—doubtless votes by the hundred. Their position is just the position of numerous gentlemen opposite, I doubt not; it is not the position of every one. Now what are hon. gentlemen going to do about it? Sit in their seats and smile at the success of chicanery of this kind? If that is to be tolerated, how can we raise our voices later on and protest against the prostitution of other pledges that possibly more than this mean something to hon. members? If this goes by without protest, merely with a smile, if we accept the cynical assurance of the Prime Minister that we must not take election promises too seriously, what is to become of responsible government in this country? Oh, he declares, what we told the people was that we were going to restore responsible government. The Prime Minister, the leader of the party, goes to the country, holds in his hand a pledge and asks for support upon it, spreads it through the country and gets support upon it—gets support upon it and declines to fulfil it. When he does that he does more to subvert responsible government than he could do with the worst parliament ever elected. He strikes at the root of all responsibility; all responsibility is gone. How are the public to know after this what they are going to get if they vote for this man or vote against that man? There is to be no assurance of what they will get. Hereafter if this conduct goes without protest on the part of this Parliament all the elector knows hereafter, if he votes in favour of a certain set of commitments, is that he will either get them when the elections are over, or be told by the elected Prime Minister not to take his pledges before the contest too seriously. If he is so to be told, where is responsible government? Now I put this to hon. gentlemen opposite—one or two of whom at least I know were not parties to either making the affirmation or the breaking of this pledge—what are they to say, now that the time has come for us to pass upon this matter as a principle of public policy? The time has come now for hon. gentlemen to express themselves. That the pledge was made there is no doubt; that it was reaffirmed, and again reaffirmed, and reaffirmed officially, there is no doubt; that it was never repudiated until the goods were delivered upon it there is no doubt—none whatever. Is the repudiation now to go without protest at the hands of the Parliament of Canada?

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, sitting pretty close to the official Opposition I find myself somewhat in sympathy with the criticism they have offered in regard to these increases; with a lot of what they have said I find myself entirely out of sympathy. I am not going to take time now to tell about the faults and the wrongdoings of either of the old political parties; if I were to do so I think we would be here all night and all day to-morrow. I am thoroughly convinced, however, from what I have heard them say about each other that the Progressives should have been here several years ago—that is a fact of which I am thoroughly convinced.

I would like to say that I am very much disappointed that so many increases are asked for in the Estimates that have been brought down. It is very nice, indeed, that those engaged in the government employ as civil servants shall receive additions to their salaries, but what about those who are receiving very much less, who have to pay these increases? I felt when I came here—and many of my Progressive friends had the same feling—that we should be prepared to give every degree of credit to the Government if they were deserving of credit, and that we should also give credit to the official Opposition where it was deserved. I felt determined, when I went back to my constituents, that any degree of credit that was coming, either to the Government or to the Opposition, should be given them as honestly as I could give it. I considered that in that way I would be doing something towards the good government of the country, and the Government, knowing our attitude, I believe, would be more apt to do the right thing, but looking as we are, for retrenchment and economy, and finding these increases asked for which I cannot justify, I feel very much afraid that I shall not be able to say the good things I intended to say with reference to the Government and their economy. As the people in the West know that $5,000 per anum in Ontario, say in the city of Ottawa, will go as far as $7,000, or perhaps $8,000, in the West, I am inclined to think that, under present conditions, with the economic depression under which we are suffering, and the necessity for strictest economy, they will consider that such increases as have been asked for here are not justified.

Much has been said about the condition of the West, and I am not going to deal with it. It has been discussed at considerable length, but I assure you that what has been said has not been overdrawn. We are living in critical times. There has been such a keen competition between the different factions, and the different industries throughout the country, each striving to get what it could, without any thought as to the other fellow, that these industries have driven the agricultural classes pretty well to the wall, and if the crop this year should fail, I shudder to think of the result. I am afraid the industrial and commercial life of Canada would almost topple over like a house of cards.

I have been looking, and hoping, for the strictest economy in connection with the Civil Service. It is hard to get proof of many things I believe, but I think that a great many more officials are engaged than are required. While there are many who are giving efficient service, who are earning their money and are not getting any more than they should receive, on the other hand, there are men engaged in the Civil Service who are not required. How do you suppose the returned soldier who was placed in a position of want and need, would feel when he went into the Soldiers' Settlement Board in the city of Regina, was kept waiting two hours before he could see the party he wished to see, and observed twenty stenographers, not one of whom, during those two hours, handled the typewriter? He would get the impression —and I think many have the impression— that, while a large sum of money may have been expended, as has been pointed out here, in re-establishing returned soldiers and paying them pensions at figures that would seem to indicate that they have been better treated in Canada than in other countries—too much of the money has gone into administration, and too much to the officers rather than to the private soldiers. I would like to see an analysis of the figures, and see how much has been spent in administration, how much has gone to officers, and how much to private soldiers. I have met many private soldiers who, I am quite convinced, have not been fairly treated. I am not going to speak at length on this matter, but I do not feel like backing up the action of the minister or the Government in increasing salaries all along the line.

Mr. BELAND: I quite appreciate the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Millar). I am also of the opinion that the strictest economy and retrenchment should

be practised in administration, not only in this department but in all other departments of the public service. It is true that in every department there is a considerable number of officials who are receiving somewhat high salaries, but I may be permitted to say to my hon. friend that those salaries are based on a classification which has been made. The salary attached to each particular class is fixed by the Civil Service Commission, or by the reclassification board employed by the late government for the purpose. This afternoon some remarks were made on the subject of the increase of $500 to the supervisor of expenditures, whose salary was already $4,500. The right hon. gentleman, in explanation given to the House, stated that these officials were not subject to the Civil Service Commission or rather, to be exact, that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. In a large measure that is true, but in so far as the civil government employees are concerned, they come under the supervision of the Civil Service Commission and in this particular instance the $500 which is asked for as an increase cannot be paid to Mr. Waddington, or the supervisor of expenditures, until it has been authorized by the Civil Service Commission, and that applies to all other officials whose salaries are under study and observation by the commission at the present time. As to the other officials, the increase is the regular increase provided for all officials—absolutely the same. As regards the promises and pledges made during the election campaign, my hon. friend is undoubtedly better posted than I am. Though it was my privilege to cover a large part of Canada during the last campaign, I never heard either the leader of the Government or any gentleman associated with him on the platform making threats of the kind that have been referred to. I cannot, of course, speak for those who delivered public addresses in my absence. The manifesto of a certain gentleman, who stood as Liberal candidate in British Columbia, has been quoted in this House. I am not in a position to answer for him. I am not, moreover, exactly informed in the subject, and, perhaps, other hon. gentlemen are not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about the official Liberal handbook which I hold in my hand?

Mr. BELAND: I explained before six o'clock to my hon. friend that it is quite evident to-day, after recent conventions of the Veterans, that the sentiment of the latter, and the veterans at large in Canada, is unalterably opposed to the payment of a cash bonus.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The Great War Veterans' Association was never in favour of paying a cash bonus; it was a little body of returned men headed by a man called Flynn.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend has been, for a long time, a member of this House, and I know he wants to be fair; but if he sat with us in the parliamentary committee two years ago when that committee convened at the Museum, he will remember that, outside of Mr. Flynn or his followers, three or four gentlemen representing very important bodies of returned men submitted to the committee a definite plan for the payment of a cash bonus. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) was present, and he will remember that it was a well-elaborated plan. It was, indeed, an attractive plan, but at that time it did not carry with the committee or with Parliament. Since then, as everyone is aware, it has developed that the veterans, with the exception of a very few, are opposed to the payment of a cash bonus. If I am not mistaken, listening to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King), I took it that his idea was not so much that a cash bonus should be paid to the returned men, as that our duty towards the returned men would be measured by the ability of the country to pay; that he would go as far as the financial resources of the country would warrant. That is what I took from the remarks of the present Prime Minister all through the campaign while it was my privilege to accompany him. I do not know why my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), who leads the Opposition so ably, should attempt to make a little political capital out of this thing. I sat for three years on the parliamentary committee as a member representing the then Opposition in this House, I had associated with me, a number of Liberal members, and not on one occasion did we seek to gain a particle of political advantage out of a proposition that we might have made at the time, not only in the country, but on the floor of this House. Hon. gentlemen who sat in the previous House, many of whom I see here, will remember that when the then hon. member for London, Mr. Cronyn, presented to this House the report of the committee, I for

one rose in my seat to concur in it, and it was adopted unanimously. Who would deny that, such an opportunity being offered to me, I could not have availed myself of it to propose something that I knew the government could not carry out. I never did that. Why? Because I think it is really criminal, in the case of returned men and their cause, that we should seek any political advantage. It is beyond doubt that, in a heated campaign, some men will publish something that may attract a few votes to them. That has happened undoubtedly amongst some of the Liberal candidates, and who can say, without fear of contradiction, that some of my right hon. friend's friends have not, on some occasion, resorted to the same tactics. I am quite sure they have. But we are here to study the important problem of re-establishment, as we have been engaged in doing in previous sessions, and let us examine this question without allowing ourselves to be biased by political or partisan inclinations. That is my view of the subject. I think I have given the committee, in all good faith and sincerity, the reasons why these salaries should be voted. Whether it be the desire of the committee that they should be passed, is another matter.

Mr. ARTHURS: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he believed a great majority of the returned soldiers were unalterably opposed to a cash bonus. Is that correct?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. ARTHURS: I am afraid the hon. gentleman has in mind an indiscriminate cash bonus. Will he also say that he believes the returned soldier is not in favour of a cash bonus which is dependent in amount upon length of service?

Mr. BELAND: I am not aware of any such resolutions being adopted by any of the veterans' organizations. The returned men have submitted a number of suggestions to this Government, as they have to the late government. These suggestions in due course will be submitted to the parliamentary committee that is shortly to be appointed for the purpose of studying the important questions of re-establishment generally, the treatment of special or problem cases, the problem of amputation cases, the insurance feature of re-establishment, the treatment of patients generally, the granting of pensions and the care of the disabled soldier. Upon all these subjects we have received a number of suggestions, and they will be studied in due course by a committee that will be appointed. My personal opinions on the subject are well known. Anything which can be done on behalf of the returned men and which is compatible with the resources of the country, I for one am in favour of doing.

Mr. MANION: I quite believe my hon. friend is sincere in his remarks; but when he states that neither the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King), nor any one of the men who were associated with him, ever on the platform spoke in favour of the $2,000 gratuity, or anything verging upon that—that is about what I understood him to say—I think, perhaps, he is a little mistaken, because I hold in my hand an article which I remember reading at the time during my campaign in my constituency stating that when the leader of the present Government spoke in Port Arthur he begged the Liberals of Fort William to bring out a candidate against me, a thing which they did not do. When he spoke there, he had accompanying him Colonel Thompson, a personal friend of mine, a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of respect. Colonel Thompson spoke in the presence of the present Prime Minister, because he spoke right after the Prime Minister. According to the Fort William Times Journal of November 11, this is what Colonel Thompson said:

> Colonel Thompson spoke briefly, as he said the previous speakers had handled the questions of the day so completely there was little for him to say. He pledged the loyalty of the returned man to the country, declaring at the same time that the $2,000 bonus was not more than he deserved, in view of the high wages paid during the war to the men who remained in the industries. But the returned men were loyal, etc.

And he goes on with other remarks. Now, I admit that that is not an express endorsation of the demand for the $2,000 bonus; but if it is not an implied support of that demand, particularly in view of the fact that the Liberal party's platform pledged itself to the grant, then I do not quite know what it is. The leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) was on the platform when Colonel Thompson made this speech, and he had spoken a few minutes before Colonel Thompson did. In fact, just before the account of Colonel Thompson's speech is a report of my hon. friend's remarks, and he certainly had at that time an opportunity to put himself on record as being opposed to the $2,000 grant, just as I did. I remember well

making a speech which was used against me in my election, because I had taken a stand against the grant. May I say to my hon. friends on the left, before I sit down, that some of them have been unfairly critical of hon. members in this corner of the House because they have thought it necessary to consider this question. Hon. gentlemen on our left speak as though we were wasting time. I presume, however, that when we come to the tariff they will take up the plank of the Liberal platform and deal with it from their point of view because it happens to suit their purpose. Just at the moment the party at this end of the Chamber think that the question of the grant to the soldiers is one that can fairly be discussed, and I think that if my hon. friends on the left of us can discuss any question that suits them, we should be able to do the same. I may say that I ran against a gentleman who supported the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and although I have nothing to say against him personally, many of the friends who worked in his interest carried on against me as lying and slanderous a campaign as was ever conducted against a man in any fight in the country. I do not see, therefore, why we should be chided because once in a while we spend a little time discussing this matter, which was embodied in the plank of the Liberal party's platform.

Mr. CRERAR: Before six oclock, Mr. Chairman, I drew your attention to the fact that the discussion was out of order. We are considering a matter of voting salaries to pay nine employees in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I can quite understand that it may be a pleasant occupation to hold political inquests, and I could do a little inquesting myself under this head if I cared to do so. I submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Manion), however, that the whole discussion of the bonus is out of order under this head, and I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANION: May I speak to this question before you give your decision, Mr. Chairman? I think that on these Estimates any part of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment vote comes up for consideration, and to my mind the question of the $2,000 bonus is certainly a part of this whole question. The grant was claimed by a large percentage of returned soldiers headed by Flynn, and it is still claimed by many; and I repeat that the question was used against me in my own constituency. So long as it is a claim on the part of the returned soldiers in the country, it is, in my opinion, just as right to discuss the bonus as it is to consider the wages of the men who carry out the re-establishment.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has asked for a ruling on the relevancy of the discussion respecting a bonus to returned soldiers. In my opinion there is very much ground for the position taken by the hon. member, and I feel that the discussion has exceeded reasonable bounds. I do not think that the remarks of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) are entirely relevant to the subject before the committee, but this being my first day in the Chair, I have been inclined to allow some latitude to discussion. Perhaps I should have been within the strict interpretation of the rules had I called hon. members to order before, but the discussion, I think, is now distinctly out of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In view of the fact that there is no item in the Estimates for soldier appropriations, it would be useful to the committee, Mr. Chairman, if you would suggest under what item we might discuss this subject.

Mr. CRERAR: There are various ways in which my right hon. friend can bring the matter before the House. He can do so by way of private member's resolution in condemnation of the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But in committee.

Mr. CRERAR: I submit that if on any item before the House we are to wander over the whole field of political inquesting, we shall never get through with the business of the session. I have a good deal of sympathy with the attitude my right hon. friend has taken, and the leader of the Government is perhaps in a rather difficult position in giving an explanation; but I submit that this is not the proper place in which to discuss this question. I want to see the business of the House proceed and the minister in charge of the department get his estimates through, with such reasonable explanations as the House is entitled to have.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister has given an explanation on one question I asked before, and I shall put the question again as clearly as I can. The department last year had twenty-five clerks and officers, and sixteen clerks have been

discharged because there was no more work for them. At least, that is what we infer from the Estimates: to use the words in the Estimates, "the position is not required." The Government has retained nine of these officers, and they are the highest paid. Surely some of the highly-paid executive officers could have been dispensed with if the Minister could discharge two-thirds of the staff. The answer suggested by my hon. friend, that the Civil Re-establishment Department includes the Pension Board, does not affect this question at all; the Pension Board carry on all their business with their own staff and with their own appropriation, and all that the minister has to do is to act as a medium of approach between the Pension Board and Parliament. His staff has very little, if anything, to do with the Pension Board administration. We should therefore have an explanation as to why the Government cannot dispense with some of the highly paid executive staff in conjunction with the sixteen clerks for whom there is now no work.

Mr. BELAND: The officials for whom the salaries are being asked administer the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. At the present time this department comprises in round numbers, not twenty-nine, but five thousand employees in the different units throughout the country from Vancouver to Halifax. In Ottawa we have some eleven hundred employees, and we have units also in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, London, Ont., Toronto, Montreal and Halifax.

As regards these sixteen clerical positions not required, we are not dispensing with these men. We thought they would probably be required, but have found that they will not be required for this year. Perhaps my hon. friend was absent from the House before six o'clock when I stated that a number of the higher officials are being dispensed with. I cited the case of an official in Toronto drawing a salary of $5,000 a year whose services would terminate on the last day of this month. If I am not mistaken, his name is Mr. Coulthard, in charge of the surgical appliances branch. I am informed by the officials of the department that he will not be replaced. I also cited the case of an engineer in Montreal, drawing a salary of over $3,000, whose services have already been dispensed with, and there are other cases. I could have supplied full information to the committee and had the deputy minister with me had I known that these questions would be raised. My hon. friend may rest assured that it is not only the officials drawing small salaries that are being dispensed with, but, proportionately, an equal number of the higher officials.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in Ottawa.

Mr. BELAND: If my hon. friend were minister of this department he could realize that these officials are actually required, to carry out in an efficient manner the work of the department all over the country, and unless my worthy predecessor thinks these men should be dispensed with, I doubt whether we should let them go, at the present time at all events. It was represented to me that these men are necessary for the efficient carrying out of the work of the department.

Miss MACPHAIL: Starting with the lower salaried officials and going up the list, there is first an increase of $40; one of $60, and three of $120, the last one being an increase from $3,240 to $3,360. Then we have a rather large jump in the salary of the Supervisor of Expenditures, from $4,500 to $5,000. I should like to ask the minister whether the Supervisor of Expenditures has any particular educational or technical qualifications to justify that increase. What is the explanation for this jump in his salary? An increase of $120 seems quite reasonable, but it almost looks as though it were a case of the higher the salary the higher the increase which is really quite a familiar thing to-day.

Mr. BELAND: It will be to my eternal honour that some explanations of mine have drawn into the discussion in this committee the first lady member of the House. I hope that I shall be successful in answering the question which she has so gracefully asked. The increase is always, I think, based on the amount of the salary, and is regulated by the Civil Service Commission. In the case of a man drawing a salary of $4,500, I would think that if an increase was granted at all, it should be $500. In the case of the next man down the list, who is now receiving $3,240, the increase is proportionately less, $120. Lower down the list, as my hon. friend from Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) has pointed out, the increases drop from $60 to $40. I would repeat that no increase in salary in these cases can be granted unless it is approved by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in this case.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, in this case. There can be no increase in salary unless author-

ized under the Civil Service Act, which means, by the Civil Service Commission. Answering the question by my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) this afternoon, Mr. Waddington was appointed after competitive examination three years ago.

Mr. SPENCE: Is the Supervisor of Expenditures working on a graded salary?

Mr. BELAND: I am not in a position to give that information at present, but I shall be glad to do so when the Estimates of the department are up.

Mr. SPENCE: I think raising a man's salary in this way is a bad precedent to establish. I have a great interest in the returned men, and anything the minister may do for them will have my sincere sympathy and support. I was inspired to suggest this afternoon that a royal commission be appointed to deal with these special cases, so that the returned men who had grievances could appear before the commission as it travelled over the country and lay their cases before them. I might mention one particular case, that of a fireman on one of the railways. He went overseas, came back and was discharged, and since has been invalided. I am sorry to say he had to be sent to an asylum, and now he has a seizure every day or two and is not fit to carry on any work. He has a wife and child, and nothing to support them. The D.S.C.R. refuses to support him. They say that under the Act they cannot do anything for him. It is such cases as this that the royal commission could take up. I have the honour, Mr. Chairman, to be a supporter of the right hon. Arthur Meighen—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPENCE:—a man possessed of distinguished qualities, a man who has both backbone and ability; a man who is highly regarded in all parts of this Dominion. I may say that at a meeting at which the right hon. Arthur Meighen was to speak—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that while it has always been the custom under the items of the Estimates pertaining to civil government to discuss the general policy of the department concerned, he is, I think, travelling rather far afield. We have spent a good deal of time on this resolution, and I would ask the hon. member to deal particularly with the matter under discussion as found on page 113 of the Estimates.

Mr. SPENCE: I am not transgressing the rules any more than other hon. members did, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. SPENCE: Then if I may not go ahead I will take my seat.

Mr. WHITE: I am not just clear in my mind as to what jurisdiction these particular salaries come under. It has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition that they do not come under Civil Service Commission; yet the minister has referred to increases which are granted under the rules of that body. I am at sea as to what those rules are, as regards maximum salary and so on. The increases asked for cannot be justified by the increased duties of the officers concerned, because sixteen clerks have been dispensed with, as well as other officials; so that the work of the department must surely be lessened. Nor can the increase be based on the cost of living, because reports issued by the Department of Labour go to show that the cost of living has come down in all branches. It seems to me that the more serious part of this question has not yet been touched on. There is an increase of but $960 in respect of six positions, but there is a precedent being established which may affect a great many positions in the gift of the Government. The Minister of Railways, through his heads of departments, will have to convince some of the railroad men that they should accept lower wages in order that freight rates may be reduced. If the principle involved in the increases now proposed is adopted in one case and not in another, some difficulty may result. If these increases are put through, what about the principles of economy that were preached before the election? The Government would be well advised to forego any such increases as are now proposed.

Mr. JELLIFF: I have been waiting patiently throughout this discussion to hear some justification of these increases. If the efficiency of the minister's department is going to be proportionately increased by adding $500 to the salary of one employee, $120 to the salaries of several others, $60 and $40 in other cases, I should offer no objection, because I do not believe we can have in any of these departments too high

a degree of efficiency. But that has not been established by any explanation made by the hon. minister. It has not been shown that there is any logical connection between the increases asked for and the reduction in the total personnel. If additional duties or responsibilities were to devolve upon remaining employees because of a reduction in the numbers of the staff, we could reconcile ourselves to increases, provided, as appears from these Estimates, there is a considerable reduction in the total amount required by the department. I was elected, as was almost everyone sitting on this side of the House, on a platform of strict economy.

9 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: Not including the hon. members to your extreme right.

Mr. JELLIFF: Oh, no. Mr. Chairman, I come from a portion of the country where in municipality after municipality the farmers, to the extent of seventy-five per cent of the population, are unable to pay their provincial taxes. Furthermore, in order to redeem that portion of the country, in order to make it a national asset instead of a national liability, those farmers have assumed a burden amounting to $5,000,000 for the purpose of irrigation. In order to put that country on its proper footing they have assumed an indebtedness that it will take nearly all this generation of farmers in the district to discharge. I cannot go back and face my people there if I vote for increases which are not justified by efficiency or by some other good and sufficient reason. There is a large decrease in the total amount asked for this department. I believe that the minister is heartily in favour of doing all he can for the returned men, and I would like to stand behind him. But I would like a further justification of the increases asked by this vote.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The Minister has said that under the rules of the Civil Service Commission the maximum salary of employees now getting $4,500 is $5,000. The Estimates, however, show that that rule does not apply in other departments. I do not think that is the scale adopted by the Civil Service Commission.

Item agreed to.

Department of Railways and Canals—salaries, $191,970; Contingencies, $29,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One moment. Surely the Minister of Railways is not going to ask that all his civil government estimates go through without any explanation, particularly when that minister permitted an ambiguous, almost meaningless, assertion of policy in the Speech from the Throne to come before Parliament to be voted on without any details as to what the intention of the Government was, and after a promise from the Prime Minister that the desired explanation would be given. We ought to have had that explanation even before being called upon to pass the Address. Surely it is now the duty of the minister to tell the House what the policy of the Government in relation to the railways is before we are asked to vote the civil government estimates providing for the salaries of the officers of the department. For example, would it not be interesting to know whether the Intercolonial railway is to be taken out from the management of the national railways and placed again under the Department of Railways and Canals as was promised by certain members supporting the Government? Is that promise to be carried out? If so we may be required to vote these estimates and more, because the railway department will have more to do then than it has to-day, and we will have a lot of questions as to who are going to be necessary and who are not. These estimates may be necessary if the Intercolonial is really going back under the administration of the Department of Railways but may not be necessary if the administration of that railway stays where it is. Now is the time, when we are entering upon the consideration of the railway estimates, to know what the railway policy of the Government is. I hope the desired explanation will not be deferred again. I hope we shall not be asked to vote money from the Treasury to carry out the railway policy of the Government without knowing what that policy is.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways and Canals): My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is not more anxious—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg my hon. friend's pardon?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I should say the ex-Prime Minister; we have been so accustomed to refer to my right hon. friend as the Prime Minister that I for the moment forgot the change that has taken place. I want to tell my right hon. friend

that I am just as anxious to make a statement to the House as he is to hear it. I hope, however, he will agree with me that in order to present an intelligent statement it is necesary that we should be in possession of all the facts and figures essential for the purposes of comparison when considering the main Estimates. The railroads that are under the jurisdiction of the Government have to make their returns at the end of the year and these returns should be embodied in the railway statement. They have not yet been submitted to the department. I am awaiting these statistics and they cannot come too soon; I am doing everything I can to hurry them up. Then I shall be glad indeed to make a statement of the Government's railway policy as far as I can and explain the transactions of the past year. To-night we are simply called upon to discuss the civil government estimates of the department. In so far as the main Estimates are concerned it will be necessary to have the story of the past year's operations before we can discuss them intelligently. All that I am now asking, Mr. Chairman, is that we go on with the estimates of civil government.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): In the Speech from the Throne it is stated that the policy of the Government is to co-ordinate the different railway properties that belong to the Canadian people, and it does seem to me that before being asked to take up any railway estimates at all we might very well have from the Minister of Railways a statement of just what the Government means by the use of the word "co-ordination". The word is susceptible of a great many meanings. It may mean just what this Government believes to be the proper policy, it may mean many other things; and it does seem to me that the Minister of Railways ought, before going on with any part of his Estimates to give to the committee a statement of exactly what the Government means; how they propose to manage the different properties; what they propose to do with the properties now managed by the Grand Trunk Board, and what they propose to do with the properties having regard to the management under the board of which Mr. Hanna is the head. These are matters that in no way depend upon the annual reports to which the minister has just referred. We on this side urge that that statement be given to the committee, that the committee be told in clear terms exactly what the policy of the Government is—either that or that the items we are now asked to consider stand until that statement has been given.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat was Minister of Railways for two or three months just before the out-going government went to the people. Nobody knows better than he, therefore, that in so far as these estimates are concerned the question of co-ordination does not bear on them at all. These are civil government estimates, there is nothing in them that will be affected by the meaning of the term "co-ordination." I have told his leader and I have told the committee that before the main estimates are brought in I will submit a statement giving in full the policy of this Government. To-night I am asking that the civil government estimates be taken up and it is for the committee to decide whether they care to do so or not.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): It seems to me that the question as to how the Government proposes to handle the railway properties is one that has direct reference to the items we are now asked to consider. These officers for whom salaries are sought will have to do with the management of the railway properties; and whether these properties are to be managed as they are now, or managed by two boards, or whether we are to follow the advice of the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and have another management of the Intercolonial—these are all matters that surely bear direct reference to the estimates we are now asked to consider. The two hon. members referred to have laid it down as a part of the Confederation pact that the Intercolonial railway must be taken away from the management of any of these boards. That must be done they say, in order to carry out what preceded Confederation, and to give effect to what I understood the member for Cumberland to say was contained in Section 142 of the British North America Act.

Mr. LOGAN: Section 145.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Very well, Section 145 of the British North America Act—that in order to carry out its terms we must place this road back under government and political control, and with that control must go the regulation of the rates without any regard to either the cost of operation or the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners. It does seem to me therefore that the whole question of

the administration of the Railway Department is one which depends upon how these properties are going to be handled, and it is surely a reasonable request that we either have the statement asked for, or that these items shall stand until that statement is presented by the minister.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I have again to say to my hon. friend that he simply wishes to anticipate the statement that will be made when I am in possession of the facts that bear upon it and when the right time comes it will be presented. There are many questions arising in connection with the subject and everyone will have ample opportunity to present his views when that time comes; but such a discussion to-night is entirely out of place. In the debate in the Speech from the Throne the leader of the Government told my hon. friend perhaps the one thing he is most concerned about and that is that there is to be one control. That will be dealt with at the right time, and to-night I do not think it is out of the way to refer to the discussion that took place when the railway estimates were before the House on former occasions. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the discussion a year ago, when the hon. Dr. Reid had charge of railways and canals, he will find that we discussed the civil government estimates without the statement of the minister, and I am only asking the House to do what has been the practice in the past, with the full assurance that at the right time, and in the very near future, I will be able to give the hon. gentleman the full information which he desires.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The items we are asked to consider are not urgent. If they were, there might be something in the claim that is now made by the minister. Last year, when the House was asked to consider these same items, under the conditions that have been stated by the minister, we were on into the middle of April. None of these items is required. The amount provided for in the votes is not required at the present time, and no interests will suffer by delay. If it were a question of the money not being available to pay the items at the present time, it seems to me the minister would be justified in making the request which he has made to-night, but, in view of the fact that the money is not required, it seems to me that the request we make on this side of the House, that these matters be allowed to stand until we are able to take up the whole question, is a reasonable one.

Mr. FIELDING: I suggest that the same objection might be raised to any item that is not urgent. All the items in the Estimates are urgent. We are anxious to advance business, and, therefore, the criticism is not a strong one. We are proceeding in the same way as Parliament proceeded in former years. I do not hesitate to say that if hon. gentlemen think this item should not be hurried along too much, I will offer no objection, and I will advise my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to consent. But the same thing might be said for every department. You might say "It is not urgent, what is the hurry?" There is no particular hurry, except that all business must be put through.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Surely there is this difference between this department and any other department; that the minister himself has stated that there is due the House a statement, which was not only promised in the Speech from the Throne, but in the remarks made by the Prime Minister himself upon the Address. There is that difference between this department and any other department that might be considered. In that respect I do not think, as the hon. Minister of Finance has said, that it is exactly on all fours with any other department and the objection that we urge in this connection could not be urged with the same force against any other department. The question of urgency is an incident. It is not the objection on which we are asking for delay. We are asking for delay, not because the items are not urgent, but because we have not the statement that has been promised to the House by the minister, and for that reason we request that the items be allowed to stand.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the hon. gentleman think there is material difference between the procedure now and the procedure in other sessions? The statement of the minister is due, but, it is not always brought in. Whether promised in the Speech or not, the statement has to accompany the main Estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals, and always did, and that is the practice now. However, if the hon. gentleman thinks it is desirable that this item be held over, I do not wish to suggest that it should be pressed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We certainly ask to have it stand. As to the railway policy, there is uncertainty. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not dispute that there is uncer-

tainty as to what the Government propose to do on major questions of public policy. There is uncertainty, and doubt, even in the Speech from the Throne itself. No one on this side of the House knows what is going to be done. We do not know what are to be the responsibilities of the Department of Railways. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite do or not, but I venture to suggest over half of them do not, and I venture also to suspect that at least a third of them expect something to be done that is not going to be done.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a good reason for objecting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unquestionably there is doubt as to the railway policy. Now, I put it to the Minister of Finance: Is there any subject, is there any department, as to the policy of which there is no uncertainty on the part of this Government? If there is one I should like to take up the civil estimates of that department.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid my hon. friend would say there is none.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will admit the truth of that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let us take up my Estimates. They are practically the same as the Estimates of the right hon. gentleman last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I expect there is no policy with regard to the hon. gentleman's estimates, so that perhaps we can take them up.

Item stands.

Privy Council, Salaries,..	$44,810
Contingencies..	10,000

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bases of this estimate are the figures that my hon. friend caused to be inserted last year. There are no increases in the staff, and there are no increases in any of the salaries, excepting those that are statutory.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I see there is an extra clerk required. The minister tells us that the increases here are statutory. Is that one clerk a statutory increase, or how is that?

Mr. CALDWELL: He is trading an office boy for a private secretary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is a private secretary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many private secretaries has the minister? All those formerly employed are apparently to be employed again, except the office boy, and I do not really recall who that was. I cannot remember any office boy. And the next is "allowance to private secretary $600". That is the ordinary allowance. In place of those two items, there is to be another private secretary at $3,600 and another assistant at $3,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the amount the hon. gentleman just mentioned of $600 was the amount voted in addition to the regular allowance of a clerk who served as a private secretary. That was adopted last session because my right hon. friend had a private secretary appointed as a clerk, and gave him the additional allowance of $600. Under the new Civil Service regulations, the appointment to the staff is made at the salary named in the estimates, no additional allowance being given to the official as private secretary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is correct, but it means an additional cost to the country of $5,610. Why not do it in the old way and save the country $5,610?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my right hon. friend will recall that there are two departments—Privy Council and the Department of External Affairs. I think he had control of only the one when he was Prime Minister. At the present time the office of President of the Privy Council has been consolidated with that of the Prime Minister, a saving of $10,000 being effected thereby. That has imposed an additional duty on the Prime Minister, and under the circumstances, it seemed permissible to allow him an extra private secretary. We save $10,000 by not having a separate portfolio, and all we add is a little extra for a private secretary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that explanation will go. There was more under the Prime Minister before. The Mounted Police Department was under him, and I think there was some other department as well that is not now under the hon. gentleman. It is true the Presidency of the Privy Council is held now by the Minister of External Affairs; but the management of the Privy Council is merely a duty in Council; it is not a duty involving administrative functions particularly at all, not at all events since the mounted police, who formerly were under that department, and the Department of Health, have been moved out. I think there is, perhaps, one port-

folio less in the present Government than in the previous Government, but I think my calculation is correct that there are two more than in the Government which administered affairs during the last session of this House. There is an increase of about $20,000. The diminution is only over the government that was formed in the month of September, 1921; consequently, over what has prevailed substantially for a long time back, instead of there being a diminution, there is an increase, and I may say that I am not very hopeful that even this saving of $10,000 will last very long. How many private secretaries are there? I do not see how more could be utilized; I do not know of any cause of more being utilized. I managed to keep those we had fairly busy, but I do not see how any minister could utilize any more.

Mr. McMASTER: Before the Prime Minister replies, might I make an observation? One of the duties of private members on the Government side of the House is to listen attentively. Their work can be rendered much easier and much pleasanter for themselves, if Prime Minister, ex-Prime Minister, Ministers of the Crown and ex-Ministers of the Crown would speak in an audible voice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member kindly tell us who the two additional secretaries are?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Beaudry is private secretary, and Mr. Talbot is assistant secretary.

Mr. HANSON: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us whether these private secretaries have been approved by the Civil Service Commission, or is this the extension of a little patronage on his part?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Civil Service Commission have approved their appointment in accordance with the regular method prescribed.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—External Affairs—salaries and contingencies, $110,030.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is a change of one in the number of clerks; but with that exception, the amounts asked for are identical with what was asked for last year by the then Prime Minister when he was in charge of the Department of External Affairs. The only increases are those which are allowed by statute.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There seems to be 100 per cent increase in private secretaries again. There was one private secretary before, and we now have two private secretaries. Is there a boom in private secretaries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If there is any explanation needed in that regard, it is simply that the Estimates, as now presented, state exactly the position in which the clerk is employed. I am informed that in previous sessions a vote had been taken under the designation "secretary clerk," and the official having that position would fill the position of private secretary. I have tried to make it plain that the positions which these officials are intended to fill are those of private secretaries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid the Prime Minister should look at his Estimates for he is not getting rid of his secretary clerks. There were three secretary clerks before, and there are three this year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that. It illustrates one of the difficulties set in the way of the Government under the working of the Civil Service Commission. My right hon. friend had a couple of very estimable gentlemen as his private secretaries. Under the working of the Civil Service regulations both of these gentlemen have to be retained in the Department of External Affairs at the salaries which they were then receiving, very high salaries, one being $3,800 and the other $4,000. I think it is obvious to hon. members that it could hardly be expected that an incoming Prime Minister should take over the private secretaries of the outgoing Prime Minister. Under these circumstances, it has been necessary to retain in the Department of External Affairs at the high salaries mentioned, the gentlemen who were secretaries to my right hon. friend. I might explain that one of these gentlemen has since been transferred by the Civil Service Commission to another department of the Government, a department for which he is well suited, and I hope that before long it will be possible to have the other gentleman also transferred to some other department, but under the working of the Civil Service Act as it is to-day, the Prime Minister is obliged to keep both of these gentlemen on the permanent staff at the salaries mentioned in the Estimates. I think both of them are splendid men, have filled their

positions with credit to themselves and have rendered real service to the country. It is a misfortune that we are restricted in the manner we are in the matter of making transfers.

Mr. BOYS: Practically all the officials in this branch down to the last four have their salaries increased, and strange to say, those who can least afford a reduction, namely, three confidential messengers and one messenger clerk, have their salaries reduced. The three confidential messengers suffer a loss of $180, and one messenger-clerk a loss of $120. It seems strange that those who get the larger salaries should be increased, while those with smaller allowances are cut down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a matter regulated entirely by the Civil Service regulations. There are many aspects of the work of that body that are difficult of understanding and appreciation, and this would appear to be one of them. In regard to any decreases, unless there has been a transference of some clerk at a higher salary to some other department, which has necessitated the bringing in of another at a lower salary. I cannot see that there is anything to indicate that anyone has been reduced.

Mr. BOYS: I appreciate the increases, because they are statutory; but surely there is nothing that compels you to reduce the salary of the lowest paid men.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What has taken place is this. One high paid confidential messenger has been transferred to another department, and instead of bringing into the office another man at a similar salary, a messenger has been brought in as a junior who will have to work his way up.

Mr. BOYS: What about the three confidential messengers? Have they all been transferred, or are they new messengers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is one new one, but the others were there when my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) was in the department.

Mr. BOYS: I can understand the explanation regarding one, but not the four.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I owe it to the Prime Minister to confirm the principle which he expounded as regards secretaries. Efficient secretaries cannot be obtained if at the expiration of the term of office of their minister they are to be merely turned out and let loose on the world. Consequently, it has been a rule that they shall be given the salary that they had before, without the secretarial allowance, and in so far as these Estimates provide for that, I commend rather than criticise them. I am not clear, however, as to how that was effected. I understand that my secretary, who was with me a considerable time, is going to the Interior Department, where certainly he can render his best service, and therefore there need be no provision for him here. But as regards the others, I see that $4,000 for one was voted last year, while this year there are two, one at $3,800 and one at $3,000. It may be that he is accepting a lower salary; if so I make no comment at the time. But still there appears to be another secretary, that is to say, there are two instead of one. In other words, there are two for the office of External Affairs and two for the office of the President of the Privy Council. I am afraid my hon. friend will not be able to get out of his office for secretaries.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend was able to get out of his office I shall not have any difficulty in getting out of mine, because I have the same number of secretaries as he had, I think he had the same number of persons acting as secretaries though they may not have been so designated. The only difference between himself and myself is that I have designated the office of secretary as such. It is quite true that I have a secretary attached to the office of the Privy Council, and also to the office of External Affairs, but as my right hon. friend knows, External Affairs appropriation covers also the requirements of the Prime Minister's office, and I do not think that anyone in this House will for a moment think it extravagant to ask for two secretaries for the responsible position of Prime Minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly not, and I do not want to appear to dispute the word of the Prime Minister; but I cannot make his statement harmonize with the estimates. There are two secretaries provided for here in about the sixth item in the estimate. That is clear. Then going back to the Privy Council estimates, we find there are two more, or four in all. Now, I do not think that four secretaries can be efficiently used, but even supposing that they can, I do not understand the explanation that these are simply officers who formerly acted

as secretaries and are now being only named as such. If so, the Prime Minister should be able to point out where there is a reduction from last year's estimate in lieu of the men who acted as clerks last year. A man may have served as clerk last year, getting $600 extra as secretary. Well, show where he goes off as clerk, in order that we may understand why he appears again as secretary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is hardly fair when he seeks to imply that there are four secretaries for this one office. As I explained a moment ago, two departments of the Government have been brought under one minister, and I cannot agree with the leader of the Opposition when he says that there are no duties attaching to the office of President of the Privy Council. During all the time that he was Prime Minister he had four secretaries but he had also a separate minister holding the position of President of the Council, and that minister had his staff with him. He had his secretaries, and evidently there was work then for them to do. There is work to be done to-day, and it is a very considerable work, as my right hon. friend would know if he had acted as President of the Privy Council. I appreciate the fact that he was not President of the Council and therefore cannot be aware of the work attached to the office. The President of the Privy Council found it necessary to have the staff I ask for here, and I confess that I find it absolutely necessary myself.

Mr. TOLMIE: I quite agree with the remarks of the leader of the Opposition regarding the hardships suffered by secretaries who on the expiration of the term of office of their ministers are thrown out of employment. Is it the aim of the Government on this occasion to find work for such secretaries at the salaries that they would have drawn, with the $600 secretarial allowance deducted?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There again, it is not a matter so much of Government policy as what the Civil Service Commission will permit. There are a number of positions in the Civil Service to which men may be appointed at the instance of the Commission. So far as it is possible to do so, the Government is trying to take care of the secretaries of gentlemen who held portfolios in the late government. For instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) has retained the secretary of his predecessor at exactly the same salary, and proposes to treat him in exactly the same way. That has not been possible in all departments, but we have endeavoured to look after those members of the service who were secretaries and to see that they receive the salaries that would be equivalent to what they earned previously in the departments. I think that a man who has served as an efficient private secretary to a minister of the Crown is likely to make the very best type of civil servant; he is apt to have much larger experience and wider information than any clerk, of the work of the Government departments except in special fields; and I should like very much if some way could be found to retain men who have given service to the country, not by day only but also by night, year in and year out, and who at the time of change of administration might otherwise not be retained in their offices. It cannot all be done in a day, however.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the whole, I think the Government have acted fairly with the secretaries of the late ministers. I do not know that that statement can be applied absolutely, but speaking generally I think they have acted fairly. I simply want to understand the vote. I think I understand by the last statement of the Prime Minister that he has two secretaries as President of the Privy Council and two secretaries as Minister of External Affairs, making four secretaries in all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would state it in this way. I have one secretary as President of the Privy Council; he has an assistant. I have one secretary as Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, and he has an assistant. As my right hon. friend knows, and this should be remembered, the difference between the office of the Prime Minister and that of other departments of the Government is that most of the work is necessarily carried on by the secretaries, not by a staff as in the case of other departments. Practically, the immediate personnel of the Prime Minister's office changes with a change of Government. That is not so to the same extent with regard to other Government departments.

Item agreed to.

High Commissioner's Office—salaries, $26,640; Contingencies, $76,586.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is exactly the same vote as last year except for the statutory increases.

Mr. HANSON: We have noticed through the press that a gentleman from the city of Toronto, a great personal friend of the Prime Minister, and a stalwart of the Liberal party, has been appointed to the very important position of High Commissioner for Canada at London. It seems to me that we might well have some statement from the Prime Minister as to any changes which he proposes to have made through that gentleman in the working of that office. I understand that it has been his stated policy that any announcement with regard to matters of policy, and I regard this as a matter of policy, shall be made to Parliament. I believe that principle has been honoured more in the breach than the observance by the present Prime Minister, because I notice that the present High Commissioner was banqueted on a number of occasions, on one of which at least I think the Prime Minister was present. I would suggest that this is an opportune moment for the Prime Minister to state to the House and to the country what changes he proposes shall take place with respect to the working of the office of the High Commissioner at London under the new incumbency.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may answer my hon. friend by saying that of recent years there have been representatives of different government departments in London, for instance the Immigration Department, the Pension Board, Trade and Commerce and other departments, each of which has carried on its work by direct communication with the departmental heads here, but there has not been supervision under one head, of all the government agencies in the Old Country. It is proposed that the High Commissioner who has just been appointed shall exercise supervision over all the government agencies in London, to co-ordinate the work as effectively as possible, and to be the one channel through which the departments of the Government will communicate with the Government offices in Great Britain. That is the one change, I think, of importance.

Another change that has been suggested is that in making further appointments to the office of the High Commissioner in London, an effort be made to secure Canadians to fill the vacancies that occur on the staff.

Mr. MANION: The Prime Minister has just covered the point I was going to raise. I have noticed at different times at that office in London that there were a great many on the staff who were not Canadians, and while I have no objection in any shape or form to British born being in that office, I believe that the Canadian office in London or anywhere else is one that should be filled by Canadians. I was going to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to make a statement in regard to that, and I am very pleased to hear that it is the intention of the Government to fill that office as far as possible with Canadians.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am getting afraid of the overtime working of this word "co-ordination". I do not know what is meant by co-ordination now. Perhaps we had better defer these estimates. How are you going to co-ordinate the various offices in England, the Immigration Office, the Trade and Commerce Office, and all the others under the High Commissioner? The Trade and Commerce officers are officers of the Trade and Commerce Department and will be subject to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Immigration officers, Mr. Obed Smith and those under him, are under the Minister of the Interior. Similarly any officers that may be over there in the interests of the Railway Department will be under the Minister of Railways. How are they to be under the High Commissioner, and then each in turn under his minister here? That kind of co-ordination will simply mean chaos. It will simply mean a division of authority, a conflict of interest, friction and trouble, so if that is going to be the fruitage of all the promises made at these banquets I am afraid it would be better to eliminate co-ordination from the dictionary altogether. Would the Prime Minister tell us to what extent these men are to be responsible to the High Commissioner, and to what extent they are to be responsible to their ministers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might tell my hon. friend that when Sir George Perley, who was High Commissioner under his government, returned to Canada to tender his resignation, he informed me that he thought it very important that in some manner the High Commissioner should have supervising authority over all branches of the Canadian Government in England. He stated that during recent years different agencies of the Canadian Government in England were becoming accustomed to taking up matters on their own account with the British Government

without any knowledge on the part of the High Commisioner as to what was going on, and frequently this had resulted in two or three different departments of the government of Canada dealing with the Home Government without the knowledge of each other and with consequent confusion and a great deal of overlapping. He pointed out that from his view it was most important that, if possible, as had been originally intended, all communication between the Home Government and the different departments of the Canadian Government carrying on work there should be through the High Commissioner's office or with its knowledge. It was, I say quite frankly, on the suggestion and recommendation of Sir George Perley as the result of his experience as to what was best and most necessary in connection with that office, that the present Government was pleased to take the line of policy which it has taken, the advantages of which, I think, are so obvious as to commend it to everyone.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a very different thing indeed to placing these officers under the High Commisioner. What Sir George Perley evidently intended was this, that in so far as these officers acting under the instructions of their respective ministers had anything to do with the British Government they should act through the High Commissioner's office, making that the medium between them and the British Government. But that does not place them under the High Commissioner in any way whatsoever. It merely makes the High Commissioner the agency of communication for all the departments. There is no supervision exercisable by him at all, nor is there any co-ordination. There is merely the ultization of the High Commisioner's office for the purposes of communication with the British Government. That is all I have ever heard Sir George Perley urge, myself, and that does not in any way detract from the authority of the minister over his officers or place any of the supervising power over an officer of a department in the hands of the High Commissioner in London. That, I should think, would be detrimental to the service, and I venture to suggest that if the High Commissioner asked for it, his request would not be endorsed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the one hand or the Minister of the Interior on the other. To make him a medium of communication is wholly another thing. He is in no sense a supervisor of their work.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question which applies not only to this department, but possibly to some others. As prices are going down, we ought to expect some reduction in the items included under the heading "Contingencies"—clerical assistance, rent, insurance, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, etc. I notice here, and I have noticed in connection with the other estimates we have discussed this evening, that no reduction in these items is indicated. I feel a little uneasy lest with the falling prices we are really enlarging or increasing our expenditures.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is very difficult to tell exactly how much will be required for this service during any given year. It has been found advisable to vote annually a certain sum, all of which may not be required. We are simply following that course: we are voting, in round figures, the same as was voted last year. If the full amount is not needed, the balance will be returned to the Treasurey, but if an insufficient amount were voted, embarrassment might result. With the business growing as it is, what is saved through reduced costs may be taken up in increased and extended duties.

10 p.m.

Mr. GOOD: Well I do not feel quite satisfied with the answer, although it may be a sufficient one as applying to this particular item. If we vote more than will be required, we may be giving encouragement to extravagance, and surely that is something we ought to avoid. It might be that embarrassment would be caused if less than the amount required were voted. But if that applies to this particular department, it surely does not apply so much to the departments nearer home.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the salary of the High Commissioner?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am informed it is $10,000.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Militia and Defence—salaries and contingencies, $615,577.

Mr. MEWBURN: I have a very sincere sympathy with the minister who is in charge of this very onerous department of government, and I commend his efforts to economize. I find that he has reduced the staff by nine, making a net saving of $925, which is very commendable indeed. I understand that the minister is going to "co-

ordinate" several of the government services: militia, naval, police, and air services are to be merged. I think the items which have just been called ought to carry, but I sincerely trust that when the minister gets through with his efforts in the co-ordination of these four departments, there will be something left beyond air.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): I may say that I tried to use the word "synchronize" instead of the word "co-ordinate," but it did not seem to fit in.

Mr. HANSON: The "syn" part is all right.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, some of us do inherit things. The estimates for civil government are practically what they were last year. We have reduced the number of employes by nine, but we are providing for $24,000 by way of annual increase according to the classification. If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I will read a statement which the officers of the department have given me; it will cover the case fairly and generally:

The original permanent civil establishment of the Department of Militia and Defence for the fiscal year 1921-22 (i.e., the year of readjustment after the war and after reclassification) numbered 441. The Estimates for that year were prepared in the fall of 1920 and were not submitted to Parliament till four or five months later. Owing to the rapid falling off of the work during that time, it was difficult to make any close or accurate forecast of the needs of the department for twelve to fifteen months in advance. Accordingly, when the Estimates were presented to Parliament it was thought that 42 of the 441 positions would not be required and, on the suggestion of the Minister of Militia, the money for these positions was not voted, leaving a net establishment of 399 persons.

Later in the year it was found that two of these positions would be required, and as the incumbents had been in the service for many years and there was a surplus in the appropriation, their salaries were paid, bringing the establishment to 401 persons.

During the year, a committee on reorganization, consisting of a representative of the Civil Service Commission, the Assistant Deputy Minister, and another general representative of the Department, together with the Chief of the branch being reorganized, found during their investigations that it was expedient to create fourteen new permanent civil positions in the various branches of the department, thus making the establishment 415, but, at the same time, this Committee recommended that 24 of the then existing positions should be abolished, reducing the establishment to 391. The recommendation to Privy Council for the new establishment embracing these changes has been put forward by the Civil Service Commission and is now before Privy Council.

One account clerk, a returned soldier, still suffering from wounds, is carried supernumerary to establishment but for which no vote is required, reducing the actual establishment for which Estimates are being put forward to 390 as compared with 399 for last year.

Attached hereto is a balance sheet showing the changes in the establishment since April 1st, 1921, and the money value of these changes.

It should be noted in connection with the total amount voted for the fiscal year 1921-22, $586,431, and the total amount required for 1922-23, $585,577, that although the saving of $854 seems small, the amount for the coming year includes provision for the annual increases in salaries of $60, $120 or $180 to 390 employes and had there not been savings as described above and in reclassification, the requirements for this year must have exceeded the vote for last year by the estimated amount of those increases, viz: about $24,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Tell us when the work of re-classification was undertaken.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was begun in 1920 and completed about three months ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see; we have at least enabled the Minister to effect such reductions as he has made.

Mr. GRAHAM: He had quite a willingness to do it before.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice that about 20 junior clerks have been released but that in place of them pretty nearly the same number of senior clerks have been appointed. How is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: In 1921-22 there were 27 junior clerks and in 1922-23 there were 16. Then of junior file clerks there were 33 in 1921-22, and 16 in 1922-23.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Further up the list there are three more junior file clerks, making twenty altogether that have gone, and on the other side of the page nearly the same number of seniors have been added. That is to say, on the one side about twenty juniors are represented to have gone, and on the other side some twenty seniors have been added.

Mr. GRAHAM: If we are to take all the good that is to come out of the Civil Service Commission we must accept the things to which we object as well. These changes are due to the re-classification made with the full consent and approval and with the assistance of the Civil Service Commission. Under that re-classification these changes were made. On the whole, my hon. friend will see that there is a reduction in the number of employees.

Mr. STEVENS: With the decrease of activity in my hon. friend's department, so widely advertised and so marked with the

reduction of staffs throughout the country, why is it necessary to have three purchasing agents instead of one? I should think with the reduction of activities throughout the country, one junior purchasing agent would have been able to carry on without adding two more to the staff.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the exact number the department had before the war. Under the re-classification the staff has been reduced to a pre-war condition.

Mr. STEVENS: But the number has increased.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no increase anywhere except through re-classification.

Mr. STEVENS: Then this is a case where figures lie.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wil not give the reverse statement. I might say this, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remark of my hon. friend as to decreased activities: During the war period a great many hundred temporary employees had of necessity to be taken into the department. The estimates of this department ought now to be credited with a further reduction of $600,000; instead of the reduction being $1,100,000 it actually is $1,700,000. These temporary employees were engaged after the war and they were paid out of Demobilization Vote, consequently their names, or the amounts paid to them, do not appear in the Civil Service list. But the reduction that takes place in the Department on March 31st, of 400 employees—which reduction I dislike personally very much to make—means a saving of $600,000 more than appears in these estimates. In other words, had not that reduction been made the vote under War Claims, which appears in another place, would have been $600,000 larger than it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I notice it is now a good deal larger than last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: The War Appropriation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, I tell my right hon. friend, since he insists, that if he had not taken $3,000,000 out of the Demobilization Fund to give it to the Dominion Steel Company we would have paid a lot of these debts this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And I tell the minister that with that taken out, an obligation which undoubtedly rose from the war, there was still a large balance over, and the whole amount asked for last year was for a sum much less than the sum asked for this year, although we are a year further from the war. I would like to ask the minister how much of this reduction was effected or provided for in the year 1921 in sums that are attributable to and paid out of demobilization or, as it is called now, "Adjustment of War Claims"?

Mr. GRAHAM: These included in the $600,000 have been made since the present Government came into office and are to take effect from April 1st, the beginning of the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think this item should carry, although we have had some usesful discussion on it. In the absence of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who was Minister of Militia in the late Government, and who will be back, I think, to-morrow—at all events by Wednesday—I think the item should stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going to press for its adoption but we will have all the other Militia estimates open for discussion, and I would like to say that I would have had my bill for uniting the different defence departments under one head up to-day had it not been at the request of the ex-Minister of Militia who asked me to defer it until he came back. He raised no objection to going on with the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is correct that the hon. member for Wellington made that request—I know he mentioned to me that he would ask that the bill should stand over—but his request would have had just as much application to these estimates. I do not suppose he anticipated the estimates would be gone on with, there are other estimates that can be taken up.

Mr. CRERAR: Before we pass from this item may I ask the minister if this sum we are voting here will cover the administration of the co-ordinated departments after the co-ordination takes place?

Mr. GRAHAM: No. It is a difficult situation to form an opinion as to the various departments as the amalgamation is not completed and each department is asking for its own estimates; but in the other departments we expect to have a saving—in some of them at least—much more than will appear on the surface. Under the heading of Civil Government, part of the estimates we are asking prac-

tically total the same amount as before till we have an opportunity, after the bill for the amalgamation goes through, to find out just where we can make a saving. It is confidently expected, for instance, that the executive work of the Air Force and the Militia can be merged; I am afraid it will become necessary to make a large reduction in the number of temporary employees on the staff of the Air Board—in fact I know it will have to be done, much to my regret. Then we have the Naval Service which we hope to amalgamate as far as possible—the purchasing department and the departmental services as we might call them. In the mounted police, which has always conducted its departmental services separately, we hope to make quite a large saving; but what these savings will be I cannot tell from the estimates for Civil Government until I have had an opportunity to bring the different departmental staffs together. I shall then be able to tell what the actual saving will be in that respect. As I say, each department, at the present time, is asking for its Civil Government estimates practically the same amount as before. When I get the amalgamation into one department effected, I hope to be able to make quite a saving in Civil Government, as well as in the other branches. It must be remembered that a great deal of what we call temporary services, although they are not perhaps paid for out of that vote, always have been carried on by temporary and not by permanent employees,

Mr. GOULD: If we can point out to the minister when he brings his bill down where a million or two can be saved in this department, he might not need all the money asked for in this item.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid it would not interfere with the civil staff very much, if any. It is like a business. You have your organization and a great deal of the work is carried on by temporary employees. So far as the permanent employees are concerned, unless we drop the organization altogether, I am afraid we need not expect much reduction in the civil staff.

Item stands.

Naval Service, salaries, $215,220.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is an increase over last year of some $5,130.

Mr. GRAHAM: The increases are all statutory.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: One would think, with all the co-ordination going on, that there might be a diminution.

Mr. GRAHAM: The only reply I can make to that is that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for every increase there.

Mr. CRERAR: They are the customary statutory increases?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the whole staff to be continued? The minister had not the privilege of being here last session and the previous session, or he would understand my amazement now in finding the civil list added to even in this awful department of Naval Service.

Mr. MANION: Suppose the work of the department were wiped out altogether, would the minister say that, because the Civil Service Commission had made appointments to the staff and the staff had been organized, it would therefore continue in perpetuity? If the work is cut down, does not the staff come down, even in spite of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will explain that we do not expect to have a saving until we get our reorganization effected. That is one of the difficulties of reorganization. We are not just in a position to say how great the saving will be. These estimates do not all belong to the naval service proper. These include very many other services besides what is sometimes called the Naval Service. They include fishery protection, which is undertaken by the British navy to some extent. They include the wireless telegraphy, the hydrographic staff, the tidal surveys and so on. Several items are put under the naval expenditures which are not justly chargeable to the naval service at all, and I might point out that notwithstanding the criticism that, while last year the naval service estimates for the naval service alone, without the other services were $2,500,000, this year I have reduced them with one stroke of the pen to $1,500,000.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend did not answer the question I asked. I wanted to know, as a general question, not dealing with his department more than any other, though it does deal with his department; when the work of a department is cut down, is it prohibited by the Civil Service Commission, as implied by his own remarks, that the organization should be cut down at

the same time? Is the cutting down absolutely prevented by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not think so.

Mr. MANION: His remark suggested the question. If the minister says it is not prevented, and he has cut down the estimate a million and a half—

Mr. GRAHAM: A little over a million.

Mr. MANION: That must mean the cutting down of the work of the department to a great extent. It would seem to me, that under those circumstances, that would permit of the cutting down also of the headquarters staff.

Mr. HANSON: Will there be two deputy ministers of this department of defence? There is the Deputy Minister of Naval Service, the Deputy Minister of Militia and the Deputy Minister of Fisheries. Is the hon. minister going to have three or four of them?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will explain that situation more fully when I get my bill for the amalgamation of the different services.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister think we ought to consider that item before he knows what he wants? He apparently does not know what he wants, and apparently cannot give any explanation as to what he wants. Why should we consider this matter till the bill is brought down? Referring to another matter, he says all the changes are the result of the action of the Civil Service Commission. I never knew the Civil Service Commission created vacancies or positions, nor do I think they are doing it now. We are going to have the work of the department cut down to a very large extent, but I see we have one inspector where there was none before. We have one accountant in grade 4 where there was none before, and six head clerks at headquarters where there were formerly four. We have an accountant in grade 2 where there was none before. Then, we have two new secretaries to the executive, whatever that is; I suppose that is to keep track of the contractions that are going to be made in the service. We have two secretaries to the executive to work out the reductions that the hon. gentleman is going to make; we have six senior account clerks as against five before; we have six senior clerks as against five; we have sixteen clerk stenographers as against eleven; five clerk typists as against one, and seven file clerks as against six, and we are told this is all due to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Get down to the totals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am taking the explanation of the minister. The explanation given by my hon. friend was that all these changes were made by the Civil Service Commission, and I am pointing out at a glance that he has not been quite properly instructed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Notwithstanding my hon. friend's wonderful information, he dodged successfully or unsuccessfully the Civil Service Commission while he was in office. We have the same number of clerks as before, and owing to re-classification, their status has been changed. If he looks at the totals he will understand it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to call attention to the same thing that I had occasion to refer to a few minutes ago. There are at the foot of this list some fifteen or sixteen junior clerks who have lost their positions, and those positions have been taken by senior clerks at much higher salaries. Is that also under the commission?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is absolutely under the commission.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is time the department of the minister took something into its own hands.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the hon. gentleman vote for that?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, I will vote for the abolition of the commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend serious in stating that the Civil Service Commission dismissed a large number of the more poorly paid clerks in the department? That was the question that was put.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say anything of the kind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the question that I understood was put by my hon. friend, and the answer was that they were dismissed by the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was not the question nor the answer. My hon. friend is wrong both ways.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My question was quite plain. I inquired why it was that fifteen junior clerks had lost their jobs and senior clerks at higher salaries had taken their places.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is, I think, mistaken. He should not be led astray by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) who knows nothing about the Civil Service Commission. Of course, he had some branches under him, but they were not under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am asking a plain question.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a reclassification of junior clerks into higher positions. The hon. member will probably find most of these junior clerks who, he thinks, were dismissed, occupying better positions owing to reclassification.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is one reason why I am in favour of abolishing the commission. Let me just look into the explanation of the minister. There are five junior typists at a salary of $720. Does the minister mean to say that those men are now in amongst senior clerks at a salary of $1,140? That is a pretty big increase for one year. I do not think the minister has made a proper explanation, because these junior clerks are at such a low salary and the senior clerks at such a relatively high salary. As I understand the matter, the usual increase is only $120 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Most of these stenographers are ladies and not men. I say again to my hon. friend that as long as we have the Civil Service Commission, the departments are bound to carry out the classifications under the commission in this respect.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is there anything in the Civil Service Act that would prevent the minister from reducing this staff? Another objection which I have to this proposition is this: The minister tells us that there has been a reduction in expenditure in the outside service of some million dollars. In other words, men in the outside service are losing their jobs, and yet the overhead of the department remains stationary. In ordinary business, when your business goes away from you, you must bring down your overhead to correspond.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the extent of our Naval Service in Canada? This, I understand, covers the fleet which, if newspaper reports are true, is somewhere out in the Atlantic at the present time; but beyond one cruiser, two destroyers and two submarines, that, I think, constitute the fleet, what is the Naval Service of Canada? I was going to add—and, perhaps, the minister could give the explanation when he rises to answer my question—that it seems to me that 125 of a staff in the head office of the Naval Service is quite a considerable staff to run our limited Naval Service.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I pointed out a moment ago, that would be what the country understands as the Naval Service, but the Naval Service includes probably half a dozen other branches. It includes the Fishery Protection Service, in which we have six fishery protection vessels. It also includes the Hydrographic Survey in which we have five vessels. Then, under the arrangement with the British Admiralty, when we passed the Naval Service Act in 1910, we have to provide for the care of the docks at Esquimalt and Halifax. We have at the present time a school at Halifax and a school at Esquimalt in addition to the ships to which my hon. friend refers. These ships were presented by the British Admiralty to the Dominion of Canada through the late government, and they were accepted by the late government.

Mr. CRERAR: A great mistake.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall be prepared to discuss that, but not on the civil estimates. That is the situation, and these two destroyers, two submarines and one cruiser are now the property of Canada on account of the presentation made of them through the late government to Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It appears to me that the same objection might be made to passing this estimate as was raised to the militia and defence estimates. If it is intended to co-ordinate the three branches of the service, it seems a strange procedure to continue the appointments under the head of civil government, to pass the three civil government estimates, and then later on to have an explanation by the minister as to how these savings are going to be made. It would be more satisfactory to know what the Government proposes to do in the matter before we pass all the estimates for civil government. It may be that many of these officials will not be required. If the Government cannot do anything themselves in making an adjustment on account of the Civil Service Commission, there is something radically wrong. I quite appreciate that, where three branches of the Government are to be co-ordinated and brought under one head, a min-

ister would naturally desire to have some reforms made. If it is owing to the fact that the Civil Service Commission exercises so much control over him that his hands are tied, something should be done about the matter. Surely if those three branches are brought under the one department, some very radical changes can be made and great savings effected. It has been intimated that there is going to be a very large saving made in the Air Force, the Naval Service and the Militia. If that be the case, surely as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) has pointed out, there must be some reductions made in the overhead charges in connection with this, as there would be in any business that was carried on on a business basis. It seems a most unusual thing to pass all these items under the head of civil government, and then to discuss how these reforms shall be put into effect. This item could surely stand along with the other two to which the same complaint might be raised.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is, perhaps, not quite clear on this point. These services must be continued, because any changes that are made cannot be completed for perhaps three months. The bill may not pass. Indeed, my bill would have been before the House instead of these estimates, if it had not been for the Opposition. This is not my fault. It is necessary to pass these estimates in order to carry on the work as we have it, until we can complete the reorganization, and I am inclined to believe that the shortest period in which we can get the reorganization effected is three months. It is not an easy matter to get together four different departments, and to undertake to say what the adjustment is going to be until we get them together. We may find that one man will answer where we have two now. I do not know which man, I do not know what salary, and until we can get the amalgamation effected, which will take some months, we must have estimates passed to carry on with our staff.

Mr. BOYS: In the Department of Naval Service there is a deputy minister at $6,000, and an assistant deputy at $4,200; under Militia and Defence a deputy minister at $6,000, and an assistant deputy at $5,100. In the Air Board the total is given as $75,000. I presume the Chairman of the Air Board has the same status as a deputy minister?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is chairman of the board and he gets nothing in addition for it.

Mr. BOYS: But I thought there was a Chairman of the Air Board too.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a Deputy Chairman, General Gwatkin.

Mr. BOYS: I presume he gets $5,000 or $6,000. His salary would be part of the $75,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: General Gwatkin is a military man, but at my request he is acting as Deputy Chairman of the Air Board at the present time. Colonel Biggar was Deputy Chairman and he got no salary whatever; he acted for nothing. General Gwatkin was Inspector General of the Air Force, and, as I say, is Acting Deputy Chairman of the board. I may add that the Acting Deputy Chairman is retiring after a few months'leave of absence.

Mr. BOYS: As it stands, I presume he receives $5,000, or possibly $6,000. Turning to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Controller, I take it, would receive $5,000 or $6,000. We have, all told, seven or eight highly paid officials, and if there is to be a co-ordination it is to be presumed some of the officers must be dispensed with. Surely it is important to know if that is to take place before we are asked to vote these salaries. If you are to have only one deputy and one assistant deputy under the co-ordination, then a lot of salaries will not be needed, and we ought to have some knowledge on that point before being asked to vote these items. The same line of reasoning no doubt applies to clerks and other officials in the various branches of the service, but for convenience sake I single out the most highly paid officials in order to ascertain the minister's views. I appreciate what he says, that it will take a little time to effect the reorganization, but perhaps it would be well to let the Estimates stand until the bill is before the House. If the bill does not pass I can understand that all these officers will have to be kept on. If, on the other hand, the bill passes and there is a co-ordination, most of these salaries would not be required for more than three months at the outside.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a difficulty in dropping these Estimates until we know how we are to make the reorganization. The hon. member possibly thinks that it is an easy matter to get the different staffs to work in, but until I have the full author-

ity of Parliament to commence the work of reorganization I do not know just what may be done. It will take months to work it out exactly in detail, and in the meantime we have assured the House of our intention to cut down expenses, by cutting down more than $1,000,000 in the Naval Estimates. That is good evidence that we intend to make reductions. Of the civil government expenditures, only 46 per cent refers to Naval Service at all; 54 per cent is for other services. When hon. gentlemen talk about cutting down on civil government, they are talking about something which they cannot grasp; nor can I grasp it fully until I have had a chance to take off my coat and go into it and decide what I am to do. Not a dollar of this money that is not absolutely necessary will be expended, but in the meantime the staffs have to carry on until we can effect the amalgamation.

Mr. BOYS: A 25 per cent vote would take care of the situation for at least three months. I think the Estimates should stand and the minister could go on with the bill. Upon the result of the bill we could deal more intelligently with the items.

Mr. LOGAN: I endorse what has been said by the hon. member. We are absolutely in the dark to-night. Let us have the bill, and we can intelligently discuss the Estimates. Discussing Estimates for three or four departments that are to be co-ordinated, seems to me rather ridiculous. Why cannot we wait until the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) returns, have the bill presented by the present minister (Mr. Graham), and then approach the Estimates in an intelligent and satisfactory way? We all desire to carry on the affairs of the country, but we are rather in the dark at the present time, and if the minister is at sea we are out in the ocean.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the reduction of $1,000,000 which the minister refers to apply to the Naval Service proper or to other branches connected with it?

Mr. GRAHAM: It applies to Naval Service proper and to other services too.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister says that 46 per cent of the activities represented here are concerned with the Naval Service. What becomes of the other 54 per cent? I think my hon. friend has made a serious charge in connection with the Civil Service Commission. I do not profess to have looked into the matter as he has done, but for the purpose of appreciating the facts, I would ask him to give me the names of the junior clerks who were reclassified and promoted, showing from what ratings they were promoted and what ratings they were given, and when that was done.

Mr. MANION: While the minister is looking up the information, I should like to emphasize a fact stated by previous speakers. I was one of the first to mention that I did not see any reason why the Civil Service Commission should be permitted to keep the overhead as high as it was, when the rest of the staff had been cut down. In looking over the details I find that it is as high as it ever was. Take the Department of Militia. There are 390 employees provided for this year as against 399, a decrease of 9; but in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police there is an increase of 8—22 as against 14; while in the Department of Naval Service the number is absolutely the same as it was before. So that with one exception, there are the same number of employees in the three departments as there were under the expensive operation which the late government carried on, according to my hon. friend. Certainly, with the cutting down that he is doing—and I have no reason to doubt that he is cutting down—I think there will be plenty of opportunity for him to reduce the staff. Seeing that he is reducing the outside staff he might effect economies in the inside service, and I agree that this vote should be held until we can get more details. At the moment the minister is not in a position to tell us what he is going to do. To keep him in good humour I might remind him that last year I well remember sitting behind the minister when his Estimates were up, and when hon. gentlemen opposite who were then on this side of the House took up very much more time discussing Estimates than we have done, sometimes even prolonging the discussion for a week or two; so we have a long distance to go before hon. gentlemen opposite are equalled in their blocking tactics of last year and the year before.

Mr. GRAHAM: In reply to my hon. friend's question as to General Gwatkin's salary, he receives a pension from the British Government, and I am informed that the amount he receives from us is $3,500. I might say, so far as giving details is concerned, that it is impossible for me to give them now. The best I could do would be to make a blind guess. It will take three

months to make the amalgamation, and if Parliament takes the ground that it must know all the details before we proceed with the work, I say that that is a very unbusinesslike stand to take, and that nobody would take it in their own private business. We cannot proceed to amalgamate these branches until given authority to carry on.

Mr. MANION: But under the amalgamation we should not need the same amount of money. My hon. friend admits that he will probably cut the staffs down, but here we find an increase in the Estimates of three different branches. We should not be required to vote an equal or greater amount than was voted last year.

Mr. GOULD: It seems to me that the minister is asking us to construct a large frame work into which can be fitted the various organizations that have existed in the past. If the bill he proposes for the co-ordination of the various branches should pass the House, the structure we are now building by the passing of these Estimates will have to be wrecked to a certain extent. It does seem to me that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) expressed the proper view, and that the minister should bring his bill before the House and give us at least some idea of what he proposes in the way of co-ordinating these various branches. Then the members of the committee would be in a better position to make suggestions to the minister as to how the moneys required for the administration of this amalgamated department could be provided. I hope the minister will see his way to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the committee rises I would like to say a word in regard to an impression which I think the committee has gained from the minister. I do not think he intended to give a wrong impression, but I think the committee got the impression that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for what they are not responsible for at all. Notwithstanding the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Act, as the minister well knows—I do not think he tried to mislead the committee or had any thought of doing so—the Government can make any reduction that it sees fit. The Government may accept the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission as to what organization is necessary for a certain work, but the responsibility of accepting it is on the Government. The Government can dismiss as many officers as they desire. If there were anything in the act restraining or abbreviating the right of the Government or the authority or responsibility of the Government in respect of the public service, I would feel, like the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), that the time had come for an amendment, but that is not in the power of the commission at all. That is not its responsibility; that is the responsibility wholly of the Government. I commend the attitude of the minister in allowing this item to stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to letting it stand. I was just saying that I cannot tell what is going to happen until I have the authority to have it happen. Let me point out to my right hon. friend that I did not make any suggestion that the Civil Service Commission dismissed people. He was listening to his desk-mate, not to me. I fully explained that probably none of the junior clerks referred to were dismissed, but simply became seniors in the re-classification. The ex-Minister of Finance put his own interpretation upon that. He was the one to talk about the commission dismissing them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that the committee got the impression, not that the commission dismissed anybody, but that they prevented the minister from dismissing them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I never suggested that. It was the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. BROWN: I would urge upon the Government the necessity of giving consideration to the demand which exists throughout the country for a reduction in the staffs of the Civil Service. The impression prevails generally throughout the country, and is shared in by myself to a very large extent, that civil servants are treading on one another's toes, so tremendously is the Service over-manned. To what extent that is true we are not in a position to say, but since coming here we have not seen anything that would tend to dispel the impression that we had when we came. If the Government could do anything to dispel the impression that the service is tremendously over-manned or over-womaned, as the case may be, or could do anything to reduce the overhead expenditure, I am sure it would receive the commendation of the people of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before moving that the committee rise and report progress, I might perhaps explain the position in which the Government is placed in regard to this vote. To-day is the 27th of March, and in four days we shall have entered upon a new fiscal year. Unless the Government is to dismiss immediately all employees whose services it will not be necessary to retain; once this amalgamation takes effect, these amounts will have to be voted to cover the interval at least, and all the Government is asking at the present time is to allow the vote for civil government to go through so that the clerks at present employed in these different positions may be retained until the minister has had time to effect the reorganization proposed under the new bill. Before that bill becomes law it will have to receive its three readings in this House, and then pass the Senate; and until that has been done it will not be possible for the minister to begin the work of consolidation. That is our only reason for seeking to get through these votes as they stand.

Mr. BROWN: My remarks applied not merely to the Militia Department but to all departments of the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government is in hearty agreement with my hon. friend in its desire to prevent any overlapping.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.51 p.m.

Tuesday, March 28, 1922

The House met at three o'clock, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT REPEAL

Mr. JAMES S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 18, to repeal the Military Service Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to put my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) right respecting a matter that was referred to yesterday. In the course of my remarks I mentioned that the Auditor General's report had been laid in full on the table of the House on one of the early days of the session. My right hon. friend stated that he thought I was incorrect in that statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought the fourth volume was not down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He said the fourth volume was the most important. I desire to let him know that the entire report is contained in three volumes. Last year the fourth volume contained the war expenditures separately. This year they have been included in the last of the three volumes.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, SASKATCHEWAN COURT OF APPEAL

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved:

That it is expedient that an additional judge of the Court of Appeal for the Province of Saskatchewan be appointed at an annual salary of nine thousand dollars.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee on the Resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before this resolution is adopted, we ought to have some information under several heads. We should know, first of all, what the present composition of the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan is in point of numbers, the composition of the Court of King's Bench, and secondly what reasons there are for the conclusion that an additional judge of the Court of Appeal is necessary. Are there any arrears of business? Has there been a demand from the people of the province, or what is the real purpose of the addition to the Court of Appeal? We should know, as well, how the number of judges in the Court of Appeal in that province compares with the number on the Court of Appeal of provinces of corresponding size. Our chief concern is to ascertain whether there is any real need for an additional judge. Under our constitution, of course, we all know, the province itself constitutes courts, and declares the number to compose the court so constituted. The Dominion Government, on the other hand, makes the appointment and

the Dominion treasury pays the salaries and all expenses. Under that procedure which the British North America Act lays down, there is always a temptation on the part of the provinces not to exercise the utmost care to avoid, in the first place, over-constituting the courts and in the next place, over-composing them. We ought to be very careful in this and in every case, to see that the province, inasmuch as it is in no way responsible for the extra expense involved, is animated only by a desire to have the number of judges which is absolutely essential, and no greater number, to constitute the court.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In answer to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) I may say that the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan now consists of four judges, one chief justice and three puisne judges. As to the necessity of adding to the number of judges we find it in the legislation which was passed by the province of Saskatchewan. As it was said, and rightly said by the right hon. gentleman, the courts primarily are created by the provinces under section 92 of the British North America Act. The judges are appointed by the federal authorities. It has been the rule, I understand, in the Department of Justice, to always supplement the legislation which was adopted by the provincial government. Sometimes it would take six months and sometimes it would take three or four years, but always the appointments which were asked by the local governments were made by the federal government. In this case a statute was passed at the last session of the legislature of Saskatchewan adding another judge to the Court of Appeal for that province. We have received the statute, and we propose the present bill to carry out the purpose of that legislation. The right hon. gentleman says that we should make sure that there is real necessity for the increase in the number of judges. I am not certain that we should go that far, unless we are of opinion that the provinces are negligent in the administration of justice. Unless we have good ground to suspect their motives in legislating as they do, I do not see that we should insist on a special report on such questions. At any rate, in this case we have that statute. It was sent to our department, and we ask the House now to supplement that statute. If my right hon. friend desires further information that I do not possess now, and insists on an adjournment of the consideration of this resolution, I would be willing to try to give him all the information he desires.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not quite correct to say that vacancies that exist by reason of provincial legislation are filled merely automatically or as a matter of course by this parliament. I remember well when I was Acting Minister of Justice declining to fill such in the province of Ontario and effecting an arrangement with the Attorney General of that province, that, in the event of vacancies in county courts being created or caused by death, those vacancies would be filled by appointment of junior judges out of other counties where there was not only a senior but a junior judge and insufficient work for the two. In that way a very considerable saving was made. I am afraid, though, the Government now in office has not followed up that good precedent. I can recall cases even now in which to meet political exigencies, they have filled vacancies from the outside, instead of filling them by appointment of junior judges who are virtually out of work in different counties of the province, which would mean a saving to the country of several thousand dollars. It is with the idea of saving, and nothing else, that I ask in this case whether inquiry has been made to ascertain if there is real need; whether the demand comes because of the need of an extra judge, or for some other reason.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I must say that I was told by the Attorney General of Saskatchewan that there is need of such an appointment. As to the position my hon. friend takes with respect to Ontario, it is quite different in this respect: in that instance there was no discussion between the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice, or between the provincial government and the fédéral government. Both agreed that there were too many judges and that no more should be appointed, but in this case we have a request from the provincial government that an additional judge be appointed for the Court of Appeal. Unless we are to say to the Saskatchewan government that we cannot accept their representation as to the need for such judge we have to make the appointment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is mistaken in regard to Ontario. No request at all came from the Attorney General of Ontario to the effect that a stay be made in the appointment of judges. The action was taken wholly at Ottawa, by the Justice Department,—by myself

when I was acting Minister of Justice. The Attorney General of Ontario had acquiesced in the movement on the part of members of the Bar for the increase of salaries. I refused to consider the matter of increases, until I obtained his acquiescence in the policy of appointing no more members of the Bench and of providing, by legislation in Ontario, to fit in with our policy that new appointments would not be made, but that junior judges would be appointed to fill vacancies, and the position of junior judge in the county from which such a judge was appointed would be done away with.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: And he agreed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the initiative was taken here. I ask now merely whether a similar initiative has been taken in this case by the Attorney General's Department.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If we were merely asked to fill a vacancy in Saskatchewan or any other province, we would probably act in a similar manner; but, in this instance, we have a statute passed by the Saskatchewan legislature providing for the appointment of an additional judge for a court in that province, and we are now implementing that legislation. I do not see how we can refuse to do so.

Mr. CRERAR: How many judges constitute the Court of Appeal in Alberta, and how many the Court of Appeal in Manitoba?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There are five judges in Alberta and five also in Manitoba.

Mr. BAXTER: It is very easy for the provinces to put forward requests of this character, and of course, it is easy to say that these judges are required. I do not assume, merely because the request is made, that the additional judge is not required; neither do I take the request coming from a provincial government as being absolutely conclusive proof of the necessity. Very often in the provinces another element enters into the matter. One province sees a larger number of judges in another province, and the tendency is to say: "Why should we not have as many highly paid officials receiving pay from the Dominion Government as some other province? It will cost us nothing." We have, in the city of Ottawa, a court which, I think, I can fairly describe as being absolutely overburdened with work. I think there is no harder-working court in the British Empire than the Supreme Court of Canada; their work is almost monumental. I should like, before making up my mind in regard to the matter now before us, to compare the number of cases passing before the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan in a single year with the number of cases that are dealt with by the Supreme Court at Ottawa. I should like to form some personal judgment regarding the matter, and perhaps other hon. members would like to do the same. It is a matter of no importance to this Government whether another judgeship is created or not; the question is whether there is a real need on the part of the people to have an additional judge to expedite the business. I should therefore be very glad if the minister would allow this matter to stand for a few days.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member think there should be three, five or seven judges in preference to two, four or six respectively, so that there would be a majority decision in all cases?

Mr. BAXTER: That is exactly my opinion. An odd number in the Court of Appeal is most desirable, and I cannot understand why the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan ever came to be constituted with four judges. I would suggest that there is another way of getting around the difficulty. It would be easy, I should think, for the province of Saskatchewan to pass legislation for the reduction of the Court of Appeal to three judges, who could do the work just as efficiently as four judges, because they must all sit together, and the other appellate judge could go on circuit or be used in whatever other way judges are used. A matter of rearrangement would not involve any more expense to the Dominion. The real question is to find out whether there is work which is not being efficiently done for lack of another judge, and until that fact is established, I do not think any member can be in favour of the appointment being made. But the moment that fact is established, I would be very much surprised if any member of this Chamber would withhold his assent.

Mr. VIEN: It seems to me that we should not object to nominate judges when the provincial authorities have created the positions. Under the British North America Act, the creation and the organization of tribunals are vested with provincial legislatures, and it seems to me that when in the opinion of a provincial legislature the organization of a tribunal is fixed along certain lines, it would be a little improper to discuss the motives which might have prompted that legislature in its enactment.

My hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) stated that in many cases the provinces were prompted to a certain extent to create a position for a high official by the fact that his salary was paid out of the federal exchequer. I do not think it is fair to cast upon the legislative authorities of the provinces, which have so shaped their judicial organizations, such an imputation. The British North America Act having left it to the provincial legislatures to organize their tribunals, it seems to me that the only fair way to deal with the question is to appoint a judge when there is a vacancy on the provincial bench. The suggestion made by my hon. friend does not appear to be the proper way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Some months ago, before even the position was created by the Saskatchewan Government, this matter was drawn to my attention by some members of the legal profession in the city of Regina. I believe it was advanced as an argument by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan that the work was in arrears; that they could not possibly keep up with it; that there was an absolute necessity for the appointment of another judge to the Court of Appeal. this argument was put up to me, and I believe it was pretty well accepted in Saskatchewan some time before the position was created by the legislature of that province.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I question very much whether it can be urged with any degree of soundness that, as a matter of constitutional right, we in this Parliament can refuse to carry out the necessary implementing legislation providing for the appointment of judges by the federal authorities. The constitution of provincial courts is a matter entirely within the realm of provincial legislation. Under section 92 of the British North America Act we have no power whatever to interfere with any legislation that a provincial legislature may pass by way of rearrangement of or addition to the number of judges whom they require for the purpose of administering justice in their province. One might stop and consider for a moment what the result would be if the federal Parliament refused to act upon the authority that is vested in it of providing judges in any province in the Dominion, after a local legislature, having regard to their local necessities and conditions, had decided that the court should be constituted in a certain way, I am quite sure that never since Confederation has it been urged seriously that this Parliament or the federal government could refuse to pass this implementing legislation. It is not for us to say whether or not the provincial legislatures should have their courts constituted in this way or in that way, or should have three, four or five judges. That, under the Act of Confederation, has been left entirely to the discretion of the people of the several provinces speaking through their respective lgislatures.

Mr. BAXTER: It is a little difficult to tell, simply by looking at the index, how many cases are reported, because cases are often duplicated; but I think I am perfectly safe in saying that not more than 120 cases a year are reported in each of these volumes. Each volume covers a year, and the cases are not all cases of appeal. Some are decisions of judges of first instance, but I do not think that many of those are included in the reports, at least so far as I can tell from a hasty glance at the volumes. Now, as there are not more than 120 decisions in a year, I should have great doubt—

An hon. MEMBER: That is, 120 reported.

Mr. BAXTER: Reported, yes. The custom in all reports—I do not blame the bench or the bar, but I do blame the organizations that publish the reports—is to report everything whether it is reportable or not.

Mr. VIEN: Who is judge of the necessity for additional judges for any provincial court?

Mr. BAXTER: I would say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Vien) himself is one of the judges, and his mind seems to be pretty well made up on the subject. I think that we are all here judges as to whether or not this country needs to pay $9,000 a year for further judicial services. The provincial legislatures can ask, and they very frequently do ask, without very much reason for doing so, to increase expenditures, and I know of cases where there has been an extension of the provincial bench without any business to justify it. I do not know whether or not that is the case in Saskatchewan, but looking at these two volumes of reports I am strongly inclined to think that there is no need for a further appointment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: By the British North America Act the organization of tribunals is left entirely to the provinces. There is no appeal from the decision of the provinces to this Parliament or to the federal

Government; all we have to do is to implement their legislation by appointing judges in accordance with the organization of the courts by the legislatures. I think it is a bad tendency on the part of the central power to intervene in a matter that is left by the constitution to the provinces themselves. It is a dangerous tendency that has prevailed of late and it is high time it should be stopped.

Mr. McCONICA: I think it was quite well understood throughout the province of Saskatchewan that there would be a request for an additional Judge of Appeal for the bench in that province, no matter what party was returned to power as a result of the last election. The Estimates show that in Manitoba there are five judges in the Court of Appeal, in Alberta five, and in Saskatchewan four. I was formerly connected with the courts of Saskatchewan, and I am well advised that the Court of Appeal in that province is crowded. I am not sure that they are despatching the work as expeditiously as some other courts are doing, although I am perfectly sure that they think they are. I suggest to hon. gentlemen that if this Parliament could arrogate to itself the right to say that Saskatchewan shall not have this judge, then it would have the same right to stop the wheels of justice altogether in that province or in any other province. If we can refuse this request we can refuse to implement any other action which any province, under the constitution, has the right to take in matters relating to the administration of justice. I certainly think that the province should have the additional judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire only to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), followed by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe). They suggest that it would be an invasion of constitutional right on the part of this Parliament to exercise any restraint whatever, or even to bring decision into play, in deciding whether to acquiesce in the request of any province. I cannot agree with that view at all. If the original intention of the British North American Act was that the request of a province is always to be met by the appointment by the Government of Canada of someone to fill a vacancy then there would have been no requirement in the Act for legislation on the part of this Parliament. All that the British North America Act would have said would have been this: "The Governor in Council shall fill any vacancy created by the province." To have taken that position evidently seemed to the Fathers of Confederation scarcely a right thing to do, and the act was so framed as to require federal legislation. I do not say that such legislation is specifically demanded by the terms of the act, but the act is so framed that legislation, as a matter of fact, is needed; otherwise, why have we legislation now?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): To get the money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, but the act could have said that the necessary expenditure would be a charge on the Treasury, requiring no specific legislation in this Parliament for each vacancy. It would have been a serious thing to put it within the power of any province, without any restraint whatever, or even an opportunity on the part of the federal Parliament to exercise consideration of the matter, to write a cheque on the Dominion Treasury for just whatever number of judges that province thought it needed. That, I repeat, would have been a serious thing. We have confidence in the provinces, it is true; but the system of balance is such that they exercise their consideration first, and we here have restraint upon their request. I admit that we should not exercise any restraint upon the province without very considerable reason. We should have more than the ordinary weight of reason in our favour before interfering with the desire of the government and legislature of a province in this matter, and for myself, I would attach a great deal of weight to representations made by members from that province as to whether or not there is need for an additional judge in Saskatchewan. I thought that Alberta had four.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Four puisne judges and a Chief Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there are five in Alberta and Manitoba, I should think there would be equal reason for five in Saskatchewan, but there would be more litigation in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan, notwithstanding that Saskatchewan has a larger population. Manitoba is an older province with a larger city, and would probably have more litigation. Prima facie also, there would be more litigation in Saskatchewan than in Alberta. All I wanted was to make sure that the minister had convinced himself that there was need for this additional judge. If he says he has, then I accept his opinion.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am convinced that there is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A while ago the minister said that he had not inquired.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) argues that because the appointing power rests with the federal government, therefore, there must be some consideration given by the federal authorities as to the wisdom of action which has been exclusively committed to the provincial legislature by the Constitution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not committed to them exclusively.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Exclusively, to the extent that under section 92 of the British North America Act the organization of the courts is committed entirely to the legislature of each province. I submit that the only reason why the appointing power was vested in the Dominion Parliament was the theory that the Governor General was the sole representative of His Majesty in Canada. Down to the time of the decision in the Maritime Bank Case the theory obtained that His Majesty was not present in regard to provincial legislation, and that consequently there was no power vested in the Lieutenant-Governor to make judicial appointments as the direct representative of His Majesty. Since then that theory has been held to be bad law, and to-day the right of the provinces to deal with matters entirely within their jurisdiction is unquestioned, and I think it is rather too late in the day for us to say that we have any reviewing power in such matters.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir LOMER GOUIN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19, to amend the Judges' Act, founded on the Resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—AMENDMENT

Mr. ARTHURS' MOTION ON SOLDIERS' BONUS PLEDGE

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply:

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House for a few minutes to a matter which arose yesterday afternoon while the House was in Committee of Supply and the Estimates of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) were under discussion.

A few days ago we heard from the leader of the Government that we should pay little attention to political documents, especially those issued during an election. We did not believe then, Sir—I do not think any hon. member believed—that this remark also applied to the platform of a great party. Before an election each party issues a platform, and the difference between the respective platforms constitutes the issue before the people in that election. And not only that, but the party issuing the platform is of course pledged to substantiate its provisions by legislation if returned to power.

In 1919 the Liberal party held a great convention in this city, and a platform was then adopted which was the basis of their appeal to the country during the recent election. We have already had from the Government side a repudiation of many of the tariff planks of that platform, and the remaining planks are being carefully held in abeyance for the express purpose of securing a few votes from my hon. friends to my immediate left. But the most glaring case of repudiation occurred yesterday. In that platform, as enunciated in 1919, we find the following resolution:

> Resolved that this convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and the dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service.

Yesterday the Prime Minister, and also the minister in charge of the estimates of this department, both declared that they not only do not intend to fulfil this pledge, but so far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he declared that he never had any intention of doing so. I believe that the majority of those who attended that convention in 1919 were honest men and went home firmly convinced that the Liberal party had pledged itself to implement by legislation every plank in that platform. According to the Liberal handbook this pledge was made in the most solemn manner. The men who attended that convention went back to the country and used every plank of that platform during the last election, and it is idle for the Prime Minister or anybody else to say that they did not use the particular plank to which I am now drawing the attention of the

House. This was a solemn promise to the returned soldiers that the Liberal party, if they got back to power, would grant cash bonuses, and it was used in every constituency where there was a returned soldier. It was used by the followers of my hon. friend, the leader of the Government, in his presence, and he himself, in spite of what he said yesterday, did pledge himself to carry out this resolution, because he said that he endorsed every plank in the platform of 1919.

The attitude of the late government and of the party to which I belonged was well known. We were opposed to the granting of $2,000, or any similar bonus, indiscriminately to returned soldiers. We did not believe that that was the proper policy to adopt. But our friends opposite, by this plank in their platform, succeeded in getting thousands of votes, evidently under misapprehension and in spite of the fact that the present Prime Minister knew that his party would never implement that promise. While the Conservative party was opposed to any cash grant of this nature, it was not opposed to doing everything possible for the returned soldier. I have had the honour to be on the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Committee for the last four or five years, and I have personal knowledge that the then government had no strings on that committee, that the members of that committee were perfectly free to take any course they chose. That committee, by their recommendations, and the late government by implementing those recommendations by legislation, have done a great deal for the returned soldier. It is not necessary at this time to go into details, but we know and, as Canadians, are proud, no matter whether we are on one side or the other, that Canada has paid the most liberal scale of pensions of any country that was engaged in the war. The late government directed its efforts toward bettering the condition of widows and orphans who had lost their bread winners during the war, and of men who returned from overseas unable to pursue their ordinary vocations through illness or wounds. But as I have said, we were faced throughout the country with this pledge made by the Liberal party under the conditions to which I have referred.

The leader of the Government, speaking of this matter yesterday, defended his position by saying that a course advisable at one moment may not be the best at another time. Assuredly this has a

[Mr. Arthurs.]

familiar sound to me; it is right in line with the general policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They had not only a policy for Canada, but a policy for each province. And in the provinces you found the present leader of the Government supporting in one county a man who was a free trader, in another county a man who was a protectionist, and in another county a man who had no idea of tariff matters at all. In fact, that procedure was carried so far that the policy advocated in one polling subdivision was different from that advocated in another, and so on right along the line.

The leader of the Government says that conditions have changed; that at present we have a large debt, incurred through the railway situation. But he has forgotten to tell the people of Canada that during the last election—not in 1919, but in October, 1921,—a handbook was issued and placed in the hands of Liberal speakers throughout Canada bearing on its face the portrait of the present leader of the Government and subscribed to by him, in which his pledge to the returned soldier was reiterated and renewed; nor has it ever been repudiated by the hon. gentleman or any one on his side.

The minister in charge of this matter took a somewhat different stand; he declared that he had reason to suppose that the returned soldier would not accept $2,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you took a vote of the members of this House, or, say, of the members of the press gallery, on the question of whether they would accept a cash bonus of $2,000, I am sure they would all vote affirmatively; and I have not the slightest doubt that the returned soldier would do exactly the same thing. It is quite true that certain soldier organizations have passed resolutions advising against any request for a cash gratuity of $2,000. It is quite true that they have moderated their demands; but it is foolish to say for one moment that these men are repudiating a cash grant of any kind.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the House for the purpose of setting forth one of the reasons why hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party are sitting on the other side of the House. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Stevens:

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

The Liberal Party assembled in convention in August, 1919, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved that this Convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service."

That the policy embodied in such resolution so adopted was continuously thereafter held before the people of Canada, and in an official handbook issued in October, 1921, by the Liberal Party under the authority of its leader Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, the said resolution was quoted and reaffirmed, and the promise and the pledge embodied therein declared to be the policy of the Liberal Party.

That candidates contesting on behalf of the Liberal Party in the late election used widely such promise and pledge as the means of securing support.

That the Liberal Party having been returned to power, the refusal now by the leader of the Government and by the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to fulfil such promise and pledge constitutes a repudiation of a solemn obligation and a disregard of political honour.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the custom of this House has been to extend to the leader of the Government the courtesy of permitting him to see, before the moment it is handed to you, Mr. Speaker, any amendment or resolution which is likely to be moved by a member of the House. Neither my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) nor the hon. member (Mr. Arthurs) who has just spoken has given me the slightest intimation that any resolution of the kind was to be submitted this afternoon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very sorry if my hon. friend did not receive a copy of the resolution. I instructed my secretary at one o'clock to send a copy, and I dictated an accompanying letter. I sent it also to the leader of the Agrarian party (Mr. Crerar.)

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend has not received it, I am quite prepared to let the debate adjourn.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no necessity for the debate being adjourned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was quite unintentional on my part.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would simply like the House to know that the first intimation I had of this resolution was as I heard it read a moment ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I just read to the House the resolution of the Liberal Convention of 1919 and see exactly what it states? First of all, it is a resolution on Soldier's Civil Re-establishment. It reads:

Whereas, it is considered that the guiding principle for a permanent settlement of the problem of civil re-establishment should be equitable treatment to soldiers in all avocations, having regard to the length and nature of service,

Resolved that this convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service.

That resolution is not a pledge on the part of the Liberal party to give cash grants indiscriminately to all returned men. As I read it, and as the Liberal convention understood it, the resolution was a declaration that in the opinion of the Convention that was the most effective means at that time of dealing with the question of re-establishment. The resolution relates, as I have pointed out, to the matter of re-establishment, not to the granting of an indiscriminate bonus to every soldier who was overseas, simply as a recognition of his services.

What the convention believed, and I think rightly believed, was that if the government would adopt the policy with the returned soldiers of giving to them a cash grant of a certain amount, and allowing them to re-establish themselves with the aid of that money, that would be the most effective way of bringing about their re-establishment. It was felt that the government was proceeding under a policy of more or less obliging returned men to act in accordance with the wishes and under instructions of officers of the government, not trusting them to make use of sums of money, according to their own light, which would enable them with regard to what might seem to them to be the most effective way having regard to their interests and circumstances, to work out their own salvation, so to speak, in the matter of re-establishment. I think that if that point is perfectly clear, hon. members will see there has not been any attempt on the part of hon. members on this side of the House or of their supporters, in any way to repudiate any statement that appears in this platform in regard to the re-establishment of the returned soldiers.

I said yesterday, and I will repeat it now, because I believe it to be absolutely true, that what may have been the wise course to take at that time, when men were returning from overseas and seeking to return to their regular vocations, would not necessarily be wise or the proper course to take some years later, particularly after Parliament had met and after the House of Commons on two occasions, had discussed the whole question, in Special Committee, and had decided upon certain measures of re-establishment, and when the government were taking action in accordance with views which were unanimously concurred in by Parliament. Let me repeat, this statement in the Liberal platform is not a pledge of cash grants to all returned men. It cannot be so construed. It is a statement of what in the opinion of that convention at that time would have been the most effective way of dealing with re-establisment.

May I say this further? Hon. gentlemen opposite are given to use of extravagant language in criticising their opponents. They have on repeated occasions resorted to the use of terms which I think are a little stronger than is necessary, even for the political purposes they have in view. May I read the last clause of this amendment?

> That the Liberal party having been returned to power, the refusal now by the leader of the Government and by the Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment to fulfil such promise and pledge constitutes a repudiation of a solemn obligation and a disregard of political honour.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of the House of Commons, regardless of whether their references are to their political opponents or not, should be careful in imputing motives of political dishonour. I think hon. members on this side of the House are just as true custodians of honour as any hon. gentlemen opposite,

4 p.m. and I would ask the House, when voting upon this amendment, to consider that aspect of the question.

It seems to me, the point of material importance at the present time, is the attitude taken with respect to this question of cash grants by myself and others associated with me in the recent election campaign. I notice that this amendment is directed primarily against myself as the leader of the party, and for that reason it is proper I think that I should refer somewhat to my own attitude on this particular question.

Yesterday my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion)

read to this House an extract from a speech made by Colonel Thompson, who was with me in our Canadian West during the course of the political campaign. My hon. friend said that the extract which he read, while it did not amount to a pledge, carried an implication to the effect that I was standing, because I was with Colonel Thompson at the time, in favour of a cash grant to the returned soldiers. As Colonel Thompson is not at present a member of this House and was therefore unable to speak for himself, I was about to rise and reply to my hon. friend when you, Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee, ruled the whole discussion out of order, and I permitted the incident to pass. My recollection is clear as to what took place at that meeting, and if my hon. friend will consult with those who were present at that gathering, or will read the full reports of it, he will find that Colonel Thompson said that while returned men might very well feel that their services were worth $2,000, the Liberal party did not propose to measure their services in terms of money, and was not standing for cash grants. That was the position he took.

Mr. MANION: The paper could not have quoted him correctly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend was ready enough to bring into this House a paper which had a partial reference to what was said at that meeting. He was careful to say that what he read did not constitute a pledge, but he did say that it carried a certain inference. Now I was present on that platform and I heard Colonel Thompson say to that audience that the Liberal party was not proposing any cash grants to the returned men. Not only did he say that on that platform, but he said it on a dozen other platforms on which he spoke when he and I were travelling together, and I submit that if we on this side of the House are to be judged in respect to our attitude toward the returned soldiers, we should be judged by what was said on the public platform as to what our attitude towards the returned men would be if we were returned to power, and not by any inference which hon. gentlemen may draw in regard to what may or may not have been said at a political meeting, or, indeed, by any misrepresentation of the purpose and spirit of resolutions passed at a general convention.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I may well leave the matter there. What I have said to different audiences, what I have said to

every deputation of returned men whom I have had the privilege of addressing, has been this: That I regarded the old House of Commons as not being representative of the will of the people, that I felt the returned men could not expect to receive from a parliament that was not truly representative the treatment which they had a right to expect from a parliament that was truly representative, and that when the election was over and the new House of Commons had been formed, one of the first steps I would take would be to refer the whole question of the treatment of returned men to a committee of this House which would be truly representative of all shades of opinion in the country; that I would ask the committee to deal with the questions that came before them, and that the Government would be guided in its action in the light of the report made. That was the pledge I made during the campaign, and that pledge has already been fulfilled. My hon. friend the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) has already given notice of the establishment of that committee, and as soon as its members have an opportunity of meeting there will be placed before them the whole position in regard to the returned men. There is no reason why the committee should not consider, if it so wishes, the question of cash grants. As far as I am concerned, the broader they make the whole of their inquiry, the better.

The point that is of concern at this moment is this: This amendment is an attack upon the honour of myself and my colleagues as to our attitude towards the returned men. I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to leave to the House, to hon. members who have heard the discussions throughout the election campaign whether in any particular, as the leader of the Liberal party, I made a pledge of cash grants to the returned soldiers generally, irrespective altogether of their need or their desire or their wish for such. I say again that the resolution of the Liberal Convention was an expression of opinion as to what seemed wisest and best at that particular time. I think in that respect the resolution was sound. In regard to the position taken during the general election, I have nothing to retract, and I am only too happy to leave it to this House to express its view as to the political honour of the gentlemen who sit on this side, by asking hon. members to reject this amendment.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): The resolution which has been placed in your hands deals with a principle somewhat broader than the very narrow and limited scope ascribed to it by the Prime Minister in his appeal to the House to reject this resolution. The object of this resolution is to meet the oft-repeated repudiation, by the Prime Minister in particular, and by others around him, of solemn pledges publicly given and written in the documents of the Liberal party to the people of Canada prior to the last election. It is, Sir, to bring before the House this point: whether or not a party—or a group, if you choose to use a more modern term—can go before the people of Canada, offering a written document stating their policy and their views upon important questions, which are bound to come before Parliament, asking the public to support them on that platform, and, after having received the support of the people and having secured the power to implement those pledges, can coolly tell the country that these pledges are light and frivolous matters, not to be taken too seriously, but, may be repudiated absolutely by those who made them. That is the principle which we call into judgment before the House to-day. We are asking the House to say whether or not they stand by an old practice of parliamentary procedure in the British Empire, namely, that groups of individuals, known in the past as parties, go before the country, issue their platform and appeal for support on a general policy, not on details of government; and if they do that, then they are bound, when they are returned to power, to implement those pledges by legislation. That is the affect of the responsibility we assume. Why, Mr. Speaker, while you were not in the House during the whole of last parliament, I think you were here long enough to remember that my hon. friend himself, the leader of the Government, and many around him, wanted my right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) to resign and go to the country. Why? Because, forsooth, he had fulfilled the pledges he and the party had given. They said that we had discharged our mandate, that we had completed the pledges and promises we had given, and, therefore, we had no right to sit here any longer. But now we have the same hon. gentlemen coming into office and absolutely repudiating pledges. He says it is not a pledge. He says he made no promise of this kind as he went about the country. I asked him yesterday, and I ask him to-day, is this document an official document of the Liberal party or is it not? I hold

in my hand the handbook of the Liberal party. Yesterday I invited the hon. gentleman to repudiate it, and he said, no, he would not repudiate it, nor will not repudiate it to-day. This document, Sir, contains, in its opening pages, the platform of the Liberal party. Is that platform a meaningless document? Or is it a document issued to the people of Canada upon which they are invited to support that party? I have here the platform, for the sake of comparison, of my hon. friends of the Progressive party. Will these hon. gentlemen say that in issuing their platform to the people of Canada they did not consider they are now bound in honour—that is what the resolution refers to—to support that platform to the limit of their ability? Every one of them who has spoken so far has given expression to that principle. As far as we are concerned, we stand exactly on that same principle. This platform of the Liberal party is issued with the imprimatur of the Prime Minister himself, issued by authority of the committee he had guiding him—he will remember that he told us the other day that he had adopted the course of being guided. I invite the attention of my hon. friend to this. I notice he is not giving me very much attention, but I would like him to do so. He said a moment ago that this pledge, which he chose to call a pledge, was all very well in 1919, under the conditions existing then. But, why, Mr. Speaker, did they reissue this pledge again in 1921? Why did the hon. gentleman offer it to the people of Canada during that three months up to December 6, 1921? If it was only intended for August, 1919, why did he issue it again last fall? If what he told us is sincerely true, that it was a pledge under the conditions obtaining in 1919, then exactly the same thing applies to every statement in this platform. I have them here. Let me give hon. members the headings. There are resolutions on finance, tariff, reciprocity, agriculture, labour, conservation of physical standards, soldiers' civil re-establishment, railways, national unity, Canadian autonomy, control of natural resources, elections, and so forth. Are all these resolutions just to be considered as they happened to apply in August, 1919, or do the principles contained in these resolutions guide my hon. friend in his leadership of his party to-day? That is the question that is before the House. Here is what my hon. friend says in this document preceding all these resolutions. Referring to the convention as a large and representative convention comprising 1,800 delegates, he says:

> The interest of the delegates in the policy of the party was evinced by a mass of resolutions from which those adopted were carefully selected by a representative committee. They express the idea of a great body of delegates of—

Of what?

—the aims of the Liberal party.

That is set forth in this document. He himself says, as leader of the party, that these resolutions, the ones I referred to and others, were carefully selected and issued to the public as the aims and the platform of the Liberal party, not as something to guide the party in 1919, but for the guidance of the party in October, November, and up to December 6, 1921, for the winning of votes for the party. If this resolution is to be treated as my hon. friend desires to treat it to-day, I say to my hon. friends to my left, who have been very courteous to him in anticipation of a fair deal on the tariff question, that they can expect exactly the same answer from him in regard to the resolution on the tariff. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), when he meets his fellow workmen in Toronto, will be able to say to them, in the words of the Prime Minister, when he is called upon to state why he did not bring in the eight-hour-day, as pledged in his resolution on labour, "Oh, that resolution was for August, 1919, and not for the present time." Either the argument made by the Prime Minister a moment ago in regard to this pledge is meaningless and a mere subterfuge, or the same language must be applied to every resolution in this platform; that is, that the resolution, the pledge, the plank in their platform, whatever you like to term it, is merely convenient to stand upon for the time being, and for the purpose of influencing the public, but was never intended to be implemented by legislation. That is the position.

My hon. friend made to-day, and has made on several occasions, quite a display over the promise that he gave to the returned men to the effect that he intended to refer this matter to a committee of this House, and that this committee would deal with it. In this same interesting book, the same piece of Liberal literature, I find pages devoted to this question. I draw the attention of the Minister of Health and of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr.

Béland) to this, because yesterday, when he was discussing this question, he took a a very strong stand. He said that personally, he had never supported the cash gratuity. That is correct, I think. He said that, as regards himself and those who were associated with him, the committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was a committee free from embarrassment and unanimous in its decisions. He does not contradict me, and I think I am stating the case correctly. But all the way through this literature, my hon. friends say that the only reason why Parliament did not give to the soldiers what they were demanding was—what? It was because the hand of the Government was over the committee and controlling it. That hand is now removed. My hon. friend knows that, and he and his friends take a great deal of satisfaction out of that fact. Let him and let his minister go before this committee, which is freed from this sinister influence which he says was exerted, and allow that committee to do what he says it was prevented from doing by the former government. That is what we ask him. My hon. friend knows perfectly well, and we know, that in making this pledge—we call it a pledge, and if it is not a pledge, his whole platform from end to end is meaningless, because there is nothing more clear in any of the resolutions than this—he had no intention of implementing it. If my hon. friend was sincere at all in making this pledge, he would implement it, but we know perfectly well that he has no intention of doing so. Indeed, we know, and we knew in the last parliament that such a pledge as this could not be implemented without serious difficulties in this country, and that is what made it so difficult for those of us who were supporting the late government, to make good in the last election, because of the conviction carried to the minds of many people by speeches and utterances of my hon. friend and his followers on such subjects as this. The people were told that it was possible to do things which my hon. friend and his followers knew it was not possible to do. We are calling upon him now to do one of two things, either to implement that pledge by legislation providing for cash gratuities, or to admit that his statement and the statements of his party were unfair to us, that they misled the soldiers in regard to the course which my hon. friend intended to pursue. Either one or the other is what we are asking; and in the absence of that,—and last night we were led to believe that we could expect neither—then we say this: This resolution having been passed, this is a repudiation of a solemn obligation and a disregard of public honour. It is that principle that we are bringing to the attention of the House; it is that principle that we are asking the House to pass upon on this occasion.

We believe that in this country public utterances and platforms issued by responsible leaders of a party should have a meaning. We believe our system of government cannot be sustained unless there be some regard for the pledges of a party when it is offering itself and its programme to the people. What position will this country be in if a party can go before the people of Canada offering to them a programme, and then after attaining its objective, can coolly tell the people: "It is not our desire to discharge that pledge"? That is the position in which the hon. gentleman finds himself to-day, and that is the reason why we move this resolution and invite the House to support it.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, this matter of the promises made by the present Government during the late election campaign in connection with giving a cash gratuity to the returned men, has been sprung upon us, and we have not had much opportunity to prepare evidence to the contrary. During the campaign, I was not out of my constituency, but I want to contribute my little bit of evidence as to what went on in Weyburn constituency. At only two of my meetings was this matter mentioned, and at one of those meetings I was asked, when on the platform, what my attitude was towards granting this cash gratuity. I had really not considered the matter very much, and I replied that I was not in favour of it. A returned soldier was helping me at the meeting that night, and I asked him what the boys would think of my reply. He said: "You are perfectly right, Mr. Morrison; the boys are not expecting it to-day; they were at one time, but that is not an issue with them any more." I do not know what promises were made in other constituencies; I can speak only for what occurred in mine. The chief issue there was not what we were going to do towards rewarding the returned soldiers; it was the record of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in managing the business of the United Grain Growers. That was the chief issue and practically

the only one. His record in this House was not touched on; the issue was the private business that he was conducting. The campaign in this regard was carried on very unfairly, and the issue was instigated by my hon. friends to my right. Those hon. gentlemen are finding very much fault with campaign matters, but to me their attitude looks like the pot calling the kettle black. They did their best; they did not regard all the finer rules of the game; they did everything to gain; and they lost. I think it would become them better if they would not say anything about breaking the rules of the game.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, in this amendment there is involved a policy which makes it necessary for me to make a few remarks upon it. I believe in the policy of the returned soldiers as it has been laid down by their organization, and I have been pledged, both by the organization which I represent, organizer labour, and by the organized soldiers, to support such a policy. I regret, however, to see that this question should have been so involved with censure of the Government, and judging from the sentiments which have already been expressed by the Opposition, I should say that they are more interested in getting a censure of the Government than in getting a bonus for the returned soldier. I personally find it very difficult to believe in the absolute sincerity of the hon. member who has moved the amendment. I hate to be a party to any imputation of false or biased motives on the part of the Opposition, but nevertheless I think that if they are absolutely sincere in this matter they should bring in a resolution or bill, as they please, dealing with the question specifically and not involving the Government or any individual in censure. I agree with the position as set forth by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I do not see how the political honour of the Government is involved in this matter at all, and while I am in sympathy with that which is alluded to in the resolution, in so far as the soldiers' bonus is concerned, at the same time I do not feel that it ought to be tangled up with any censure of the Government. I think that this is a case of using what would be more or less a popular issue for the purpose of getting a vote of censure passed on the Government. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman who is responsible for the resolution will bring in another one on the specific question which is before us, he will find a great deal of support in this wing, whereas I doubt very much whether he will find any sympathy for his motion as it stands. I cannot vote on this question because I do not want to vote against the bonus, and I do not want to vote for a censure of the Government.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): As an onlooker and a new member, I must say that this discussion, while illuminating and interesting, has not so far been edifying; and I agree with the member (Mr. Irvine) who has just sat down that it would be very much better if we could dissociate the specific issue under consideration from the question of censure of the Government. There is another question related to this one which occurs to me, and which was brought up some days ago in the House, and that is as to what would result if this group, to which I belong more or less independently, should vote against some Government measure. Now, I think it would be unfortunate that anyone in this House, not wanting to censure or to oust the Government, should be compelled by some custom, which I think surely is now obsolete, to vote contrary to his own conscience and opinion. And this is a case in point. If the Government could be convicted, on the present occasion, of dishonour and duplicity in this matter, and we in this section of the House should desire to censure them, I should hope very much that such a vote would not be carried too far; and I should be glad if some amendment to the constitutional rules could be effected which would leave greater freedom to an individual to vote according to his own conscience and his own opinions. I think that such freedom is necessary. I simply say, in conclusion, that so far as I am concerned it will be practically impossible for me to sit in judgment on this squabble between the two old parties. I do not feel that I can vote at all.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire first of all to say a word with regard to the objection taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on the ground that the courtesy of sending him a copy of the resolution had not been observed. I have made inquiry and find that my instructions, given at one o'clock, were carried out, and that within a few minutes of one o'clock a copy of the resolution and a notification that it would be moved in amendment to Supply was delivered at his office, a similar copy having been delivered to the office of the leader of the Progressive party (Mr.

Crerar) who, being present, received it. The Prime Minister not being present apparently did not receive his copy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure my right hon. friend would like me to have the facts correctly stated. As he has just said his instructions were to leave the resolution at my office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To be delivered to you.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As the right hon. member knows, I have an office in the House of Commons and one also in the departmental block, where I am obliged to be when dealing with business that appertains to the affairs of the Government. The leader of the Opposition knows that Council meets between two and three o'clock, and at that hour my place of business is in the East Block. The copy which my right hon. friend sent was taken to my office here, which I did not reach until three o'clock. My secretary sent it to me during the course of the debate with a message that it was found on the table, but evidently not delivered to any member of the staff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute the facts as stated by my hon. friend; I merely state that my instructions were to deliver the resolution to him. It was taken to his office here, and I only add that when similar notices were given me while I was Prime Minister they were delivered also to my office in this building, inasmuch as they had reference to House of Commons matters. Hereafter such notices will be delivered to the hon. gentleman at his office in the East Block. I am not finding fault with the Prime Minister at all. I want to make it clear that not only had I no intention of being discourteous to him, but I took the natural steps to notify him of the intention to move this resolution.

Now, what is before the House this afternoon is something which, if I am able at all to estimate the importance of matters that come before Parliament for consideration, is not of cursory or secondary, but of primary and first importance for the decision of hon. members. One hon. gentleman describes the debate as a squabble between one side and the other. Well, everything that comes up for debate in Parliament may be so described, but the question to which hon. gentlemen's minds should be addressed is this: What is the proper thing in the interests of Canada to do? What is the proper decision to give regarding the question propounded in the amendment that has been moved? It is a question of good faith of political parties; it is a question of the good faith of the House. That is what we have to consider. There is no question before us as to whether there should be a further gratuity to the soldiers of the country. If that were the question before Parliament I would vote in the negative. Is my sincerity doubted, or the sincerity of hon. members who sit around me? By whom is the question of sincerity raised? When we were in office were we or were we not frank with the returned soldiers? We told them definitely, once we had gone the extent we thought the country could go in the matter of cash gratuities, that we could go no further, and we took the penalty of certain hostility among them because of that candour. I put the course we pursued before hon. gentlemen to my left and hon. gentlemen in front of me, before both Oppositions, if you may call them such, en face et de coté, and I ask them whether that is evidence of sincerity or not. We are deciding in this debate, by our votes on this question, whether or not parties are to be held to their pledges. If this resolution is defeated, he who votes against it votes that he is not a supporter of the principle that a party in power is bound by the pledges by which it attained that power.

Now, what was the pledge? Let us inquire dispassionately what it was, and let us inquire, as to the value of the Prime Minister's explanation of the effect of his party's commitment in the terms stated in their platform as transcribed into the resolution. It was this:

> Resolved that this Convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service.

What is the Prime Minister's statement to-day? He says: There is not embedded in that any promise or pledge whatever. Not embedded there any promise to the five hundred thousand returned men that the Liberal party was committed to give them a further cash grant in addition to the then existing gratuity and pension! Well, all I want to say is this: that if what the hon. leader of the Government says is the only effect of this resolution, then the Liberal party stands under an indictment greater than that levelled against them in the resolution now before

the House. Could any returned soldier in receipt of his gratuity and of his pension, having fought, as large numbers of them did, if not the majority, for a further recognition in cash, in the form of a general addition to the grant, could any returned soldier reading that, not come to the conclusion that the Liberal party favoured that for which he had fought? Can the hon. gentleman conceive that any one would come to any other conclusion? "Resolved that this convention declares that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service." Would not any returned soldier reading this at once think that the Liberal party is in favour of cash grants in addition to the present gratuity? Could any scheme to deceive and mislead the soldiers be more plainly devised than that resolution, if it means what the hon. gentleman says? If it falls short of a promise to the men of a cash grant in case the party passing that resolution is returned to power, then the indictment of deceit is as bad at least as the indictment of repudiation.

That is the resolution. "Oh," says the Prime Minister, "I went through the campaign and I did not promise any cash grants at all." Indeed, Colonel Thompson, who was with him, though he is reported to have made such a promise, actually said he was not in favour of cash grants. He said precisely opposite to what he is reported to have said. Well, are we concerned with Colonel Thompson? Was Colonel Thompson empowered to amend the resolutions of the Liberal party in convention assembled? I doubt, in fact I would question, were I a follower, the right of even the leader of a party to amend those resolutions, to take in his pocket the commission of his party and at his will alter it, whatever the circumstances might be. Colonel Thompson had no such right.

But the leader of the Government says, "I made no promise; I never stood on any platform and promised cash grants." Why, he did not need to do so. He had an official proclamation issued by a committee of which he was the chairman, more than a month before the campaign was launched, and he had commissioned every speaker for the Liberal party to make that promise under his authority. So he could well afford to be silent while he placed in the hands of every speaker who stood on the platform in his support a document with his photograph on the outside, issued by a committee of which he is declared to be the chairman, that declaration appearing on the frontispiece. That document contains this statement:

> That the platform as adopted and quoted below expresses the idea of the great body of delegates of the aims of the Liberal party.

And in that document he quotes the following, just as it is set out in the resolution before the Chair:

> Resolved that this Convention declares, that the adoption of a system of cash grants to the soldiers and dependents of those who have fallen is the most satisfactory and effective means of civil re-establishment—such grants to be in addition to the present gratuity and to any pension for disability resulting from service.

With that in the pocket of every candidate, with that authority to go and repeat the promise embedded in that resolution, what would be the need of the Prime Minister and leader of the party to refer to the subject at all? Nay, more, on platform after platform, men commissioned by himself, commissioned in writing to say so, proclaimed this to be the policy of the party, to be its promise and its pledge. And in my hands now I hold the proclamations, as quoted yesterday, that those candidates issued to the returned soldiers among their electorate promising that this was going to be done. I wonder if even the hon. member for the city of Ottawa, right in the city where we stand now, will say that he did not utilize that plank of the Liberal party? Yea, he utilized that platform in this city in association with the Prime Minister himself, and sought to obtain votes on the strength of the pledge contained in the document which I hold in my hand.

That is the condition of affairs that existed in the last campaign. It is not the conduct of elections that we are concerned with. The hon. Prime Minister says, "Oh, you did not do everything that was right." The Government in office in the last Parliament—and I appeal to the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) to say if what I speak is right or not—that Government in office, whether it was politically advantageous or whether it was not, set about to implement by legislation, and did one by one implement by legislation the pledges that it made to the people before being returned to office. Did any member

of the late government stand in his place and say, "Oh, those resolutions were very good in the months of September and October, 1917, but now we are in power, and they don't apply once you get in power if it is two months later." Did any one hear that position taken? No. We set about the fulfilment of our promises, and we took the consequences of that fulfilment—and I want to say that those consequences were not always advantageous to us, and no one knows that better than the leader of the Progressive party. One by one we put those pledges into effect, one by one we fulfilled the contract which we made with the people—a contract which the people accepted when they put us in power, and expected us to carry out.

We were told yesterday: "Oh, the Great War Veterans at their last convention opposed the granting of cash bonuses. I do not know what could be advanced more false, more shadowy, more tricky than the argument that the policy of a great party is subject to alteration by the resolution of some organization in the country. But as a matter of fact there was no such resolution passed by the Great War Veterans. In 1920 they passed a resolution after the convention of 1919, to which I have referred, in which they affirmed themselves definitely in favour of cash grants and pledged themselves to secure such grants if they could. In the face of the position taken by the Great War Veterans the Government of the day declined their request, and said to them: We believe we have gone as far in the general cash grants as is in the interests of the country, and we think that anything further should be in the way of enabling the soldier to help himself through re-training, seeking out various ways in which specially disabled men may be helped in the struggle for life to overcome to some extent the handicaps they labor under as the result of their war service. That was the answer we made to those men. We took the responsibility and the discredit for the straight denial of that request. In the 1921 meeting no resolution was passed changing the position taken by the Great War Veterans in 1920. They passed a general resolution with regard to re-establishment, but took no special position one way or the other on the matter of cash grants. I examined their records in order to make certain of that. But I feel like apologizing, Mr. Speaker, for referring to the action of any association, however respected, however honourable, however worthy of deference its opinion may be; because I never knew a political party to be in a position of such desperation that it had to seek a loophole of escape from its own solemn pledges, from its own declared policy, by pleading the action and the opinion of some association other than that political party itself. Does the Great War Veterans' Association sit in appeal over Liberal policy? Are they a court of appeal empowered to amend, modify, strike out or enlarge any part of the Liberal platform? Well, possibly they could improve on it; I do not doubt they could. But I would not want to be the leader of the party that submitted to the jurisdiction of any court of appeal in relation to the policy that it puts before the people, save alone the court of appeal of the people themselves. The people accepted the pledge of the Liberal party, accepted the pledge of the Prime Minister, made two years and a half before the election, reaffirmed more than once in the meantime, and reaffirmed last of all in the most solemn way in the handbook of his party which he placed in the hands of all his speakers throughout the length and breadth of Canada with the authorization to make those pledges, to state those intimations, to declare that policy. That is the position the hon. gentleman is in to-day.

Now, is it a matter of no concern how we decide this resolution? I do not know that I am particularly concerned as to how others vote than myself. It is a vote of confidence in the Government; I seek no camouflaged position in that regard. If any hon. gentleman wants to say that this Government is to be open and free to repudiate the position it took prior to the contest; to repudiate its solemn pledge and policy and still enjoy the confidence of the House, then it is the right of that hon. gentleman so to vote. If there is anything of more conseqence to that hon. gentleman than the good faith of political pledges, than the good faith of political parties, than the honour of a political party in carrying out its solemn pledge, then the hon. gentleman is the judge of what is more important to him. But if this House is now to give a verdict of acquittal; if this House is now to declare that the platform of 1919 is a "scrap of paper," that it may be accepted as already annulled, abandoned and forgotten, then the consequences of that position must be faced. That platform contains other principles; it contains other policies than those we are discussing to-day. No matter what course the Government takes on any subject em-

bodied in that document, on any subject referred to by them in this House through session after session, since and during the campaign, they can never take a position of more direct and defiant repudiation than they took yesterday in relation to this subject. If they are to be acquitted for so doing, then the hon. member of this House who seeks to hold them to their pledges, who seeks to hold them to their avowed policies, will already have cut the ground from under his feet, because he has acquitted them of the very same charge of which he seeks later to hold them guilty. I, for one, will not put myself in that position. I purpose to hold them to their whole chapter of pledges. I purpose to make solid my ground by my vote upon this resolution and through it to declare that I have not lost faith in the political honour of our country. I purpose by my vote here to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Oh, oh," say hon. gentlemen; I presume those are the hon. gentlemen who have lost faith, and they have good reason for doing so. I have a recollection of sitting through four sessions of this House when hon. gentlemen who now say "oh" were sitting opposite to me. Though they opposed us in many matters of policy; though they made very many charges against us, they sat through four sessions and never once declared that we had failed in fidelity to the pledges we made by which we obtained office.

Mr. VIEN: Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a correction? Does he not remember when we criticized his government for having repealed Orders in Council passed during the election of 1917 exempting farmers' sons from the application of the law? The repeal of those Orders in Council right after the election we interpreted as lack of good faith toward the farmers' sons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government in office, in the spring of 1918, at a time when the war was at its worst, repealed Orders in Council—or, rather, enacted Orders in Council,—which took away the exemption of farmers' sons between the ages of twenty and twenty-three. That is quite true.

Mr. VIEN: After the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, after the election.

Mr. VIEN: Not before?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Orders in Council were not in effect then. We removed these exemptions by special Orders in Council, and we did it in obedience to the pledges we made to the people of this country in pursuance of the fact that the throwing of the whole force of the country behind the war effort was the first mandate of the government.

Mr. VIEN: Will the right hon. gentleman allow me to make this correction? The Order in Council exempting the farmers' sons was enacted right before the election and repealed right after.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The Order in Council was amended by a subsequent Order in Council with exactly the effect I have stated. We carried out the primary and major mandate, and we carried it out at all costs, knowing it was not popular. In the course we then pursued we had the co-operation and support of the present leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar), who walked that path with us, however difficult it was, and served his country by so doing.

That is the record of the late administration. But hon. gentlemen opposite would say: I agree with the declared policy of my leader in office that the declared policy of my leader out of office is something not to be taken seriously, is something that may be lightly abandoned without the honour of my party being at stake. The leader of the Government seems very much scandalized that there should be any impugning of the honour of the Government because on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, a solemn, clear, definite, and unmistakable resolution of policy, confirmed time after time and over his own hand on the very eve of the election itself, is openly repudiated in this House by his own voice and the voice of his minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Where are we to-day in Canada if this is to go on? Where is the electorate of this country to stand if by resolution of this Parliament we declare that we absolve the Government from the pledges by which they obtained office? What is to be the position of the electorate when an appeal to them is again made? Hon. gentlemen will doubtless put out their platform; they will undoubtedly lay their proposals before the country. Will the leader of the Government be compelled to go upon the public platform and say: These are our proposals now, but when we get into office they will only be the

proposals we made to get into office? They will only be the pie crust made to be broken. You cannot tell by what we propose what we will do, and we warn you not to take too seriously what we say when we ask for your votes for the purpose of getting into power. Will not that be the position he will have to assume, and will not hon. gentlemen who vote in his support, who vote in favour of the repudiation of policies and pledges and the sacrifice of political honour, will they not have to stand behind him in that thing, and say they have associated themselves with him and that that is what they believe should be the code of political honour in our country. For myself—and I make no appeal to others who may regard these things differently; for I let them do as they choose—I propose to show by my vote and by whatever influence I have that the time has not come for the sacrifice of pledges and policies in this country, that the people of this country demand of a government that it stand true to the proposals and the promises by which it obtained office, that it take the penalty of those promises if they were ill-advised or hastily made, and above all that the people of this country believe that the code of honour which a political party and the government have is more sacred to them, has more to do with our future and our weal, than anything else that may come before Parliament for discussion.

Now, I appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House, and I say, first of all, this is a motion of want of confidence. It is not because it is a motion of want of confidence that I ask for its support, but it is because it declares for a principle that is vital for our continued respect throughout this country as a Parliament. Those who have still confidence in a government that is guilty of what is alleged in this resolution are quite free to vote against the resolution. I myself have no confidence in a government that is guilty of what this resolution alleges.

Now, let us analyse and see if what this resolution says is true or not. Is it true that the Liberal convention, which named the hon. gentleman leader of the Liberal party, which commissioned the Liberal party to go to the people of this country with a policy there laid down—is it true that that convention passed this resolution or did it not? On that point there is no difference of opinion. All agree that the resolution was passed and became the policy of the Liberal party. Is it true that on the faith of that resolution the support of the people of this country was sought by means of the promises there made, or, as the hon. gentleman would perhaps put it, there implied? Of that there is no doubt at all. Is it true that candidates of the Liberal party in the last election took that pledge, made it their own, took it under the authority of the present Prime Minister of this country, and obtained the votes of the people of this country upon it? Can there be any doubt of that? Is it true that the present Prime Minister of this country extracted that resolution from the minutes of the convention on the very eve of voting in the last contest, made it and reaffirmed it then and there,

5 p.m. put it in the hands of his speakers from one end of Canada to the other, and commissioned them to make that pledge to their electors and get their support upon it? Is that true or is it not? We have the evidence of it all right before us, evidence in writing, evidence over the name and even over the photograph of the Prime Minister himself. Those facts are true.

Now, has that policy been repudiated or has it not? Did not the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) stand here yesterday and declare that the making of further cash grants was no longer the policy of this Government, before one single cash grant had been made? Of that there is no question. Did not the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stand in his place yesterday and declare that it was no longer the policy of the Government to make cash grants to soldiers? Of that there is no question at all.

Mr. BELAND: If my right hon. friend will allow me, I do not believe I made such a statement. May I repeat what I said yesterday?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. BELAND: I said that the veterans' organizations in Canada had declared themselves opposed to a cash bonus. That is the statement I made to the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read what the hon. gentleman said. After having declared that the veterans were opposed to the bonus, which by the way the veterans have never declared—I have their resolution here—my hon. friend said:

If my hon. friend wants to know what my attitude would be on the subject, it could not be

any different from the one taken by the returned men themselves, and that is not to grant the cash bonus.

Mr. BELAND: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, what did I say? I stated that the hon. gentleman had stated his attitude to be—and I assume he spoke for the Government—not to grant any more cash bonuses.

Mr. BELAND: The difference between the right hon. gentleman and myself is that he wants to impose his own will, whereas I want to respect the will of the Veterans.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will leave the hon. gentleman's retort to answer itself. The point he rose to interrupt me upon was that I had misinterpreted his words. I have read his words, and they are precisely what I said. He announced as Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment his opposition to further cash grants, and the Prime Minister in his statement did the same thing. If, however, in the face of this debate, if in view of the position they are in to-day, the Government wants to recant or modify its position, there should be ample opportunity to do so. If they are taking the stand, no further cash grants, let them say so. If they want to change from their attitude of yesterday, let them make the change. If they do not intend to change, if they are against further cash grants, then why by interruptions lead any hon. gentleman to any doubt upon the question. They stated yesterday they were opposed to further cash grants. There can be no doubt at all about that. Those are the words of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, who presides over the department affected. Those are the words reiterated by the Prime Minister himself, and even in to-day's debate is there any hon. gentleman who would not take it, after the Prime Minister's speech, that his Government had definitely decided against further cash grants to soldiers as intimated in the resolution of the Convention of 1919? No. Of the repudiation there is no doubt. Of the making of the pledge there is no doubt. Of its reiteration there is no doubt. Of the authority of the Prime Minister for both the making and the reiteration there is no doubt. Of the repudiation we have had confirmation by one after the other in the debate yesterday. Now, is this Parliament to decide that the making of the pledge followed by its repudiation—the first step in relation to their platform since they came into power—is to go without the rebuke of this Parliament? Shall this House by its vote declare that that sort of conduct meets with its approval? This resolution is an opportunity for hon. gentlemen to say that it does not, and I shall vigorously support the resolution.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker: down in my old home town some years ago a worthy alderman won undying fame by a single sentence. He had been present at a discussion occupying considerable time, at which speeches had been made very much like the one to which we have just listened by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and at last he said, "Mr. Chairman, I move that we quit nonsense and proceed to business." We have business to do in this Parliament, but my right hon. friend and his supporters seem to think that some good end will be served by interrupting business with the motion that has been made to-day, and I pay it a very excellent compliment when I speak of it as nothing worse than nonsense. Does my right hon. friend think any good purpose is to be served by constantly reviving the campaign issues? Does he think he can stand examination on these tests himself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: I venture to say that if any one takes anything like the pains he has taken to look over the work and the speeches preceding the election, he will find cases where my right hon. friend has made statements which have not been followed by results.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I invite the hon. gentleman to pursue the inquiry.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend makes a serious denial. I will remind him of an incident in this House that most people will remember. The right hon. gentleman gave what was equivalent to a pledge that there would be no dissolution of Parliament until there had been a redistribution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I invite the hon. gentleman to quote my words, and he will find that he is not correct.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not expect this "nonsense," and, therefore, I have not the quotation, but if this debate goes on, or perhaps a similar debate, I will produce the passage, and I will show what the hon. gentleman said in this House, at the opening of last session, during the debate on the Address, when he was asked to dissolve the

House, and when it was argued that the government did not represent the people. The Montreal Gazette at that time endorsed the position of the right hon. gentleman and declared that it would be an outrage to dissolve Parliament until the West had obtained its representation. The hon. gentleman told us very truly that the West was going to be entitled to so many more members, and he said "If we were to dissolve the House on any issue in advance of that time we would be doing a great injustice to the western provinces." He has done that injustice. He has perpetrated what the Montreal Gazette declared would be an outrage by the dissolution of Parliament. We are going to have a period now of five years during which the western provinces are going to be denied proper representation. My hon. friend has asked for an instance, and I give it to him now. With further investigation, we might give him other instances. Soon after my right hon. friend became Prime Minister he went out west and in Calgary made his declaration in regard to the tariff policy, saying that the country had a right to know what tariff they were going to have, and declaring that before Parliament was dissolved they would have before them a tariff revision in black and white.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Better get the speech and quote it.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is not correctly quoting what I said.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. FIELDING: The Speech from the Throne promised tariff revision. So far as that is concerned, the hon. gentleman monkeyed with the tariff question for years. They had Sir Thomas White telling the House that the tariff revision was overdue and that it ought to come that year. but it did not come, and then another year passed, and it did not come. Then they had the Tariff Commission which wandered all over the country. They made a solemn declaration in the Speech from the Throne that during that session they would bring down tariff revision. Is that statement true, or do I invent it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon gentleman invites an answer, I will give it. The words he quotes were not used. What was stated was that a tariff revision would be brought down in due course. The interposition of the American situation on the tariff question was good and sufficient reason for postponing it.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman not only put in the Speech from the Throne that statement, but instructed the then member for Prince Edward Island, Mr. McIsaac, in moving the address, to declare that the tariff revision was imperative. It was said, "Now is the day of tariff revision." Was that true? With that promise in the Speech from the Throne they let the session go by, and dissolved Parliament without a tariff revision at all. What right has the right hon. gentleman to talk of the honour of Parliament in the way he does, after these two instances I have given? My hon. friend did these two things, and I have no doubt if we would make an investigation we would find many more. Again I say, he cannot afford to challenge discussion along these lines. The question whether that resolution with regard to the soldiers' bonus at the convention of 1919 was or was not a wise one, I am not going to discuss, but this I do say, that it was not an issue in the recent election. If it were correct that it was an issue affecting the elections recently held, there would be some ground for the hon. gentleman's complaint, but we all know that, whatever may have been said at that convention, at the time the election came on that question had ceased to be an issue in this country. I had the pleasure of taking some part in the election. I spoke at a number of meetings. I never mentioned the soldiers' bonus, and never heard it mentioned. My opponent never mentioned it. It never was an issue at all. So that I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reason in the world why that should be treated as an issue affecting the election.

My right hon. friend talks of the appeals to the people on which we won the election. He cannot talk on any appeal on which he won his election. Whenever he appealed he was met from ocean to ocean, to a degree that was never experienced before in the history of Canada, by a repudiation of his Government. The soldiers' bonus was not an issue in the election, so far as any knowledge of mine goes. I never spoke of it, and my opponent never spoke of it. I spoke at many meetings in many parts of the country, I never heard it mentioned. I was never asked a question about it. It may have been an issue in former times. The country accepted the judgment of the

committee of the House, presided over by that excellent member, Mr. Cronyn, as a settlement of the soldier bonus question. Before that committee the door was opened to consider any matters that might arise in connection with soldiers. But when he says that was an issue at the last election, and that on that issue we came back to power, I tell my hon. friend he is entirely mistaken.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I do not propose to detain the House for any length of time in a discussion of this matter which has been pretty vigorously threshed out by my hon. friends on both sides of the House. The crux of the amendment moved by my right hon. friend is that it levels the charge of insincerity and of disregard to the niceties of political honour against the Government and my hon. friends who sit opposite. That is a very serious accusation to level, and if I were convinced that it had substantial foundation. I would have no hesitation in supporting the amendment of my right hon. friend. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not so convinced, and I will very briefly give the House my reasons. I do not now propose to enter into any discussion as to whether the resolution dealing with this matter passed at the Liberal convention, 1919, was passed in good faith or not. I have no reason to believe that it was passed other than in good faith, and for the reason that every one in this House and out of it knows that at that particular moment, in the midsummer of 1919, our soldiers were being demobilized, they were being returned from Europe and there was a feeling throughout the whole Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that everything we could do for the returned men who fought so gloriously overseas was only what Canada should do for them. That was the atmosphere at that time. But if I say to the Government, "Because you had a resolution approving the principle of a soldiers' bonus at your convention in 1919, you must disregard all that has taken place since then and implement that resolution," then I am going a little too far. That is the position I take in this connection, and let me very briefly state my reasons. The Liberal party then in Opposition in this House might be, and probably were, perfectly consistent at that time. But if public opinion throughout Canada has changed upon that question in the last three years since June, 1919, and if other things have intervened, then, in my judgment, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and my hon. friends opposite are not acting dishonourably in stating that the time has passed for the giving of a bonus to the returned soldiers. That is the position I take.

What are the reasons? We have our financial situation for one thing. I speak so much about it, I am afraid I make myself wearisome sometimes upon the point; but I think anyone who studies the financial position of Canada is aware that it is one of the gravest things facing this country. We know that the finances of Canada will not, at the present time, stand a vast contribution by way of a soldier's bonus. We recognize that fact; we recognize also the fact that three years ago a definite policy was followed by the government of the day, in my judgment a wise policy, a policy endorsed by Parliament at that time, for giving assistance to returned soldiers, and already a sum amounting to almost a hundred million dollars has been spent in the soldiers' land settlement scheme. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) brought in the soldiers' land settlement scheme; I supported him at that time, and I think yet that, while the scheme may have had defects in its operation, it was soundly conceived. I am quite willing to admit that my right hon. friend, and the then government of which he was the head, endeavoured to administer that scheme in the best interest of the returned soldiers of this country. For these considerations, I cannot agree with my right hon. friend and the mover and the seconder of this resolution, that because the present Government, in view of changed circumstances, cannot come forward and provide a cash bonus for the soldiers, it is acting in bad faith or dishonestly. I am anxious, as I am sure all other hon. members are, that good faith in matters of public policy should be observed. I must, however, confess that I am afraid there is possibly a little bit more behind the moving of this amendment than the mere vindication of political honour in this House, and I am led to that conclusion by a statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) who spoke to the resolution. In that statement, my hon. friend said to the Government: "You should either implement the plank in your platform, or state that you took an unfair advantage of us in the election." That is placing the reasons for a consideration of this question upon altogether too low a level

and, consequently, I cannot agree with my right hon. friend and his supporters in the amendment which they have moved. The amendment, as the leader of the Opposition has stated, is a direct vote of confidence in the Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Want of confidence.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, I would scarcely expect my right hon. friend to move a motion of confidence in the Government. It is a direct motion of want of confidence in the Government. What does that mean if we look at the situation fairly? If we carry the thing to its logical conclusion, it means that if this motion carries, this Government is out and we shall have another election. I do not think my hon. friends to my right for a moment expected or desired that this would be carried to that conclusion, and for that reason I shall oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs.)

A good deal has been said in the debate about the conduct of the election. I trust that in this House we shall soon get away from an examination of what happened prior to December 6. I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, in all confidence, and I will state it here for the full information of the House, that if I and my hon. friends around me desired to pursue that line, we could bring a very emphatic indictment against not only my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), but some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. Possibly in the course of the election I may have said something; for in the heat of elections, we sometimes get beyond the bounds of political proprieties or what should be the political proprieties. But I cannot see that much good will come to this House from continuing these discussions.

As I have already stated, this Parliament has very serious business to do. Let us get down to the consideration of that business. When my hon. friends opposite are not pursuing a course that I conceive to be in the best interest of the country, then I stand here to tell them so, and to oppose them in that course. That is the angle from which I approach my duties in this House; and because the amendment moved by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) approaches it from another angle, I cannot support him, and I shall oppose it.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, when this debate started this afternoon, I had no intention of taking part in it, and I would not do so now but for the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) brought in a statement which I made yesterday evening regarding what Colonel Thompson had said at Port Arthur. I was not, of course, present at the meeting of the Prime Minister; I think I was out in some section of my constituency or somebody else's at that time. But at any rate Colonel Thompson is quoted exactly as I quoted him yesterday evening, and I did the courtesy to the Prime Minister of sending him the paper in which the quotation was given. I might point out that this paper is not a political paper; it takes an absolutely independent stand. It did not support me in the election, so that I am quoting from a paper which is not a supporter of mine. If I wished to go on quoting—and I shall not take up any time in quoting anything—I could give a quotation from a speech of my hon. friend which might embarrass him severely in this House. As is reported in the Port Arthur press, he took the stand in that city that the government of Mr. Meighen at that time was committing the unpardonable crime of appointing its friends to the Senate. That was one of the statements quoted in connection with his speech, but I do not wish to deal with that. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government stated, in the speech which he made this afternoon, that this pledge of the Liberal party was wiped out because of the actions of the Great War Veterans. Then I ask, as has been asked before: Why do they include it in their platform in October, 1921? Their platform was sent out at the beginning of the election, and it would have been the easiest thing in the world to delete that part of it since my hon. friend says now that they had no intention of carrying it out. As a matter of fact, I hold in my hand what has been handed to me by an hon. member from Vancouver, namely, a statement put out in the press by three Liberals who ran for Vancouver, absolutely pledging themselves to a cash gratuity. There is no doubt they based that pledge on the platform of the Liberal party. The Prime Minister also said that in 1919—I think I am quoting him correctly; I hope he will correct me if I am not—when that resolution was passed at the convention, they favoured cash grants, but they have changed their opinion since. We were giving cash grants at that time to soldiers returning from overseas. Every soldier, who served over-

seas and who returned, received from the government that was in power at that time, a cash grant running anywhere, I think, from three hundred to six hundred dollars. So that we were giving cash grants; and unless that resolution meant a further cash grant it could mean nothing at all. I presume now that it might well be said to have meant nothing. My hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine), I think, said that this was a camouflage motion, and that it really was not intended to get a bonus for the soldiers. I admit that very frankly. The party in this corner of the House, which were in power from 1917 to 1921, again and again refused to consider cash grants for soldiers. I made myself unpopular amongst some of the returned men by openly declaring my opposition to the principle. This resolution has nothing to do with any request for a grant, and so far as I am personally concerned I do not believe that the thing is possible. I think it is a financial impossibility to give $2,000 to each of the returned men. The only thing the resolution does is to condemn the putting into a platform, for political purposes, of a promise which the party that makes it has no intention of carrying out. The resolution condemns such unscrupulous tactics; it declares that pledges which are not intended to be implemented should not be exploited for election purposes. In other words, it is a condemnation of the breaking of faith with the people of the country after a party has been elected on a pledge which it has used during an election campaign. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is quoted as having said at one time, in a jocular way, that platforms were made to get in on but not to stand on, and it seems that that piece of pleasantry has become an established political principle. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said a moment ago that he did not favour the resolution because it sought something that was not possible. Let me repeat once more that the resolution does not demand that the Government should give a cash bonus to the soldiers. It is a resolution condemning the principle, or rather the lack of principle, of advocating platforms in the country before election and refusing to carry them out afterwards. Now, my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has been accused of having broken his pledges. Let me say that I got elected on a platform put forward by Sir Robert Borden in 1917, and that we carried out every one of the twelve planks of which it was composed.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Including Sir Robert Borden.

Mr. MANION: Sir Robert Borden carried himself out, because he happened to be so unfortunate as to fall ill; and I would say in regard to the laughter which I hear on the other side that I have yet to see in this House, on either side, a man for whom I have greater respect than I have for Sir Robert Borden. I saw him in this House during the better part of four years, and I have—and I believe my hon. friends on the other side have—the highest respect for the attitude which that right hon. gentleman took on all questions. I have said it in private, and I say it in public now, since the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) has seen fit to interject the remark he has made, and his friends sneeringly approve it, that I have never seen Sir Robert Borden in the House of Commons, on any question that was discussed, taking what I considered to be a narrow or bigoted stand; and I think that is a tribute which can be paid with pride to any man who has sat in Parliament as long as the right hon. Sir Robert Borden did.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) dismisses this resolution as so much nonsense. He points out that my right hon. leader promised that there should be redistribution before an election and that he did not carry out that promise. Well, the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are in power now, and I do not notice any remarks about redistribution in the Speech from the Throne this year, although they have an opportunity of doing what they think we should have done. It has also been said that the bonus question was not an issue in the election. I grant that in many cases it was not; but it was made an issue by the platform of the Liberal party, and it was used by those members I have quoted and by some of the supporters of the men whom I opposed on public platforms. It was made an issue by the party opposite in various parts of the Dominion during the election and was used as a means of securing the soldier's vote. If the present Government had wished to be fair in regard to this question they would have deleted the pledge from their platform when they put that platform before the people. Now, Sir, I do not wish to take up more time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RINFRET: Let us get down to business.

Mr. MANION: My last remark seems to please some hon. gentlemen. Well, I am glad to be able to please them to that extent at any rate, although some of them during the last four years were not so very considerate of the time of the House or so anxious to help expedite matters. Let me point out again that the resolution does not advocate a bonus for soldiers, but condemns the making of promises by political parties who afterwards refuse to carry them out. I do not believe in that type of political warfare and I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. E. J. SEXSMITH (Lennox and Addington): I want to ask two questions, Mr. Speaker: Are we to understand from the mover of the resolution that there shall be given a cash grant to the returned soldiers?

Mr. ARTHURS: No.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Or does the hon. member imply that there has been an absolute refusal to assist the soldiers, and that the Government does not intend to give any further help to them?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Then we have lost three hours and a half.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): In view of the wording of the resolution I am somewhat surprised at the question asked by the last speaker (Mr. Sexsmith). The resolution is clear and definite. It is a condemnation of the principle of giving pledges, before an election, which a party has no intention of carrying out. As I listened to the various speeches I could not help thinking of an inscription on the walls of another chamber in this building, "The spirit of the printed word". I also recalled an address delivered in this Chamber a year ago in the debate on the address by the present Prime Minister, (Mr. Mackenzie King), and I am going to quote a few words from his remarks. What I am about to read was his carefully prepared peroration which he read to this House. He said:

> What is it, Mr. Speaker, that works havoc in human lives, that destroys the noblest of friendships, that blights all that is most sacred in our human relations? It is the loss of confidence that comes through disillusionment, through the broken pledges, the shattered ideals, the lost visions, the vanished faith. Cruel, indeed, it is when that breach in confidence comes between man and man, between friend and friend, between race and race, between nation and nation; but when it comes between a people and its Government, there is no saying what injury it may ultimately work.
>
> What we need to-day is to seek to restore to the people faith in our parliamentary institutions, through conceding their right of control over the Parliament of the country. We know that there are rights under the law; that there are powers under the constitution; these we are prepared to concede to the limit. But is there no such thing in our national economy as public morality? Is there nothing binding in conscience and in honour between those who rule a people and those who have permitted them to rule?

There are the words of the present leader of the Government on that occasion, and yet to-day he attaches no importance to the promise that was made a part of his platform, which was re-affirmed, and, as has been pointed out, circulated throughout the Dominion in the handbook of the Liberal party during the election of 1921. I know that in my constituency twenty-four pamphlets were circulated by the Liberal party, being placed in the mail boxes throughout the rural districts after dark presumably so no one might know who was doing it. And this was one of the pledges made to the people, which the people had a right to believe would be carried out by those who were appealing for their support.

I was a little surprised at the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) this afternoon. "Why," he said, "this stuff is all nonsense. We are just wasting time. Why do you pay any attention to things embodied in platforms, election addresses and promises?" It seems to me that I heard the hon. minister make a similar statement some time ago. He was quite frank and candid. This was before the election. Speaking in this House on May 18, 1920, he said:

> Now, responsibility generally sobers men.

Yes, responsibility sobers men, and he is evidently sober now. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government is also evidently sober to-day. I suppose that would imply that they were not sober when these statements were made to the people. What else did he say on that occasion?

> I think myself that we will find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise and we all find when we come to the responsibilities of office that we may have to modify our views.

He said we may have to modify our views. I am not going to take up the time of the House in quoting from the Liberal platform, but I do want to call attention to something else. The hon. Minister of Finance has stated that the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen) did not keep the pledges and promises

which he made to the people, and he referred to the revising of the tariff and other matters. What happened in regard to them? Just about a year ago, on February 15, 1921, we find that the present Prime Minister moved a resolution in this House in amendment to the Address in the following words:

> We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's present advisers do not possess the confidence of this House or of the country, and that their retention of office constitutes a usurpation of the powers of popular government.

This is all he had to say on the matter: We are not going to discuss tariff, redistribution or anything of that kind; the Government has no right to legislate, and its retention of office is a usurpation of power. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, who was then Prime Minister, went to the people, and he had to deal with the promises and platforms made by the then leader of the Opposition, now Prime Minister of this country, who to-day asks hon. members assembled here, the representatives of the people of Canada, to attach no importance to promises and pledges that were made while his party was in opposition. Has our public life become so degraded that this is the lesson we are to teach the youth of our country? Is this the ideal we are to set in public life—that we are to repudiate promises made to the electors of Canada. I say it is an insult to any hon. member to ask him to disregard the pledges and promises which he made to his electorate.

Now, Sir, this is not a new policy which has been developed by the Liberal party. Eleven days after the armistice was signed, in fact the ink was scarcely dry on the signatures, when an organization meeting of the Liberals of Western Ontario was held in the city of London which was addressed by the leader of the Liberal party of that day (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Reference was made to this matter at that time, and a resolution was passed that our soldiers' claims would be one of the first things that the Liberal party would deal with if returned to power. When I came into the House last night and heard the Prime Minister and the Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) repudiate these promises, stating, "We do not intend to do anything with them," I immediately recalled the statements that were made upon that occasion. I hold in my hand the London Advertiser of November 20th 1918, the official organ of the Liberal party in Western Ontario, then as it is now. Two things featured the speeches then made. One was referred to by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) relative to promises which had been made to the farmers of Canada regarding exemption from militia service. It was taken up by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion and he condemned the Government of the day for having violated its promises, and I am going to read from the official organ of the Liberal party exactly what he did say. Here it is:

> Delegations of farmers came to Ottawa, thousands of them, to ask the Government to be as good as its word. They were told no, it could not be done, and the reason the Government gave was that the military situation was serious. The military situation at that time, that is about the month of May, was certainly very serious, but sir, are we to believe that the men who introduced that policy, who told us that it was absolutely necessary that we should have this compulsory recruiting, that it should be universal—are we to believe that when they made that promise, are we to suppose that they believed that this war could be fought without reverses? Did not they know last fall that we were to have a last offensive of the German armies in France; did not they think it was possible that these armies might suffer reverses of their own; and that when they gave that promise they might meet with a situation such as this? If they did, then sir, there is only one of two things, they made the promise to the farmers in ignorance or they made it in bad faith. I know what their motive was.

This matter has been referred to so often in this House that I am afraid hon. members opposite have not followed the course of the war with any degree of care. It is very easy to look backward and see where you have made mistakes and where you might have done better; but when we are subject to censure by hon. members opposite, in view of what has happened and it is on record, I say that it ill becomes any hon. member to your right, Sir, to taunt the Government of that day with having put in force the law which was then enacted. If hon. members will refer to the report of General Allenby, Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian Expeditionary Forces, to the War Office, issued from his general headquarters on September 18th, 1918, they will find that he states how his army had been depleted by reason of the situation which had developed on the Western Front, and he points out that in the first week of April 1918 the 52nd Division had been withdrawn and hurried to the Western Front, that in the second week of that month the 74th Division had also been withdrawn and hurried to the same destination. Those

withdrawals were followed by nine yeomanry regiments, five and a half siege batteries, ten British battalions, and five machine gun companies. In May fourteen battalions of British infantry were withdrawn, and he had to fall back until his depleted forces were made up by fresh recruits from India. I mention this to show the desperate situation on the western front at that time, and the need for men to justify the cancellation of exemption from military service at that time. It was not until after troops had been sent him to take the place of those that had been removed to the western front that he achieved the victory which was the deciding factor in bringing the war to an end. Now, this is a matter which has apparently escaped the observation of some hon. gentlemen opposite; yet they readily point to the cancellation of the farmers' exemptions as a justification for the attitude of this Government and of the Liberal party to repudiating one of the pledges contained in their platform.

This resolution has been referred to by a number of speakers in the party to my left as one that should not be taken very seriously. It struck me that they were very anxious to find some excuse for not supporting a vote of censure upon the Government with regard to its attitude on this question. The one who considers himself the alpha and omega of the Farmers' movement in Ontario, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) says that the discussion has not been very edifying. Well, I do not think that he added very much by the remarks which he himself made. I followed him closely; I believe it is the first time he has spoken in this House. He has written most voluminously in regard to the movement of the Farmers' party in Ontario, but when his constituents and the people of Ontario read Hansard to-morrow I fear they will not be very much edified by his contribution to the debate. Other hon. members to my left have made some observations. But I want to point out that a violation of pledge of this kind recalls to one's mind the justification of the allied countries for taking the action they did in August, 1914—the repudiation of a solemn obligation by Germany, an obligation which they characterized as a "scrap of paper." Many sacrifices were made in that war; millions of lives were laid down for a principle; yet in this Parliament to-day we are calmly asked by the Prime Minister and his supporters to attach no importance to pre-election promises. Conditions, they say, have changed since they adopted that plank in their platform. But have they overlooked the fact that the policy in question was reaffirmed by them during the recent election campaign with a view to getting the support of the soldier electors? If they knew they were not going to put it into effect, then they deliberately set about to deceive the very men who made such tremendous sacrifices that we might be permitted to assemble here in Parliament this atfernoon.

Mr. JOHN L. BROWN (Lisgar): The hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Sutherland) has seen fit to criticise the remarks made by those who sit in the Progressive group. I have been brought up to believe that we should be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us, and it is incumbent upon me to be able to give a reason why I shall vote as I intend to do upon this resolution.

I am not very greatly concerned in coming to the defence of the Government in this matter. I am not greatly concerned in what may have been their attitude before the election and how it squares with the position they take now, any more than I am with the attitude taken by the official Opposition, either before the election or at the present time. To what extent this question was an issue in the election I am not prepared to say. I was in a happy and unique position in my constituency: there was no one prepared officially to endorse either the hon. gentlemen now sitting opposite or the then government. Opposed to me was a gentleman who repudiated the Union government and its successor, the National what-do-you-call-it—the big name—and all its works, as well as the right hon. leader of the Opposition. But this question was not an issue in the constituency of Lisgar. As has been pointed out, the only issue raised in that country—and we could not get any discussion of public and really important questions at all—had to do with the question of the United Grain Growers. It is worth noting that in that section of the country, where that particular question was best understood—and we did understand it—the electors spoke in no uncertain terms. Hon. gentlemen on the Government benches will take note of that, just as well as hon. gentlemen of the official Opposition.

I said that I proposed to give a reason why I intended to oppose this amendment. The reason is simply this: I came here with the intention—and I stated this before the election—of giving any government that happened to be returned a fair opportunity to carry into effect the principles for which we stood. Up to the present time no issue has been raised that would make it necessary to depart from that position. I congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition in his making use of an opportunity to rise to great moral fervour and to make a great moral appeal. For my part—and I think I can speak for the majority of those around me, though I do not know; perhaps I have no right to speak for them—I propose to judge the Government as I would have been prepared to judge a government that might have been formed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition had his party been returned to power. I propose to give them an opportunity to endorse the principles for which we stand. None of those principles are in any way involved in this discussion, and as the resolution is, according to the leader of the Opposition, a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government, I intend to oppose it.

I do not want my position to be interpreted as condoning anything that might seem like political trickery or breach of faith on the part of public men, whether members of the Government or of the Opposition. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has referred to the pledge that was made in regard to redistribution. At the time of the nominating convention in my constituency I said that the time was inopportune to nominate a candidate in that riding because I did not think any government could be so lacking in good faith as to fail to implement the promise which we understood had been made to the country, namely, that redistribution would be granted. Unfortunately our faith in that respect was shaken; so, looking at the matter in an impartial manner, as I think we may do, I see no reason why we should vote for the amendment, which amounts to a motion of want of confidence in the Government of the day.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Arthurs) which was negatived on the following division.

[Mr. Brown.]

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baxter,
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Boys,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Garland (Carleton),
Grimmer,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hocken,
Hubbs,
Ladner,
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Porter,
Ross (Kingston),
Senn,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tolmie,
White,
Wilson—42.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Brethen,
Brown,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chew,
Chisholm,
Clifford,
Coote,
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Ethier,
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Fielding,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
German,
Gervais,
Good,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Essex),
Kennedy (Gengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leader,
Léger,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald,

Mackinnon,	Papineau,
Maclean (Halifax),	Prevost,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),	Pritchard,
McBride,	Rankin,
McConica,	Raymond,
McCrea,	Reed,
McDonald,	Rinfret,
McGiverin,	Robb,
McIsaac,	Robinson,
McKay,	Robitaille,
McKenzie,	Ross (Simcoe),
McMaster,	St. Père,
McTaggart,	Sales,
Malcolm,	Savard,
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Séguin,
Marcile (Bagot),	Sexsmith,
Marler,	Sinclair (Oxford),
Martell,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Mercier,	Speakman,
Michaud,	Spencer,
Millar,	Steedsman,
Milne,	Stein,
Mitchell,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Morin,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Morrison,	Stork,
Morrissy,	Thurston,
Motherwell,	Tobin,
Munro,	Trahan,
Murdock,	Turgeon,
Murphy,	Vien,
Neill,	Walsh,
Ouimet,	Warner,
Pacaud,	Woods—162.

PAIRS

The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips, is as follows:

Messrs.	
Power,	Mewburn,
McMurray,	Ryckman,
Hunt,	Guthrie,
Laflamme,	Bristol,
Jacobs,	Church,
Cannon,	Maclean (York),
Pelletier,	Le Sueur,
Putnam,	Jones ,

Mr. MEWBURN: I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 9, respecting the Canada Trust Company.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate Canadian General Insurance Company.—Mr. Lanctot.

Bill No. 11, respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Lafortune.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Ethier.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Civil Government—Justice—salaries and contingencies, $235,517.50.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): There are a few changes in the Estimates. There is an increase of $9,785 as follows:

One inspector of penitentiaries, new position	$2,820
One senior clerk stenographer for minister's office	1,320
One clerk stenographer for the penitentiary branch	960
One clerk stenographer for the department	960
	$6,060
Statutory increases for 46 officers	3,725
	$9,785

The decreases are as follows:

Saving by superannuation of Miss Armstrong ($2,100) replaced by Mr. Pearson ($1,140)	$ 960 00
Saving by vacant clerkships, reverting to minimum of class	417 50
Over estimated last year	995 00
Total decreases	$2,372 50
Net increase	$7,412 50

I must say that this is more apparent than real, because we have to deduct from this the salary of Mr. Archibald, Parole Officer, who was receiving $3,600. There is another amount of $600 which was paid to Mr. Ahearn, one of the secretaries of the Minister of Justice. Mr. Ahearn is now in the department, but he is no longer acting as a secretary. These two deductions would represent a decrease of $4,200, so that the net increase, counting statutory increases, would be $3,212.50.

I have the following to report from the Accountant. The apparent increase of $7,500 is caused partly by a transfer of the vote of $2,000 heretofore voted under "Administration of Justice" for expenses of the purchasing agent's office, and $5,500 to raise the vote, because, for a number of years, it has been too small for the increased requirements of the department, and supplementary votes have been neces-

sary. The amount last year was $32,900, and we are now asking for $32,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry I could not follow the reasoning of the minister. The attempts at economy in this case, and it is not singular, have resulted in a substantial increase in disbursements. The explanation, as I understood it, was that there are certain statutory increases which account for the estimate. That is clear; but it accounts for only a small part of the salaries themselves. Of course, these increases do not account at all for contingencies. The minister says that the difference, some $7,000, is more apparent than real, because there is a saving of $3,600, in that the parole officer, Mr. Archibald, does not appear on the list. It would seem to me that the result of that would be that had Mr. Archibald not died there would have been an increase of $3,600.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Mr. Archibald's salary is included in the Estimates, which were prepared before he died. We do not, however, intend to replace him by the appointment of a new man; his place will be taken by one of the officials of the department. We are therefore saving $3,600 in his salary, and $600 on Mr. Ahearn's salary, or $4,200 in all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the minister to say that these salaries are included in the Estimates. Why not strike them out? Mr. Archibald has been dead about a month.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We do not intend to make a new appointment; we will not spend the money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Ahearn, I understand, is in the Clemency Branch?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will he be continued there?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So that he will draw his salary?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, but not the extra $600.

Item agreed to.

Interior: Salaries, $1,462,770; Contingencies, $115,000.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): The sum of $1,353,922.50 was voted for the fiscal year 1921-22 for salaries of the permanent staff at Ottawa, and it is estimated that it will require $1,462,770 for the service during the fiscal year 1922-23, an increase of $108,847. As shown in the schedule, the permanent inside service consists of 832 employes, an increase of ten over the fiscal year 1921-22. Statutory increases under the Civil Service Act have been provided for in every instance, and the balance of the increase shown is due to the application of the classification. The increase in the number of employees is accounted for as follows: Number of positions in 1921-22, estimated, were 822, less position of superintendent accountant, deleted. Then there was a transfer from the Commission of Conservation by Order in Council No. 2550, of the 20th of July, 1921, of eight persons. The following employees, namely, economic adviser, hydro-electrical engineer, outside agent, librarian, principal map draughtsman, four senior clerk stenographers, and a messenger clerk, account for the difference between the 822 estimated for and the 832 employed in the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that this explanation quite covers the matter. Take the assistant office engineers, for example. They are fairly highly paid employees and they have increased from 15 to 31, or over 100 per cent. There are undoubtedly reductions in some other instances, but what is the reason for this increase?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These increases were dated back to April, 1919, and they were not classified until this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not asking as to the salaries; the minister has given some explanation regarding them. I am speaking as to the number of the office engineers, which has increased from 15 to 31.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are no increases, but there have been changes made by the classification of the Civil Service Commission, and these changes account for the difference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt my hon. friend has given a good deal of thought to the Estimates. I suppose I am right in that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I suppose so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, does he consider that the Estimates as pro-

duced are a proper exemplification of the platform of economy?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As I am informed, this is a matter over which I have no control.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No control over your employees?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have been in charge of the department for a short time, but I do not appear to have control over the number of employees, or the classification; my hon. friend appears to have provided for that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. minister thinks or believes that he has no control over the number of his employees, then with all my respect for him personally, I really think he should resign and let some one else take his place who will have control.

Mr. JACOBS: Are you looking for it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When I was head of that department I controlled the number of employees.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When I have been in charge for a time I will try to control the employees too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad of that promise of improvement, but I do not want the House to get the impression—at least, it will not be my fault if it does—that any minister does not absolutely control the number of officers in his department; that is to say, unless he fails to get the approval of Council, he can reduce the number to any extent he deems advisable, and the responsibility is his; he cannot shift it on to anybody else.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not seeking to evade responsibility for control of the department. I quite understand, even from my short tenure of office, that one has the authority to carry on with a lesser number of civil servants than he may find in his department; but I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is advisable to be well-informed and to go slowly before starting to make changes. I have said that I think the department is very well organized; I still think so; but perhaps after mature consideration I may find places where more economy may be exercised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right in connection with the classification. There is no doubt that former temporary emloyees have been drafted into the service, and very properly so, under the rules of the Civil Service Commission. For example, there is an apparent saving under the heading of Clerical Assistance from $40,000 to $25,000. That saving, as it is taken up, accounts in part for the increase in my hon. friend's vote, because those temporaries are made permanent and therefore added to the list. I am quite well aware of that. But take travelling expenses and sundries; that cannot be blamed on the Civil Service Commission. There is an increase of 30 percent. Why that increase?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I admit that personally I have not interfered with the services of any one of the departments over which I have control. I think it will be generally agreed that with eight hundred or nine hundred employees, while one is trying to get acquainted with them, there is not very much time to examine very closely as to where certain services might be dispensed with. This again is accounted for by a change. Travelling expenses and sundries, $32,000, shows an increase of $10,000 over 1921-22. It is estimated that $22,000 will be required to meet expenses of the permanent Inside Service officials at Ottawa who may be travelling on Government business, and an amount of $10,000 will be necessary to cover the expenditure connected with telegrams, postage, subscriptions to newspapers, express charges, cab hire, washing towels, and for other small items relating to the Inside Service of the department at Ottawa. The amount estimated for 1921-22 for travelling expenses was $12,000, but, on account of additions to the permanent Inside staff through blanketing-in Orders in Council or Section 79 of the Dominion Lands Act, it will be necessary to increase the item in order to meet the requirements of this service. The expenditure from 1st April, 1921, to 31st December, 1921, was $17,036.78. I am advised that the $10,000 is very largely charged from other services and is drawn by the very same civil servants who may be travelling. Those expenses will now be all taken out of this particular vote. There is therefore no real increase in this vote, it being in the nature of a transfer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the total expense for the past year $17,300?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, the total expense from April 1st, 1921, to December 31, 1921, nine months, was $17,036.78.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then why are you endeavouring to increase the vote for nine months? The old vote would just about cover that.

Mr. BAXTER: I notice at the foot of page 78, dealing with senior file clerks, that the number is increased from twelve to twenty-nine. I thought at first that possibly some junior grades were moved up, but looking at the top of page 79 I find that even this year there are twenty-three, or a reduction of only two on the number last year. That would mean seven less in the junior grades, but there is an increase of seventeen in the senior grades. There is one other item on page 79, clerk stenographers, increased from 96 to 111, while the juniors have been reduced by ten. It may be that these two items together make up 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the entire increase in the department, and that the Civil Service Commission is responsible, although it would hardly seem to me to be so on a cursory inspection. On the other hand, it may be that the pruning knife which was applied to most of the departments by the late government—and which, very naturally, was very much resented—having been dropped, the economies which resulted are now being made up for by a constant expansion. I do not know whether the hon. minister can answer the question off hand. I do not ask to hold up the passing of the vote because of that, but I should like to know, and possibly the House might be interested too, in his explanation before all the Estimates are passed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A large proportion of the $10,000 item, practically all of it I am informed, is taken from the vote for other purposes in the interests of which these men were travelling. They are now grouped together, have become civil servants and can no longer procure money from that vote; therefore you find the item of $12,000 added to the travelling expenses for the purpose of covering those items. In answer to the hon. member for St. John, I thought I made it very clear that there is no increase, except to the extent of the eight who joined the service and were transferred from the Conservation Commission staff to that of the Department of the Interior. On the other hand, the items as changed simply represent, so far as my information goes, the changes made by the Civil Service Commission with respect to classification, and that I take it is fixed. I have not attempted to interfere with it, assuming that the Civil Service Commission have control.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What are the functions and duties of the Publicity Agent for whom $2,400 is provided on page 77? There are two or three other new items in the same group.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that the publicity agent advertises the parks and playgrounds over which the department has control, and takes steps to induce tourists and other interested persons to visit them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the encouragement of the minister and to inspire in him hopes for the future, I want to say this: it is difficult in a large department such as the Interior to avoid increases, particularly in the face of the statutory increases of civil servants. This year I find that his increases amount to approximately $108,000. In the year of which I was reminded by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), when I was Minister of the Interior—and I know the previous reductions were the same—notwithstanding the obstacles, notwithstanding that the work of the department very considerably expanded, we took care of all statutory increases and of all the actual work and effected an actual reduction of $6,200.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the explanation of the increased amount asked for printing and stationery? Members of the House are literally flooded with stationery and printed matter from nearly every department; it seems to me that a good deal of it could be lopped off. It looks like a case where we should have a decrease rather than an increase, particularly in times like these.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The money is needed to pay for books of various descriptions,—index books; land patent record books, etc., file backs, special paper for patents, printed forms, purchase of typewriters and stationery required for the general use of the Inside Service at Ottawa. There are 250 typewriters constantly in use in the Inside Service, the cost of repairs and supplies in connection with which amount to a very large figure each year. The expenditure under the head of printing and stationery during the past three years has been as follows: fiscal year 1919-20, $58,603.64; 1920-21, $70,367,-.16; 1921-22, $77,000. The amount estimated for 1922-23 is $13,000 more than the

amount of the estimated expenditure for 1921-22, but as strict economy is being practised it is thought that $58,000 will be sufficient to cover this service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But still, why the increase? We were using typewriters before. Prices are going down; paper is a good deal cheaper than it was. I may say that in order to effect a saving, the Department of the Secretary of State went through the old war departments and got hold of all available typewriters, and the departments were asked not to purchase any new ones. Is my hon. friend putting this large increase into the purchase of typewriters?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I did not say so. That is simply one of the items.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then why the increase?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was going to ask the question about printing and stationery which the minister has just answered. We find ourselves at a loss in criticising any of these Estimates, because as soon as we speak about them we find that everything is covered by the reclassification. This reclassification is like charity; it covers a multitude of sins. Of what avail are our criticisms of these Estimates if every time we ask, why these increases, there is a tendency to hide behind the Civil Service Commission or the reclassification; and because of that we cannot go into the details. I realize that the heads of these departments are new men and cannot be expected to be familiar with all the details. At the same time, they are responsible for their departments, and we want to impress upon them that the country expects of them and will demand of them, classification or no classification, a reduction of these Estimates commensurate with the reduction in the cost of living and the price of supplies, due regard being had also to the country's diminishing income.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the general vote of the department as a whole we are able to show a considerable saving. I hope no one would intimate that I have been endeavouring to hide behind the Civil Service Commission in connection with this matter; that was not my thought. So far as Civil Service salaries are concerned I must confess that we appear to have very little control,—I may say frankly, none at all. My hon. friends have pointed out that we have control so far as the reduction of the service is concerned; that is quite true. I think my predecessor in office was managing the department very well; I have every confidence in his ability to do that. It may be that further savings could be effected, but after some years' experience with civil servants I do not know that you can get along by reducing your staffs all at once. I am not prepared to say at this juncture whether or not further reductions can be made, but I do say that if savings can be made in any quarter, I am determined to make them. This vote is asked largely on the representations of the officials of the department. It is stated that the money is needed; if it is not needed it will not be spent.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a new appointment here: Economic Adviser, $4,200. Is this new Economic Adviser appointed to assist in the expenditure of the additional $100,000, or is he to assist the minister in reducing the expenditure? It seems rather a peculiar thing to appoint an economic adviser and then ask for an increase of $100,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I trust my hon. friend does not assume that I am thoroughly familiar with the titles of all the different officers in this huge department. I do not pretend to be able to give the information, and I would not try. This official came over from the Conservation Commission. I do not know why he has this particular title. Indeed, I may say I have sometimes wondered at the multiplicity of titles in the Civil Service.

Mr. MANION: We voted against titles some time ago in the House.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not seem to have reduced them in the Civil Service.

Mr. CRERAR: I was very glad a moment ago to hear the declaration from the minister that he proposed to practise as rigid economy as possible in the administration of his department. I commend that attitude, and trust that it will be fully appreciated and practised by the Government as a whole.

Since yesterday I have taken the trouble of getting a little information in respect to the increasing cost of civil government in this country, and to my mind it is quite alarming in view of the circumstances in which this country finds itself financially. I find, for instance, that in 1903 the total vote for civil government in Canada was

in round figures $1,404,000; that is twenty years ago. In 1913, ten years later, it had increased to $5,372,000, and between 1913 and 1923 the cost of civil government has grown to over $11,000,000, or an increase of almost 100 per cent in the last ten years. That, to my mind, is a subject of very serious importance to this House. Parliament votes the money and naturally we are reluctant to cut down the Estimates that a minister asks for. I know that that is the attitude with which I approach the matter myself. I am anxious to see the public services carried on efficiently and effectively, but the time has come, I think, when we must frankly face the situation.

In respect to the department over which my hon. friend has supervision, I find that the increase has been equally great. In 1903 the total expenditure for civil government in the Department of the Interior, including salaries and contingencies was roughly $135,000; that is twenty years ago. In 1913 it had grown to $1,025,000. Now at that time the Department of Immigration was also in the Interior Department. Consequently, the figures I have just given include the expenditure for immigration purposes, as well as the conduct of the business of the Department of the Interior. At the present time the minister is asking for a vote of $1,462,770 for salaries, and $115,000 for contingencies, or a total of $1,577,770 for civil government in this department alone. That is an increase in the last ten years for civil government alone of $575,000 in the Interior Department, and if we include the vote for the Department of Immigration, which amounts to almost $275,000, we find that the cost of administering these services has increased by almost $1,000,000 in the last ten years. This does not take into account the cost of running the department outside Ottawa. It is simply the cost of civil government, the overhead cost of managing the machine, and I submit to the House and the Government that it is costing too much to run the business of this country. I am not criticising the Government for a moment; I am not disposed to criticise the government that preceded this one, for I had twenty-two months' experience in a government and I know how difficult it is to keep down expenditure, but I do say in all seriousness that the time has come in this country when there should be a thorough examination and revision not only of the cost of civil government, but of administering the whole government machinery outside of the head offices at Ottawa, to see wherein economies may be effected. We cannot tax the people of Canada at the rate of $450,000,000 or $500,000,000 a year, and expect the country to prosper, and if I may offer this suggestion, I think the Government would be well advised—and in this I am confident that they would have the whole-hearted support of the Canadian people—to set about seriously to consider where the cost of running the machinery may be cut down not only in the city of Ottawa but throughout the whole Dominion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette, and in view of the minister's own declaration that he finds his department exceedingly well run, he will now consent at least to say that extravagance shall stop or that it is not going on in his department, and will reduce this vote to the amount asked for last year. If we are to practise economy, this is the time to start.

I cannot add anything very much to what has been so ably said by the hon. member for Marquette nor indeed to the very frank admission of the minister himself, that he finds his department well run. Surely in this year of contraction and further deflation, there ought not to be an increase in the cost of administration, but rather economy, and I would suggest that the minister seriously consider cutting down this vote.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think no one knows better than the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that we have no control over the statutory increase. That is a matter for the Civil Service Commission. I should be very glad to run the department for the same amount as last year if the Civil Service Commission would permit me to pay the same salaries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister consent to cutting down the vote to what it was last year except for the statutory increases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That would mean that I should forego the increase of $10,000.

Mr. BELAND: May I remind my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) that legislation was passed by Parliament last session doing away entirely with the Conservation Commission, and the contention of the government then was that a large part of the work carried on by that commission would be diverted to the Department of

the Interior. I think that would account for a large portion of this increase.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The contention was not that. The contention was that the work was already being done by the Department of Interior and that there was mere duplication in the Conservation Commission. That was why we adopted the economy of abolishing the commission. It appears, according to the minister, and I have no doubt he is right, that eight clerks were tansferred from the Conservation Commission to the Interior Department, but those should have taken the place of men who dropped out by death, superannuation or resignation. I do not see any need of increasing the number of employees in the Interior Department at all. Even though eight were transferred, there would be many more than that, even since the minister took office, who could drop out by retirement, death or superannuation, so there should not be an increase in the number. Furthermore, with reclassification and a better arrangement of the work it was hoped, and there is no reason why it should not take place, that there would be more work done by the individual man, permitting of a reduction, not by dismissals, but by the natural contraction that would take place through death, retirement and superannuation. It is that, the minister, I think, has failed to take account of.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me read the items that go to make up the $108,847.50:

Transferred from the Commission of Conservation (10)	$19,902 50
Transferred from Board of Pension Commissioners (1)	3,360 00

I do not know at the moment, but I presume the Government who passed the Order in Council did know for what purpose those ten individuals were transferred to the Department of the Interior, because they passed the Order in Council in July and transferred ten people.

The next item is Board of Pension Commissioners (1) $3,360, statutory increases make up $52,737.50, increases due to reclassification $55,418.50, less appointments at minimum to fill vacancies $22,571. And I am told that where retirement or superannuation takes place the office is filled at the minimum salary, and not at the maximum, so that what my hon. friend has just been pointing out does take place, but the position has been filled at the minimum salary, which requires $22,571, making up $108,847.50. That, I claim, is uncontrollable, unless the argument is used that the staff of the department be reduced, and I stated three or four times that I have not gone into that matter. I frankly confess that. But let me tell the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that I will go into it. I think it would be presumptuous on the part of any one who has been in a department of this size for a period of a few months or six weeks to say he knows all about it, and that he would know which services could be dispensed with and which were absolutely required. I have absolute confidence in the ability of my predecessor to run the department, and I presume he required all the service I found there when I took office. I agree most thoroughly with the hon. gentleman from Marquette. I know that in the provincial government of the provinces during the period of the war, and undoubtedly in this Government, it was found incumbent upon the members of the Government to increase the payments to the staff, and they have been increased very materially. Not only was it found incumbent to increase them, but it was found incumbent to pay bonuses, and the cost of civil government has increased enormously. There is no doubt that, in conjunction with other services in Canada, the cost of government will have to come down, and that will be part of the business of this Government.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice on page 79 there is an item under the head of Research Astronomers. There are two of them at $3,060. These positions are apparently entirely new, and there was evidently no classification of last year. The item amounts to over $6,000, and right next to this item is the item of Astronomical Computors. I would like to know why there should be an increase occasioned by these appointments. Surely the Civil Service Commission are not responsible for that.

Mr. KNOX: What effect would it have on this vote if the natural resources were turned over to the Prairie provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid I could not answer that question. I would not like to venture to say what proportion, but I imagine a very large, or a fair, proportion of the Department of the Interior would go over to the provinces. There are the territorial services that will have to be carried on, but just what proportion I am unable to say.

Mr. KNOX: I was merely asking for the purpose of showing that there would be a saving, and that it would be an argument in favour of turning over the natural resources to the provinces.

Mr. GOULD: The thought has occurred to me that it is possible our Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) would like to bring down a huge credit balance next year, and on that account he has not been very severe in his criticisms of his ministers when they have presented their budgets to him. The time to practise economy is right now, and surely from all the expressions that have been given on both sides, particularly the Government side, it is apparent the House has indicated its approval of the principle of economy. We are everlastingly talking economy on this side. We believe we should have economy, and yet in every case excuses or reasons are given why each particular department should be sustained in its vote, practically as high as the expenditure of last year. It seems to me the excuse of the Civil Service Commission is offered too frequently. They are charged with the responsibility, but it seems like a man trying to hide behind a woman's skirts a little bit.

If the Government appreciate the position of the taxpayers throughout the country, they will deal with the question of expenditure with determination to bring the administration back to a basis of rigid economy. While it is true that the minister has only a brief acquaintance with his department, he must have had advice; but I fear his advisers have not viewed the situation from the standpoint of the taxpayers. If all these large spending departments are coming before Parliament and asking for the same amounts of money as have been spent in recent years we must simply insist upon the Government putting into practice those principles of economy which have been enunciated on all sides. We must demonstrate by our votes that we are going to put in practice that which we preach. The ministers must accept the principle that economy has to be practised and the principle must be illustrated by the amount of money that Parliament is asked to vote.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say that, so far as the total vote of the department is concerned—and that concerns all our activities, including the Civil Service, and the $108,847.50 increase,—there is a net decrease of $68,482.50 this year. We are not dealing with that matter for the moment, and it might be unfair to interject it, but the total vote was $7,358,527.50, for 1921-22. This year we are asking for $7,290,045, or a reduction of $68,482.50, and I say that in spite of the increase of $108,847.50 the statutory increases, the memorandum of which I have just given to the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do the hon. gentleman's figures include civil government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a summary of the whole vote of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Inclusive of civil government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They never give it together.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have a summary of the figures for the whole department here. I mentioned, in answer to my hon. friend who makes the statement that we must economize, that it was probably unfair to interject the vote of the department into the civil government. A saving of $68,000 is not a very large economy in an expenditure of $7,000,000 odd, but I just want to show my hon. friend as we will be discussing this later that we are endeavouring to cut down, and we make that saving in spite of the statutory increases amounting to $108,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do the sums mentioned here include a bonus, and if so, what amount?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That will all be provided for if the bonus is continued. I am told the bonus was supplementary last year. The estimates that I am quoting are the estimates for last year, supplemented by a bonus. Whether the bonus will be continued or not is another matter.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister did not answer my question as to research astronomers.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Labour—salaries and contingencies, $304,255.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): It will be noted that the civil government Estimates for the Department

of Labour for the fiscal year 1922-23, as prepared, show an increase of $23,400. This increase is explained as follows. Under the present regulations of the Civil Service Commission, it is necessary to provide for payment for positions resulting from promotions or changes in duties, before the positions are actually created by Council. There are in the Estimates now before the Committee a number of such positions, that is, a position specified with a stated salary opposite it, which position has not yet been created or filled, but which it is believed to be necessary to create and fill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it be convenient to give a list of those at this moment?

Mr. MURDOCK: Let us take the third specified position—Director of Technical Education. Since I have been minister of the department, we have had no Director of Technical Education. That official was taken from the Dominion Government by the Government of British Columbia, and we have not yet filled the position. I do not know just when we shall fill it, but possibly we shall not fill it for the next few months. It, however, appears necessary to place in the Estimates an amount to cover the salary for such an official, if it be found that we can get the proper and desirable man to fill the position, and if we think the time opportune to appoint such an official.

Mr. CRERAR: What are the duties of a Director of Technical Education in this department?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Director of Technical Education has, in co-operation and conjunction with the provincial educational authorities, the duty entrusted to him of maintaining timely supervision of the expenditures of the amounts of money granted by this Government to assist provincial governments in providing for proper technical education in the various provinces. As the hon. gentleman will know, this Government has a specified vote which, this particular year, amounts to $1,100,000, and which is apportioned on a certain basis prescribed by law and on an equal basis as between the provinces, to promote and further technical educational advantages to the youth of the various provinces. Those are, as best I can describe them, the duties of the Director of Technical Education. At the present time we have an Assistant Director of Technical Education, who is carrying on with the assistance of one or two stenographers, I am not sure just how many.

Mr. CRERAR: This, perhaps, affords an illustration of the manner in which these expenditures grow. As we well know, education is a matter entirely within the control of the provinces, and I think it should remain there. I know a good many of my hon. friends opposite agree with me in that view. It is of doubtful wisdom to develop in any branch of the federal government any staff or group of people whose business it is to mix up in the function of education which is particularly a function belonging to the provinces. If the federal authorities desire to assist and promote technical education in the various provinces, that can surely be done without the need of building up a staff of educational experts in our Labour Department. This is an item upon which we could have a little enlightenment.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am quite sure the hon. member for Marquette will not hold me responsible for the condition that I find in this respect.

Mr. CRERAR: Not for a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am quite sure he will agree with me that, even though his views are absolutely correct and this House should conform thereto, it would be necessary to change an existing law. Under the existing arrangements and the law placed upon the statute book by the government which preceded us, we have a graduated, increasing amount of money provided by the federal government to assist, on a fifty-fifty basis, the various provincial governments in promoting proper technical education amongst the young people of those provinces. If the views of my hon. friend were to prevail, it would, of course, be necessary to eliminate the law now existing, which provides in the present year for a fund of $1,100,000, or $100,000 in excess of the amount provided for in last year's Estimate, and we would, in substance, be saying to the various provincial authorities: No longer will the federal government undertake to uphold the hands of the provinces or to assist them in providing technical education for their young people. I think my hon. friend will agree that to maintain the necessary and timely supervision over that federal expenditure of $1,100,000 during the present year, it is not unreasonable

that there should be a director of technical education. We have not one now, and there should be such an officer; and we should also have an assistant director, because there might be something to do in two provinces at the same time. A couple, but not more than a couple, of stenographers are also needed, or approximately a staff of four, to maintain the supervision over the expenditure of this money during the present fiscal year.

Mr. CRERAR: I am aware of the legislation by which this assistance was given for technical education, but I do not think that it provides for any Director of Technical Education, or Assistant Director. That was what I was drawing my hon. friend's attention to. As regards his last statement, it is a fact, for instance, that the federal government pays large subsidies to certain provinces in Canada, but because that is done, under the law there is no provision that there should be a staff of experts to supervise, with the provincial authorities, the expenditure of those subsidies.

Mr. MURDOCK: I regret that I have not with me a copy of the statutes. I had understood that the law specifically provided that there shall be a director.

Mr. CRERAR: If that is so I stand corrected.

Mr. MANION: In view of the fact that the position which the minister speaks of was marked up against last year, so that it does not represent an increase, why is it that the total number of employees for the coming year is 11 more than in the preceding year? And before the minister answers this question perhaps he will answer another. He has spoken of technical education. Perhaps the House will be interested to know his view as to whether or not the Dominion Government should take part in technical education.

Mr. MURDOCK: The last question is indeed a fair one and I personally regard it as commendable that the federal government should show a disposition to cooperate, where desired, with the various provincial governments in promoting technical education. My hon. friend (Mr. Manion) asked why the permanent employees show an increase, the respective figures being 106 permanent employees for 1921-22 as compared with 117 for 1922-23. I am glad of the opportunity to answer the question. On the 30th of December I took charge of the Labour Department and found the following employees therein: In Ottawa, there were fifty-one permanent ladies, and twenty-five temporary; fifteen permanent returned soldiers and seven temporary; other males, twenty-eight permanent and five temporary, or a total of ninety-four permanent and thirty-seven temporary. Outside of Ottawa, at the employment offices in Calgary, Winnipeg, Vancouver and other points, there were three permanent ladies and four temporary, three permanent returned soldiers and one temporary; other males five permanent, or a total of 147 employees instead of the 106 which my hon. friend sees on the Estimates for the closing fiscal year. There were forty-two temporary employees. Perhaps my hon. friend would like to know how long these temporary employees had been working in the Labour Department.

Mr. MANION: Yes, and perhaps the minister will explain how it is that, in view of the fact, that there is to be a reduction of thirty or forty, he is increasing the estimate on civil government by $24,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: The proposal is to make twelve of these forty-two temporary employees permanent. Some of the rest have received notice, which so far as I understand will not be revoked, that they are to leave the service on the 31st of this month, or a few weeks later.

Mr. STEVENS: There are sixteen who are scattered over the country that are included in the estimate of last year, and my hon. friend is including them in the deduction he is making.

Mr. MURDOCK: All of the permanent employees of the department outside of Ottawa are included.

Mr. STEVENS: Where are they?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the number of employees in Ottawa?

Mr. MURDOCK: There were ninety-four permanent and thirty-seven temporary when I took charge.

Mr. STEVENS: Are the eleven permanent employees outside Ottawa included in this list?

Mr. MURDOCK: There are four wage investigators for 1922-23 at $11,460. The estimate also provides for a wage investigator who has heretofore been employed in the province of Quebec, and used temporarily on the basis of $15 per day. The

proposal now is to provide a permanent salary of $1,980 to begin with, but without the definite assurance that we shall positively fill the position or put that wage investigator on a yearly salary. We do ask, though, to have the provision made so that his services can be utilized on the basis of a yearly salary, instead of on the basis of $15 a day, if it should be found to be a better business arrangement.

Mr. STEVENS: That accounts for three permanent employees.

Mr. MURDOCK: I thought my hon. friend from Vancouver was asking for certain employees outside Ottawa.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly; there are eight more permanent employees outside Ottawa.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is a clearance officer who is assistant to the officer at Winnipeg. It is proposed to provide a salary for him on a permanent basis of $1,980.

Mr. STEVENS: That is a new appointment.

Mr. MURDOCK: Making a somewhat lengthy temporary appointment permanent. In the case of a number of these temporary employees the Civil Service Commission have intimated that they would decline to give any further temporary certificates because of the fact that such certificates for the same individuals had been issued on two, three or more occasions, and that they must be placed on a permanent basis.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the function of an employment specialist? Is he busy at the present time, and is the increase in his salary due to his increased employment in dealing with unemployment?

Mr. MURDOCK: This employment specialist analyzes the returns which come to the Labour department from various parts of the Dominion in regard to the employment situation. He was appointed by the late government, and is classified by the Civil Service Commission as specially qualified to perform the duties and to be regarded as an employment specialist. For fuller information the hon. member might consult the book which is issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. IRVINE: Is he a statistician?

Mr. MURDOCK: He has to deal with statistics, facts and figures, analyze them, and tabulate them to secure as accurate results as possible.

Mr. IRVINE: But those results would be purely statistical?

Mr. MURDOCK: Largely statistical, I think, and based on comparative estimates in each case with similar figures from other parts of the country.

Mr. HANSON: While these Estimates are under discussion I desire to call the attention of the minister to a matter which in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the House, is of great public importance, namely, the critical situation in the coal-mining districts of the maritime provinces, as a result of the strike-on-the-job which is now in progress in portions of Nova Scotia. I observe in the press that the hon. minister has declared himself in very strong terms to Mr. McLachlan, the secretary of the United Mine Workers of America, holding office in that province. I apprehend there will be no other opportunity to discuss this matter, and I think it is due to the country, especially in view of the representations which have been made to hon. members by circular letter, and also in view of the representations which I believe have been made to the hon. minister himself by the mayors of several towns in the districts affected, that we should have a declaration from him as to his policy in connection with this very important matter.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, in reply to my hon. friend from York-Sunbury, when a boy I was taught "There is a time and place for everything."

Mr. HANSON: This is the time and the place.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend has intimated that he has learned through the press my personal views of the intended strike-on-the-job. He has probably also noticed in the press that to-day a deputation from Nova Scotia waited on certain members of the Cabinet, including the Prime Minister. It is likely that a statement upon the situation as developed at the conference may be forthcoming within the next day or two, and therefore it would be entirely unbecoming for me now to undertake to deal with the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think we have got started yet, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister of Labour was giving

us some information, but was interrupted by questions. He started to give us a list of appointments which he said were not filled now and which he had to have in reserve; he had given us one when he was interrupted. I hope now he will be able to go on.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend from West York for coming to my assistance. I will now proceed. I referred to the third specified position, Director of Technical Education. Now I would ask hon. members to go down to the position specified as Statistician at $2,400 a year.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to put another question or two with regard to this statistician. From my previous question I understand that the employment specialist is largely a statistician. Now we have another statistician in the Department of Labour. A little further down we have Wage Investigators, who I presume are also statisticians. Then a little further down we have Principal Statistical Clerks, who I presume, are statisticians. Then we have Junior Wage Investigators, who, I assume, are also statisticians. Then we have Senior Statistical Clerks and Junior Statistical Clerks. Would it not be possible to co-ordinate these statisticians and dispense with half of them?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend evidently thought I was too slow in running down the list, so he proceeded to get ahead of me. If he will bear with me patiently I will endeavour to go over each of these positions and discuss them for his benefit. The position of statistician is not a new one, though we are going to ask the Civil Service Commission to provide definitely for the classification of this employee. The duty of the statistician relates to the comparison of prices, the particulars concerning which you will find in the Labour Gazette. He has to secure accuracy in the comparison of those prices and make a correct estimate of the cost of living from time to time. Then we come to the head clerk. This vote is to place a capable employee in a slightly higher class in order that he may get a thorough line on the work of an efficient officer who is advancing in age, and thus become properly qualified to discharge those duties if necessary. The next position is that of Senior Wage Investigator. The vote is to place on a somewhat higher basis the position held by an officer of the department at Calgary.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. HANSON: The minister was good enough to read me a little lecture a moment ago as to times and places. May I ask him if any of his investigators are in Cape Breton at the present time, and if so who they are, and what progress they are making?

Mr. MURDOCK: The answer to the first question is, No; therefore there is no necessity of answering the others.

Mr. STEVENS: I am very grateful for the information the minister has given me with regard to four out of eleven permanent employees outside of Ottawa who, he says, are included in this list. If he will inform me with respect to the other seven, I shall be obliged.

Mr. MURDOCK: I must ask the hon. member for Vancouver also to bear with me. I have started to do that several times, but have been tripped before I got through. I will try to get through the whole list. Now, we are asking the House to provide for five wage investigators instead of four.

Mr. STEVENS: You have already given that. I am anxious to get information with regard to the others.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has not finished his initial list. If my hon. friend will bear with him, I think it is only fair that he should have a chance to do so.

Mr. MURDOCK: I started at the beginning of the list and am trying to deal specifically with each of the changes. I was going on to say that the fifth wage investigator is a gentleman in the province of Quebec whom we have been paying on the basis of $15 a day, but for whom we now ask you to provide a stated yearly salary of $1,980 in case it should be found necessary to use his services continuously.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): What are the duties of these wage investigators, and what control have they over wages paid or received?

Mr. MURDOCK: These wage investigators are skilled in the comparison of wage rates as paid to various classes of employees. As you know, for many years the Government has had a fair wage policy, and it is necessary quite frequently to investigate what the fair wages in any particular class of employment may be in a certain locality. To illustrate, recently we found it necessary to place two wage investigators in the Niagara Peninsula to ascertain comparative fair wage rates for various classes

of employees engaged on the Welland Ship Canal. As the hon. member for Vancouver will know, one of these wage investigators undertakes, under the direction of the department, to maintain supervision over comparative fair wage rates in the mining industry on Vancouver Island; and he has been entrusted by employer and employees with the duty of determining from time to time what should be the graduated scale of wages paid in the coal mining industry.

Mr. HANSON: But not in Cape Breton.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Have the Fair Wage Investigators anything to do with farm labour? To make clear the purport of my question, I may say that I have had considerable to do with this matter in the western territory, particularly in Saskatchewan, and I know that there is a real effort being made in those provinces by the provincial departments of labour to standardize the wages of farm labourers. They have been attempting to do that for two years. I think the first attempt was made in the summer of 1920, but they did not get very far. The officials met again a year later, and made a little more progress, and I happen to know they are attempting another step in advance this year. I should like to know if these Fair Wage Investigators have anything to do with that, and if so, what progress they are making.

Mr. MURDOCK: Do I understand my hon. friend to suggest that the Fair Wage Investigators of the federal department of Labour have been undertaking to interfere with the wages paid to farm labourers in Western Canada?

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): That was not my point. I know that the provincial departments of labour, in co-operation with the employers of labour on the Prairie provinces and with the employees, are attempting to evolve some system of standardizing the wages that will be fair both to the farmers and farm labourers. It may not seem to the committee to be a matter of importance, but there are many thousands engaged every year in seasonal occupations in Western Canada. Does the provincial department co-operate with the federal department? Have representatives of the federal department attended the conferences that have taken place, and if so, what part have they taken in them.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is right to the extent that the Dominion Government bears one-half of the cost of the employment service, although permitting the provinces to maintain a large control over the manner of conducting that service. If my hon. friend has heard of any Fair Wage Investigators being connected with these matters, it is only in an advisory capacity to the provincial employment service officer, and only for the purpose of seeing that the money of the federal Government was spent wisely and well. Our Fair Wage Investigators have no other authority in matters of that kind.

Mr. IRVINE: Have the Fair Wage Investigators authority to investigate the wages paid to men in the employment of private companies or are their investigations confined to government works? If these Investigators have authority to investigate the wages paid to labourers by employers generally, how is it that they are not investigating these cases in Nova Scotia at the present time? If they are investigating those cases, what power has the government to put their recommendations into effect? I ask merely to ascertain what are the functions of these officials, and what authority they have in this matter.

Mr. MURDOCK: No Fair Wage officer of the federal government has any right or authority to interfere in the matter of the wages paid by private concerns. His investigation in that respect resolves itself merely into ascertaining what are the wages paid for the purpose of determining what would be a fair wage on government works in the district.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What are the duties of the Industrial Engineer?

Mr. MURDOCK: He was at first assistant to the Director of Employment Service, and handled the work of the Department in the absence of his superior.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: He is simply an assistant to the director?

Mr. MURDOCK: He is now used for general utility purposes in connection with employment and other questions. The next increase we come to is that of Junior Wage Investigator. Last year there was one such officer; this year we are suggesting that there should be two.

Mr. MACKELVIE: What about the Senior Wage Investigator?

Mr. MURDOCK: I thought I had explained that that was the position we were

proposing for the gentleman at Calgary who has supervision over the entire coal mining industry in British Columbia, off the Island, and in Alberta. He is a very capable official.

Mr. STEVENS: What is his name?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. F. E. Harrison.

Mr. CHURCH: I suppose that the minister, being young in office, has not yet given much thought to economy, for I notice there are increases practically all the way through his sub-departments. I understood from his speeches in Toronto during the election campaign that he would introduce new and better methods for carrying on the work, but he seems to have surrounded himself with a small standing army of officials so that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like him and all his retinue. For example, I notice there is an Editor of Copy at $2,160. What are his duties? I understood the hon. gentleman took the position in reference to his annual Estimates that he was introducing new methods and creating economy by just advising capital and labour to get together—he said it was a state of mind. This is the most criticized department in the public service all over Canada. Some officials are merely paper officials. I happen to have had some experience as a municipal officer for seventeen years under many governments past and present, and I say in reference to some officials here that their work is more on paper than real when you sum up the effect of it. I found the minister going to Toronto and a report was published of a speech he made at a Methodist church one Sunday night on what he was going to do—he was going to settle the labour problems probably in the same way that he lowered the high cost of living. He told his hearers that he was going to introduce new ways and means to effect economy. I am sorry I have not the article here. It relates to the first page of these Estimates. He was going to do something by compelling "capital and labour" to get together. What he meant and how he was going to do it he never said. What does he need with all these officials? He said you had to consider the state of mind of the people. Whatever he meant by that I do not know. We find now that he has publicity agents, editors, subeditors and an employment specialist. How any people has this latter officer got jobs for? We have several thousand out of employment in the place I come from. Further down he has 148 officials as against 130 last year, although now there is less work. Then he has a senior wage investigator, publicity clerk, editor and junior wage investigator. I suppose they will check up the editor. Then further down he has statistical clerks, a number of them, and clerk stenographers, probably to check up the statistical clerks; junior statistical clerks to check up some other set of clerks; secretary to executive, and editor of copy. He does not say what kind of editor. Does he hand out copy for the minister? Then there are assistant editors, one at $1,800 and one at $1,440. What are their duties? Do they work eight hours a day, or like the minister 24 hours a day? Then you have a translator $1,410, then editorial assistant at $1,275. You would think you were running a newspaper office instead of a Department of Labour. As a new member of the House I do not want to criticize the minister. He has not had time to look over the department, but this is one of the most extravagant departments of the public service and one full of frills and fads. I would like to say that a little economy would not have a bad effect on the department. If he can do so well in three months wait till you see the minister's estimates next year. If he can present such estimates after he has been in office two or three months what will they be next year, with the list of editors, supervisors, and other members of his retinue? On the next page they go from $108,000 to $192,000, and further on you come to the Labour Branch confidential messengers; two messenger clerks, probably confidential clerks to check up the other two messengers, and then contingencies, clerical and other assistants, including the minister's assistants. Then we have confidential messenger to the minister. He is not satisfied with the other messenger, but wants to have one of his own. Then you come to the printing and stationery bureau. What about the editor of copy? I think altogether too much copy has been given out by the minister and this department. His business and that of the department is to settle strikes, but I never knew them to settle strikes yet. We had several strikes in Toronto and all the department would do would be to wire or come down to the city and ask the municipal authorities to settle a strike. I think the department is overmanned. I think they

could do with less men especially in view of the explanation of the Government that they are practising economy. Let us start in each department and let us get rid of the frills and fads with which this department is honeycombed. There are more frills in this department than any other department of the public service and I say that without fear of contradiction. I have had a good deal to do with this department. The minister went on to speak of the high cost of living. Let him investigate the price of coal. Soft coal at the Virginia mines is quoted at $1.10 a ton at the mines and hard coal at $6 a ton at the Pennsylvania and other mines. With all these officials why cannot the minister do something to get a reduction in the price of coal? What is he doing to bring down the price of coal? Is he going to bring the producer and consumer together? I am sorry to detain the House so long but I think the House is entitled to more information on each of these items.

The provinces have labour departments and the larger cities have labour and unemployment departments. Is there overlapping? We hear about the people who are out of work in Toronto and other large places. True it is, this Government has had to dole out some money, but they could have done a great deal more if they had reduced expenses by cutting down the number of these useless officials. If they will bring down the cost of civil government they will be doing something towards effecting economy. The question of economy in Estimates is before the United States Congress to-day. They are reducing estimates over there and the municipalities are struggling to reduce estimates. Yet here is the minister coming to the House with a big increase in his Estimates. Although we are told that the relations between capital and labour to-day are happy, the minister's advice is for them to get together. If this is done he should not need these various officials, because if they adopt the principle of getting together it is so much the better for labour and capital and I do not know what he will want the 148 officials for.

I would like some Progressive to go through the Labour Department and see what the officials are doing. Are they settling strikes? I do not wish to criticize them too much. They have done some good work I suppose, but I say these officials are not all necessary and that the Labour Department is often a paper organization so far as settling strikes go. Then you have the question of the Industrial Disputes Act which does not apply to a public utility, such as water-power, electric railway and electric light companies, operated by the people—and yet you have those officials who are going about the country, spending money and advising these publicly-owned enterprises to appoint boards to settle strikes.

I think if the hon. minister would go slowly in his Estimates when he is just starting, look further into the department and cut out some of the frills and fads it would be better for the House and the country and we would get better results for the money expended and promote the true and best interests of labour.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely gratified to know that the member from North Toronto (Mr. Church) is here to deal with these questions in his usual way, and I am particularly gratified to note that he appears to be in the same state of mind and body that I have known him to be for many years in dealing with any such question as the one he has undertaken to analyze during the last few minutes. I regard it as a special honour for a young minister to have had so much attention paid to him as has been bestowed on me by the hon. member for North Toronto. But in disregard of all the views expressed by my hon. friend, I will undertake to proceed with a consistent and business-like analysis of these Estimates that are being submitted to you, and to show you wherein such increases appear to be necessary on the basis of the amounts that were regarded as necessary by the present Opposition, when it was the government last year. If, as stated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), this Labour department is a paper organization, and unnecessary, as I understood him to intimate, he might surely, for the protection of the reputation of his party, have kept that fact a secret for at least a little while longer, because I want to inform the hon. gentleman, what he was not here to receive a short time ago, namely that when I took hold of this department, there were in it 147 employees, 42 of whom were temporary and we now propose to make twelve of those temporary employees permanent, who will perform largely the same duties as they have been performing, and to discontinue, so far as possible, the services of the other temporary employees. I am sure, too, that the labouring men in Toronto, in whom my

hon. friend has expressed, in years gone by under certain conditions, such an earnest interest, will be highly edified, on reading Hansard or the papers, if they take the trouble to quote the hon. gentleman, to learn that his estimate of the Labour department and its functions during the present and the past government, is that it is useless, of no effect and no good, a paper organization. My experience has been that the labouring men in Toronto and elsewhere have, at times held the view that sufficient consideration has not been given to the aims, claims and rights of labour, and that there should be rather a broadening than a contraction of the efforts of the Labour department. But we, tonight, have had the honour of listening to the advice of the hon. member for North Toronto, who intimates that there is nothing to that department; that it should all be wiped out. I am sure the labouring men of Toronto will be very much edified to hear of the latest stunt of the hon. member for North Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would surely never do to check the minister in his statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was just referring to the fact that it would never do to interrupt the minister in order to pass this resolution, and I was called to order.

Mr. MURDOCK: We then come to the senior statistical clerks, of whom there were six last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister not missed the Publicity Assistant?

Mr. MURDOCK: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I have.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Will the minister be good enough to tell the commiteee what are the duties of the publicity agent proper, before we take up the question of his assistant?

Mr. MURDOCK: The publicity agent, I am told, draws what many hon. members may have seen at times, charts indicating the fluctuations as between supply and demand in the labour market in Canada, for the information of those who are interested in such matters. He also draws such charts and gives such publicity to the charts and to other information as would appear advisable to assist in equalizing, so far as possible, employment throughout this Dominion.

Mr. BOYS: Does he draft the political chart too?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think not.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend evidently lost his.

Mr. MURDOCK: I might say to my hon. friend that, if he was drawing political charts, he would show to-morrow morning a largely rising margin as regards majorities. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) asked me about the publicity assistant. I am told that is just a classification which the Civil Service Commission have given to this clerk, classifying and specifying the work and defining the duties.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Is his work defined as assistant to the publicity agent proper?

Mr. MURDOCK: I was speaking about the publicity agent.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I thought you were speaking about the publicity assistant?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member is right.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The reason I asked the minister the question was that I noted by the Estimates that the publicity agent is apparently a new officer this year. I thought it would be fair to inquire if the work had doubled.

Mr. MURDOCK: The work has not changed whatsoever; but the Civil Service Commission have defined the duties, and have classified the position as publicity assistant.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): How was he classified last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told that the position was classified heretofore as a senior clerk, although the clerk was performing the duties now being performed and which it is proposed shall continue.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): What is his name?

Mr. MURDOCK: M. K. Roughsedge. The next is an additional senior statistical clerk whom we are asking shall be provided for on a permanent basis. He has been

performing the duties during the past fiscal year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a promotion.

Mr. MURDOCK: It is a promotion on the permanent classification. The next item is for 14 statistical clerks instead of 13, an addition of one, and then the increase in salary for the other clerks. Next is 14 clerk stenographers instead of 11. Two of them have been there during the entire past fiscal year on a temporary basis and on certificate; the third additional clerk is a temporary employee being promoted on a permanent basis. Then we are asking for five office appliance operators instead of four. In this instance we are again asking to have placed on a permanent basis an employee who has been carried throughout the past fiscal year as a temporary employee.

Mr. STEVENS: What are the duties of the office appliance operators?

Mr. MURDOCK: Notwithstanding the length of time which the member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) credits me with having been in the Labour department—almost three months—I have not had the opportunity, which I should like to have and which I hope I shall have, to investigate fully the working of the various branches of the department. I have, however, seen some of the office appliances that are used, and I should be glad indeed if any hon. gentleman would visit the Labour department and inspect the appliances that are used for the purpose of tabulating promptly and accurately certain results that are required from time to time to indicate the unemployment condition throughout Canada as well as many other matters upon which it is desired to secure absolutely accurate and reliable figures that cannot be controverted or disputed.

Mr. STEVENS: Are these employees operators of tabulating machines?

Mr. MURDOCK: Tabulating, mimeographing, multigraphing and some other larger machines. We have in particular in the department one machine which we cannot buy. I understand that we pay a rental of $100 a month for it, that being the only basis on which we can secure it. My predecessor thought that it was worth the money many times over and I have no reason to dispute his opinion in this regard. In the next item we ask for two additional junior clerk stenographers, who we feel are needed. These two additional clerk stenographers have been employed during the past year on a temporary basis, and it would appear to be consistent to come into the open and classify them on a permanent basis if they are to continue in the department. And that is what we are asking to do. My hon. friends will agree that that covers the additional increases in the permanent staff of the Labour department. I again call attention to the fact that there are about 30 temporary employees who were there when I came to the department and who are not provided for in these civil government estimates that are being considered. I do not know whether they can all be entirely dispensed with or not, but if they can, I assure hon. members, and especially the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) that they will be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What saving does the minister expect to make in getting rid of the thirty employees?

Mr. MURDOCK: In regard to such of them as we find it possible or necessary, through lack of funds, to dispense with, the saving would, of course, be in their salaries, whatever they might be. Most of them would no doubt be employees with lower grade salaries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I understood that my hon. friend was making some real economies in connection with the Outside Service. He is now contemplating dispensing with thirty. I should like to know what salaries these thirty are getting and what saving the minister expects to effect in connection with them. I fear that the minister is perhaps holding back a little bit. He is not quite sure that he can dispense with any of them.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend would like to go over the entire list of forty-two temporary employees I could tell him what they are getting.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would be too much. It would not be fair to the minister, and I want to be fair to him. Let him give us what the thirty are getting.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend need not concern himself about being fair to me; the hon. member for North Toronto will look after that.

Mr. CHURCH: Why are there 117 officials as against 106 last year? I see that

there are planning clerks, filing clerks, and so forth. What are the duties of these various clerks?

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend will clearly state what information he desires I shall try to give it.

Mr. CHURCH: If the minister will give the information it will help him in putting through his estimates. I see there are planning clerks. . What do these men do? Do they plan election campaigns? Then I see there are filing clerks. What are their duties? Do they file the minister's speeches?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from North Toronto reminds me, in spite of myself, of the reply of the thief on the cross. I might call his attention to the fact that we have not yet got to the Estimates which he a moment ago was so interested in inquiring about; we have only been considering so far the Estimates of the Labour department. But we were not going fast enough for the impatient criticisms of my hon. friend; he must get ahead of the wagon and take up the Printing Bureau Estimates before we come to them, starting in with some of his characteristic criticisms.

Mr. STEVENS: We have been treated I think with a very plain and very patient explanation by the minister, Mr. Chairman, but with all due deference to him I must insist on bringing him back to the point where I had him very successfully a while ago. He very kindly gave me the positions of four of the twelve employees I asked him about. Really there are sixteen included in this list. He has not given me the other seven permanent and five temporary employees outside of Ottawa. While referring to that I wish to make another observation. We have in his statement a reduction of thirty employees. If that reduction is real, I wish frankly to congratulate him, because it is a step in the right direction. But with a reduction of thirty employees, which, to use his own expression, he has asserted with characteristic emphasis, we find an increase in the amount asked for of a little over $23,000. I want my hon. friend to get my point, because this is really the value of his economy, if there is any economy in it at all. Thirty less employees. Very good. But surely we do not need $23,000 more to pay for the remaining 117?

Mr. MURDOCK: I thought I went over the eleven additional positions which we are making permanent, but which heretofore have been temporary.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps I have not made myself clear. A few minutes ago my hon. friend told me there were eleven of these employees outside of Ottawa. He explained to me four of them very satisfactorily. Now I should like to have an explanation regarding the balance, and also regarding the increased amount.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend must have misunderstood me. We have eleven permanent employees outside of Ottawa and only five temporary employees.

Mr. STEVENS: Where are they employed?

Mr. MURDOCK: One fair wages officer in Vancouver with a temporary stenographer; another fair wages officer at Calgary; another at Toronto, and a stenographer; in Montreal a fair wage investigator, a permanent employee; in Winnipeg we have a superintendent of the western provinces for the employment service, with two statistical clerks and one clerk stenographer.

Mr. STEVENS: Are they temporary or permanent?

Mr. MURDOCK: The clerk stenographer is temporary. There are two temporary junior clerk stenographers. In Halifax we have a clearance officer on a permanent basis, also a clerk stenographer with him on the same basis.

Mr. STEVENS: That accounts for seven permanent and five temporary employees. There are eleven permanent employees in this vote.

Mr. MURDOCK: One of them is not on a permanent basis but on the basis of $15 a day when required, as I stated; and another is a fair wage officer transferred to the Labour department on February 4, 1921, and on a temporary basis heretofore. Does that give my hon. friend the information that he requires about the eleven?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes. I am sorry it has given my hon. friend so much trouble; I had no idea it would do so. Now will he explain the discrepancy in the additional amount for the reduced staff?

Mr. MURDOCK: Under the present regulations of the Civil Service Commission it is necessary to provide for payments in respect of positions resulting from promotions or changes in duties before the positions are actually created by Council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But you need not create them.

Mr. CHURCH: If the Minister requires 148 officers to solve labour problems of the country, how many would he require to solve the high cost of living problem about which he talked so much during the election and has referred to so often since he became minister?

Mr. FIELDING: If within a little time we might pass this item it would be worth while remaining; otherwise I suggest that we adhere to our wholesome but unwritten rule of adjourning at eleven o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Wednesday, March 29, 1922

The House met at three o'clock, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DUFF:

1. What is the total capital cost of all ships belonging to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine up to and including December 31, 1921?
2. How many ships are in commission?
3. What was the net loss on operation of said ships for the year 1921?
4. What amount is owing the Finance Department or Government of Canada for interest up to and including December 31, 1921?
5. What amount, if any, has been allowed for depreciation in value of said ships?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. $73,571,842.27.

2. 65.

3. $2,210,724.55, exclusive of depreciation and interest due Government.

4. 1920, $1,741,394.27; 1921, $3,357,-833.39. Figures computed at 5½ per cent on a total capital cost.

5. In statements prior to 1921, $815,-841.32. For the year 1921, at 4 per cent, $2,342,932.19, a total of $3,158,775.51.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain):

1. How many vessels of the Government's Mercantile Marine are now being operated?
2. What is the average cost per day to the Government of vessels when not operated?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. 48.

2. 2,800-ton type costs, $163.12; 3,400-3,950-ton type, $226.38; 4,400-ton type, $274.23; 5,100-ton type, $296.08; 8,100-ton type, $422.72; 10,500-ton type, $572.87. All these figures include watchmen's wages, insurance, interest and depreciation. Two passenger boats on West Indies trade, the Fisher and the Forester, cost $399.56.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Criminal Law so as to permit judges of the various criminal courts of the Dominion to send juvenile delinquents to special farms or schools of agriculture or other such institutions instead of sending them to penitentiary?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN: The intentions of the Government will be disclosed when legislation to amend the Criminal Code is introduced.

MONUMENTS, HISTORIC SITES

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Have tenders been called for the placing of monuments upon historic sites? If so, by what department or body in connection with the Government?
2. Do the tenders call for monuments made of concrete?
3. Were tenders for these monuments advertised in any way in the province of New Brunswick? If so, how?
4. Have tenders been awarded? If so, to whom and at what prices?
5. Has any consideration been given to the advisability of using granite instead of concrete?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. No tenders have been asked for by the Canadian National Parks Branch, Department of the Interior, for the placing of monuments on historic sites, but tenders have been called for the purpose of getting prices on a suggested monument.

2. Yes.

3. No. Tenders were called from firms in Central Canada for the approximate number of monuments required there, the results obtained to serve as a guide in the purchase of monuments for more remote points and in regard to the material to be used in such monuments.

4. No.

5. Yes.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

Mr. FORKE:

1. What is the total amount loaned by the Government to soldier settlers, through the Soldier Settlement Board?

2. What amount is at present outstanding in this connection?

3. What percentage of the payments due on 1921 accounts were paid by December 31 last, in each of the provinces, by soldier settlers who had received loans from the said Board?

4. What amount was due in each of the provinces on December 31, 1921?

5. What amount was actually paid in each of the provinces up to December 31, 1921?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. $86,958,220 (To February 28, 1922)

2.

Principal	$77,389,170 22
Interest	2,575,849 66
Total	$79,965,019 88*

*(To February 28, 1922)

3.

British Columbia	21.4 per cent
Alberta	12.3 "
Saskatchewan	20.2 "
Manitoba	15.0 "
Ontario	43.7 "
Quebec	15.5 "
New Brunswick	24.2 "
Nova Scotia	34.6 "
Prince Edward Is.	42.1 "

4.

British Columbia	$ 794,152 83
Alberta	1,712,794 44
Saskatchewan	1,257,467 38
Manitoba	921,233 87
Ontario	357,744 69
Quebec	137,301 83
New Brunswick	113,718 87
Nova Scotia	84,692 64
Prince Edward Island	51,146 64
Total	$5,430,252 96

5.

British Columbia	$170,227 26
Alberta	209,561 30
Saskatchewan	253,748 53
Manitoba	138,126 44
Ontario	156,422 21
Quebec	21,354 96
New Brunswick	27,514 20
Nova Scotia	29,336 27
Prince Edward Island	21,515 44
Total	$1,027,806 61

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What where the total gross receipts from Customs for the years 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922 up to date, for the following places: Toronto, Quebec, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Hamilton?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a Custom House in Toronto this year?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1.

	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19
Toronto	$30,092,168 22	$28,577,316 16	$29,822,946 16
Quebec	2,403,067 44	1,912,201 29	1,955,300 64
Montreal	34,685,954 83	36,206,928 08	36,457,836 76
Winnipeg	9,464,629 91	11,013,374 65	10,009,204 92
Vancouver	6,261,450 40	7,509,268 35	8,645,196 86
Hamilton	5,724,042 93	6,445,492 99	6,726,071 57

	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22 (11 months)
Toronto	$38,385,212 32	$35,183,243 02	$21,776,983 68
Quebec	2,610,611 15	4,293,004 32	1,985,942 87
Montreal	47,798,250 16	46,990,948 25	27,405,886 27
Winnipeg	11,538,219 51	10,771,432 33	5,679,142 11
Vancouver	9,140,617 38	9,484,496 45	8,977,750 12
Hamilton	5,874,673 32	6,293,897 10	3,080,330 53

2. When expenditure on new works can be resumed, the matter will be considered.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

*Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Is it the intention of the Government during this session to amend the Dominion Elections Act?

2. If so, will proposed amendments be presented to the House in time for due consideration?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. It is intended to amend the Dominion Elections Act, and no doubt amendments to the Act will be presented during the present session.

2. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The answer to the first question was not such as to indicate whether the Government would introduce amendments or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is probable that the Government will introduce some amendments.

HAMILTON-QUEENSTON HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAPLIN:

1. When was the Hamilton and Queenston Highway taken over by the province of Ontario as a Provincial Highway?
2. What was the estimated cost of this highway?
3. What has been the cost to date?
4. What proportion of the cost is chargeable against the different municipalities through which the road passes?
5. What proportion is chargeable against the city of St. Catharines?
6. How much has been paid on account of the construction of this highway out of the Federal grant?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. This department has no information as to the exact date.

2. The estimated cost given in the project statement to the department, for agreement under the Canada Highways Act, was $613,750, for water-bound macadam construction. The cost of laying a bituminous macadam and cement concrete surface on portions of this highway is estimated at $700,521.50 additional, or a total estimated cost of $1,314,271.50.

3. The cost for purposes of aid under the Canada Highways Act as audited to December 31, 1921, was $1,121,661.54.

4. Forty per centum of the actual necessary and reasonable cost as determined under the provisions of the Canada Highways Act is paid by the Dominion to the province. The balance of the total cost is adjusted under provincial acts, as between the province and the municipalities affected.

5. This is a matter between the province and the municipality.

6. $206,132.20.

RAILWAY FINANCES

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry):

What sums have been advanced, or what is the amount of loans guaranteed to the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific, since the time that such loans or advances were authorized during the last session of Parliament?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

Canadian Northern:

Sums advanced	$34,035,553.72
Bonds guaranteed	25,000,000.00

Grand Trunk Railway:

Sums advanced	$36,200,857.03
Bonds guaranteed	25,000,000.00

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway:

Sums advanced (to Receiver)	$ 4,651,341.88
Loans guaranteed	nil
Guaranteed interest paid by Dominion	2,138,335.46

Above as of March 25, 1922.

MESSRS. HANNA and MITCHELL--SALARIES

Mr. TURGEON:

1. What was the amount paid in 1921 to D. B. Hanna for his services as President or in any other capacity in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway Company?
2. What was the amount paid to A. J. Mitchell in 1921 for his services in different capacities in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway Company?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Salary, $35,000; director's fees, $2,000; total, $37,000.

2. Salary, $20,000; director's fees, $2,000; total, $22,000.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY—INSURANCE

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What amount of insurance is carried on the property of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway Company?
2. When was it placed?
3. With what companies was it placed, and in what amounts?
4. Who were the brokers through whom it was placed?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. As to Canadian Northern Railway Company: $112,590,338.

As to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company: $22,822,720.00; effective under General Fire Schedule at February 9, 1922.

As to Canadian Government Railways: No insurance is carried on former Canadian Government railway lines such as the Intercolonial and, latterly, the Transcontinental.

2. As to Canadian Northern Railway Company: December 1, 1919, and additions made since to Schedule of Insurance.

As to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company: February 9, 1921, for a term of one year, continued on basis of pro rata additional premiums until December 1, 1922, when General Schedule of Canadian Northern railway will also expire.

3. As to Canadian Northern Railway Company: Western Assurance Company of Canada.

As to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company: Union Assurance Society of London,

England, 20 per cent; Cornhill Insurance Co., 37 per cent; Lloyd's of London, 43 per cent.

4. As to Canadian Northern Railway Company: The Toronto Insurance and Vessel Agency.

As to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company: Hare & MacKenzie, Ltd., Montreal.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE

Mr. BROWN:

1. Who are the leaseholders of the hay lands on the Dominion Government Lands known as the St. Peter's Indian reserve?
2. When do these leases expire?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to renew said leases?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Messrs. Charles Bird, Jacob Jonasson, Rufus S. Benson, Stephen S. Benson and Rufus Henrickson.
2. May 1, 1923.
3. No.

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE

Mr. GOULD:

1. Are there any indications of the return of grasshopper plague in the western provinces this year?
2. If so, in what sections?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to continue research work with a view to finding means to counteract the damage caused by (a) grasshoppers; (b) wheat stem saw fly; (c) rust; and (d) cut worm?
4. Will experiments with chlorine gas be continued as a means of destroying insects injurious to agriculture and to trees?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.
2. In Manitoba from evidence at hand, we anticipate that grasshoppers will be less in evidence than they were during 1921. In Saskatchewan a further outbreak is expected but the chief outbreak will apparently be in Alberta, in which province there was a heavy egg deposition in 1921, which it is expected will result in an important infestation of hoppers in 1922, particularly in the sections immediately north of the main line of the Canadian Northern railway.
3. Yes.
4. No. Previous experiments with chlorine gas indicated that this remedy is too expensive.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the present bonus to civil servants?
2. If not, what reduction will be made, and for what reason?

[Mr. W. C. Kennedy.]

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The matter of continuing the bonus to civil servants is under consideration at the present time.

CANADA WHEAT BOARD

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw):

1. Has the Canada Wheat Board been discontinued?
2. If not, what is the present status of the said Wheat Board?
3. Have any funds of the said board been transferred to the Federal Government?
4. If so, what was the amount?
5. Was the transfer of such funds accompanied by any recommendation as to their use?
6. If so, what were the recommendations, and what action has been taken or is proposed by the Government, to carry out the recommendations referred to?
7. Was the total cost of operating the Canada Wheat Board borne by the grain passing through its hands?
8. If not, what was the actual cost to the Government?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.
4. $560,000.
5. Yes.
6. The Canada Wheat Board recommended that the above amount be distributed to the provincial governments pro rata on the basis of the quantity of wheat delivered by producers in each of the said provinces to the board, such moneys to be used for the immediate relief of distressed farmers in the various provinces. So far the Government has not yet decided on the action to be taken in regard to this recommendation.
7. Yes.
8. Answered by No. 7.

QUESTION STANDING AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. LANCTOT:

What amount of money has been paid to the Right Honourable C. J. Doherty since the 11th of May, 1855 (*a*) As judge; (*b*) As retired judge; (*c*) For transportation and other expenses while serving as judge; (*d*) For indemnity while a member of the House of Commons; (*e*) Travelling and other expenses while acting as member of Parliament; (*f*) As a Minister of the Crown; (*g*) As travelling and other expenses while acting as a Minister of the Crown; (*h*) As travelling and other expenses during his official missions in Europe and the United States; (*i*) As counsel on the boundary arbitration proceedings between Canada and Newfoundland on the Labrador Coast; and (*j*) As lawyer and counsel in any other cases given to him by the Canadian Government?

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN OF ALIEN BIRTH

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that subsection two of section twenty-nine of the Dominion Elections Act be struck from the Act in its entirety.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution, in its purpose, is identical with an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act of 1920, offered by myself in the session of 1920 and again offered in the session of last year. The aim of the amendment, as of the resolution to-day was to prevent the disfranchisement of many thousands of Canadian citizens. On the former occasions, the amendments failed; the government of the day voted them down. And yet they did not fail entirely, because in the session of 1920, after we who are now on this side had pointed out the injustice in connection with the bill as drafted, the Government, recognizing that we were right in part at least, itself brought down an amendment which corrected the wrong in some degree. My resolution proposes to remove the injustice entirely. In 1921 I brought the matter up again in the House, and once more after a year's thought, and reflection, and meditation, on the part of the Government, the latter decided that full justice had not been done, and while my amendment was again voted down, a supporter of the Government brought in another amendment which was carried. I commented at the time on the fact that the then government seemed to be under the impression that justice ought to be done on the instalment plan, and declared my intention to come to Parliament again in the session of 1922 for the final instalment. I did not anticipate that I should present the amendment to a Liberal Government, because we had been assured by the right hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), as well as by some of his supporters, that we should have no election in 1921. I am not at all disappointed in being able now to present my amendment to a Government which, I hope, will give it a more sympathetic reception than it obtained from those who are now sitting "angularly opposite".

This matter was debated at a very great length in the sessions of 1920 and 1921, and for that reason I do not propose to go into it fully again; but because many members of the present Parliament were not in this House in the previous Parliament, I shall as briefly as possible again review the facts in connection with my resolution, for their information, and for the purpose of refreshing the memories of those gentlemen who were members of the House when I brought the matter up before. In the session of 1920, the then Acting Solicitor-General, who is member for South Wellington in this House, (Mr. Guthrie), introduced what is known as the Dominion Elections Act. In introducing the bill he made what I think was conceded by all of us to be a most excellent speech. What appealed to us particularly was his statement that the franchise under that act would rest primarily and largely on the fact that men and women were British subjects, and that from that citizenship would flow the right to exercise the vote. That was in striking contrast with the provisions of the War-time Elections Act, in which only certain women were given the franchise; and I for one was pleased when I heard the minister of that day state that in future there should be no unfair discrimination as to the franchise of Canadian women. We assumed, therefore, that the franchise would be based on Canadian citizenship.

But when the printed bill was placed before the House we found in it a clause which entirely debarred thousands of Canadian citizens from the vote. As the bill then stood it was utterly impossible for probably 100,000 citizens of Canada to exercise the franchise, and it left many others under a heavy disability before they were in a position to vote. That fact was drawn to the attention of the Government, and while there was a disposition, I believe, on the part of some of our political friends to think that the clause had been inserted with the intention of depriving certain Canadian women of their franchise, I have not taken that attitude. At any rate, the Government declared, through the ex-Prime Minister, that this was an error on its part, and an amendment was introduced which partially remedied the evil.

Now, that clause of the act, in my opinion, still in practice, disfranchises many thousands of people. It is to be found in section 29. The section first recites the general qualifications of a voter. It states that the franchise rests with British subjects who are so by birth or naturalization. They must have resided in Canada for at least twelve months, and two months in the constituency in which they are to vote. These are the general provisions; and then the following clause appears, to which I

would ask the careful attention of hon. members:

For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person, shall be deemed incapable of being changed, or of having been changed, merely by reason or in consequence of marriage or change of allegiance or naturalization of any other person, or otherwise than by personal naturalization of such first mentioned person. Provided, however.—

I would call the attention of the House to this most peculiar provision.

Provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply to any person born on the Continent of North America, nor to any person who in person applies to and obtains from any judge having jurisdiction in naturalization proceedings, a certificate under the hand of such judge and the seal, if any, of his court, to the effect following:

I am not going to read the certificate, but in effect it is this, that the judge shall certify that the person who makes application for the certificate has proven to him that he or she is qualified for personal naturalization. He then grants a voting certificate, which must not be confused with the naturalization certificate. The person who makes application is already legally naturalized, but in order to obtain the right to vote she must obtain a voting certificate before her name can be placed on the list. Perhaps this is not very clear to many members, and in order that the significance of that clause may be fully grasped, it is necessary to refer to the provisions of the Naturalization Act itself. Under the naturalization law there is one outstanding feature that applies to my resolution, and it is this: The wife of a British subject is herself a British subject; in other words, if a woman of foreign birth marries a man who is a British subject, she herself immediately becomes a British subject. If her husband is also of foreign birth and he becomes naturalized, she at the same time automatically becomes naturalized. Moreover, the minor children of such a man become naturalized with him. It follows then that foreign-born women married to foreign-born men who are legally naturalized are just as truly and legally Canadian citizens as are their foreign-born husbands.

Now, if the right to the franchise is based on citizenship, my contention is that the woman who is naturalized legally should have the right to vote just as unrestrictedly as her husband, who also is foreign-born. I stated a moment ago that the bill as originally drafted disfranchised something like 100,000 British subjects who happened to be born in what are sometimes called the Central Empires —Germany and Austria-Hungary. I am not making any particular reference to that except to say that under this clause which I am now discussing even if those women did go to a judge to obtain voting certificates—and, remember, they were British subjects—the judge could not grant them such certificates, for the simple reason that they were not qualified for naturalization, the Naturalization Act at that time absolutely forbidding the naturalization of persons who originally came from the countries with which we were at war. In justice to the then government it must be said that they disclaimed all intention of giving the law that effect, and they brought in an amendment placing those foreign-born women on exactly the same plane as other foreign-born women, making it necessary for them, however, as for others, to obtain this voting certificate before they could vote, although, as I say, they were naturalized British subjects.

The government of the day amended the Dominion Elections Act in the session of 1920. The matter remained in that position until the following session of 1921, when, believing that it was not yet properly settled, I brought it up again in Committee of the Whole and proposed an amendment similar to this one, but it was voted down, and again I proposed it on the third reading of the bill, with the same result. But mark this, the government of the day admitted again that there was an injustice there, and a second time they brought down an amendment that to some extent removed the disability.

But what the House will be particularly interested in now, after hearing that perhaps as a bit of history, is as to the actual present status of foreign-born women in Canada who are legally naturalized. This is the effect of the law: That married women in Canada, if of foreign birth and naturalized as the result of being the wives of British subjects must, before they can vote, apply to a judge for a voting certificate, although they are legally and actually Canadian citizens. I must qualify that statement; there are three exceptions, one most peculiar. The first is that all women who voted in the elections of 1917 are not subject to this peculiar provision, making it necessary for them to secure a voting certificate; then, again, men and women who became naturalized as boys and girls

through the naturalization of the father need not secure the voting certificate; finally, women who were born on the continent of North America are not put to the same necessity.

Now you have the peculiar condition, in connection with the last proviso, that the woman who is born, we will say, in the West Indies—and she may be an uneducated negress—or a person who comes from Mexico or any other part of North America, is given the franchise without restriction if she is married to a British subject; whereas if a woman comes from France, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Germany, Austria, Belgium or any other country than North America, she is obliged to go to a judge to obtain this voting certificate. I say that is an unfair distinction, and I have never to this day heard any justification whatever from members of the former government as to why that provision was drafted.

It has been said in previous debates that these women who are naturalized should not complain of the necessity for appearing before a judge and showing that they are proper persons for naturalization. Well, it means that they are at once placed in a separate and distinct class, and there at once attaches to them at least some doubt as to whether they are as worthy to vote as are their husbands, who also were born in a foreign country and who are not in any way any more Canadian citizens than are their wives. It obliges them to take three distinct steps before they can cast their ballots. In the first place, they must go to the judge, and that may necessitate, as it often does in Western Canada, a journey of perhaps one hundred miles or more, and the judge may after all refuse them a voting certificate; then it necessitates their seeing to it that their names are placed on the voters' list; and, finally, they must go to the poll to deposit their ballots, as of course everyone else must also.

Then there is the natural feeling of pride which rebels at the unnecessary restriction. I know in my own riding women who have lived in this country for thirty, forty and even fifty years, women who are good Canadian citizens, and they resent the necessity of appearing before a judge and showing cause why he should issue to them voting certificates. As a matter of fact they do not go before him, and I am of the opinion—and probably other members can speak with just as full knowledge—that of the women affected by this clause perhaps 75 to 80 per cent are thus virtually disfranchised.

We have both Dominion and provincial laws which do not perhaps in all cases meet with the approval of our citizens, but I do not think we have on our statute book any laws which conflict so directly one with the other as does this particular clause with the Naturalization Act. Our Naturalization Act provides distinctly that the wife of a British subject is herself a British subject; but this clause in the Election Act states that the wife of a British subject is not a British subject when it comes to voting.

Those two laws are absolutely irreconcilable, and if they are irreconcilable, the illogical one ought to give way. If my resolution is accepted that is what will happen, and the franchise will be universal to all Canadian women without restriction, the same as it is to men. We are now in the position of the Indian giver; he gives only in the expectation that it shall be returned to him again. The Naturalization Act gives to these women citizenship and the Dominion Elections Act takes it away. I leave it to the sense of justice of hon. members whether the franchise itself is not the first privilege or right that ought to flow out of citizenship. It is upon that ground that I base my claim that there should be no restrictions whatever placed in the way of a British subject, other than the ordinary restrictions that apply to male citizens, and that they should be given the franchise as a natural result flowing out of the fact of their citizenship. I say, Sir, there is only one proper remedy for that: let us adopt the principle that citizenship in itself confers the franchise. It is the only solution. Why should not a foreign-born woman, legally a Canadian citizen, as unrestrictedly have the right to vote as the foreign-born man, her husband, who is also a Canadian citizen? I have never heard any satisfactory reply to that question. Let us accept finally and frankly the logical consequences of our action in conferring upon women the privileges of naturalization. Now that women have the franchise, there should be no discrimination between foreign-born citizens of this country and the wives of those citizens, who are just as fairly and just as legally Canadian citizens as are their husbands. Let us bestow the franchise as freely as

we bestowed citizenship, whether upon men or upon women.

That, Sir, is the intent of my resolution. I hope that it may have the support of my friends on this side of the House. I believe it will have the support of the Progressive members; I know it will of some of them. I hope that the leader of the official Opposition will see his way clear to assist now in granting that final instalment of justice to women—a right that should never have been withheld.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has been very consistent during the past three sessions of Parliament and very assiduous in pressing upon the House the view which he has just expressed. I have no objection to offer to the manner in which he has presented the question historically upon the present occasion. It is just possible that the reasons which existed two or three years ago were more pointed in those days in support of legislation such as that mentioned by my hon. friend and such as that to be found in section 29 of the Dominion Elections Act, than they are to-day. But I submit that when the act was passed in 1920 there was real, substantial ground for the enactment. The object of that section of the statute was to place the male voter and the female voter upon the same plane and to surround each with the same conditions in respect to the franchise. The naturalized male subject was entitled under the Franchise Act to vote, but before being naturalized he had to meet the requirements of our naturalization law. Under the Naturalization Act, a woman married to a naturalized British subject became by operation of law a British subject, but no examination was required of her. There was a discrimination, apparently, as between the male and female voter at that time, and the object was to surround the right to use the Canadian franchise with every reasonable precaution. We had done so in regard to men who became naturalized, and we desired to do the same thing in regard to female voters.

My hon. friend, I think, confounds two entirely different things, namely, citizenship on the one hand, and the right to exercise the franchise on the other. There are thousands—yes, tens of thousands—of British subjects in this country who cannot vote. The judges of our country cannot vote. There are a number of requirements in addition to British citizenship which must be fulfilled in order that a man may be entitled to vote. The fact that a man is a British subject does not necessarily confer on him a vote. Until recently, indeed a property qualification was necessary in some of our provinces. I do not know that it is necessary now, but the mere fact that a man is a British subject has never been taken as tantamount to saying he is a voter. We in our wisdom in this Parliament did say that the chief qualification in regard to the franchise should be British citizenship. In 1920, when this law was enacted, there is no doubt that there was considerable unrest in Canada; various sets of opinion prevailed throughout the country. With regard to male voters who were not British subjects by birth, we had insisted on safeguards before they attained naturalization; we did not so insist in regard to women voters. When section 29 was placed in our election law it was merely an attempt on the part of Parliament to safeguard the right to the franchise in the case of women just as we had done in the case of men.

Now, we did make exceptions. We made an exception in regard to women who were born on the North American continent. Was not that a reasonable exception? The woman of the United States who became the wife of a Canadian citizen, should not, I think—on a superficial glance at the case, at all events—have been required to undergo the same critical examination as that applying to women coming from, say, Central Europe. Living conditions in the United States; the mode of government in the United States; the practice and enforcement of law in that country, and the language of its citizens—these are all similar to what we enjoy in this country. A woman born and living in the United States until her marriage would be brought up under conditions almost identical with those which a woman would enjoy in Canada. She would be presumed to know the institutions of this country as she would know those of her own. But not so with the citizens of Central Europe; many of them knew nothing of Canada, of our laws, of our language, or of our institutions. A man, in order to gain naturalization, had to appear before a judge and be able to pass a fairly critical examination, but the woman from Central Europe could marry the naturalized British subject and, without any examination or the imposition of any conditions whatever, would become a British subject and be entitled to vote merely by reason of her marriage, simply by operation of law. It was to guard against that condition of affairs that section 29 was placed in the statute of 1920.

It was pointed out in the following session that a difficulty would arise in the case of women who had voted previously in the Dominion of Canada and that a number of them might be deprived of the franchise in the ensuing general election. As soon as that was brought to the attention of Parliament at the last session, the difficulty was remedied, as the member for North Waterloo has pointed out. But the reason for the legislation is the reason which I have sought to give to the House. As another year has now elapsed, there may not be quite as much reason for this restriction as there was two or three years ago. It may be that as time goes on there will be less reason for it. But in my humble judgment the restriction then adopted was a reasonable and proper one, and it met with the approval of the House of Commons at that time.

Now, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) intimated to the House this afternoon that the Government will in all probability bring down during the present session some amendments to the Elections Act. I have no doubt that at every session for a number of years it will be found expedient to amend that act, and I would like to see what amendments the Government proposes before definitely passing on a motion such as the one we have before us at the present time. I cannot say that I have any very strong opinion upon this question myself, but others may differ from me. I do not believe that the law in its working out created any injustice to any considerable portion of the foreign-born women. I know that it has been charged that in some places it was difficult to obtain certificates, but I think that any woman with any reasonable degree of effort could in the long time which intervened before the general election have obtained a certificate entitling her to vote if she so desired. The law was passed in 1920, and amended in 1921, and the election was held on the 6th of December last, so there were months and months and months during which the certificates might have been obtained from any judge having jurisdiction in the Dominion of Canada. I do not think any great injury arose by reason of the enactment. However, as I say, it is a fair matter for consideration now, and I think my hon. friend from North Waterloo might well consider letting his motion stand until we see just what amendments the Government proposes to bring down in regard to this question. Personally, I have no very strong opinion about it.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, if I were of a vindictive disposition I would be willing to concur in the view expressed by the former Solicitor-General (Mr. Guthrie) and allow the law as it stands at present to remain on the statute books until another general election. But in view of the fact that I come of a race which likes to practise charity to all, I think it is only just, now that we are placed in the seats of the mighty, that we should try to even up matters and give those gentlemen opposite a reasonable run for their money when the next general election takes place.

I want to tell my friends on the opposite side that if I received a majority of something like seven or eight thousand in my division in the last election, it was largely due to this section 29 of the Elections Act which is now up for discussion. I had in my division something like five or six thousand foreign-born women. It was expected by the government that a large number of them would be prohibited from voting under this peculiar section 29, but I saw to it that every one of them was naturalized, and I venture to say that ninety-nine out of every hundred who were naturalized voted against the government which put upon the statute books this miserable and nefarious section. It is only natural that it should be so. I do not mind admitting frankly here that I sedulously circulated the fact that the reason why these women were standing in queues of thirty and forty and fifty in front of the judge's room, and in front of the court house before it was opened, in below zero weather, was that the government insisted that they should be put upon a plane different from that of their sisters born in Mexico, Guatemala, Hayti, Honduras and other portions of Central America.

The former Solicitor General tells us that the reasons at present are not so pointed as they were in 1920 when this law was put upon the statute books. I agree with him that the reasons are not so pointed now. Before 1920, when the reasons were pointed, these gentlemen were obliged within a very few months of that time to take the political jump, and that is the reason why they proposed by this act to disfranchise a large number of the people whom they thought and rightly so were going to vote against them. But even if this law had not been put into force, I believe these women would have voted against the government for their other sins of omission and commission during their four or five years of power.

I must congratulate the former Solicitor General upon his consistency. He took the ground some years ago that the amendment we proposed was inimical to the interests of the country, and he still thinks that, although he believes the reasons are not now as pointed as they were then. He has suffered a great deal within the past few months, and one would imagine that suffering and tribulation would cause him to think of the sins he committed in the past, but like the person about whom the poet wrote his "head is bloody, but unbowed". He is very much like the ancient Bourbon dynasty, who never learnt and never forgot. I think we ought to be under a debt of gratitude to the Government for having acquired for us this very large body of women voters in December, 1921. It has been said, and I agree with the statement, that "the female of the species is more deadly than the male." The government learnt that to their sorrow on the 6th of December last. When this question came up in 1919 and 1920 my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and myself were voices in the wilderness in the matter of pleading for the enfranchisement of women, and I remember my good friend the ex-Solicitor General telling us that the reason why these foreign-born women were put on an inferior plane, and a plane different from that of women born on this continent, was because the standard of living and morality among women born in Europe was somewhat different from the standard on this continent. He tried to circulate the myth that these foreign-born women all came from alien-enemy countries, and I suppose that nine out of every ten people who read the newspapers were of the opinion that this section in the act was merely intended to prevent German and Austrian women from exercising the franchise. The public mind had not cooled off at that time to the extent it has now and the feeling was that perhaps such women should not be permitted to settle the fate of the government in power. My hon. friend should have created the impression that the law applied to every class of women born in Europe, to French women, Belgian women, Italian women, and people of that kind, all of whom showed what they were capable of doing during the war. Every foreign-born woman from Europe was disfranchised by this act for the reason given by the former Solicitor General, that their standard of living and morality was different from that of the women born on this continent. I want to say that standards of living and morality are not governed by the country in which a person lives, but by something entirely different, and when we took the ground that all women should have the right to vote if British subjects, that applied to every class and character of women, no matter from what country she hailed. If they were British subjects by the fact of their husband's naturalization, and had all the rights and privileges of British subjects as such, they ought to have had the right of voting, which is one of the most important and essential rights given to British subjects in this country. We now have fallen on more pleasant days; I think that even our friends among the official Opposition will soon look at things in a very different light from that which they do now —I hope they will at any rate. But whether they do or not, my hon. friend from North Waterloo and myself will still continue to agitate for the repeal of this obnoxious law; and even if a measure of that kind is introduced into this House and fails to obtain the necessary majority in the other Chamber we will continue until this right is obtained for these women no matter from what country they come.

I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) to note—it may be a matter of sorrow to him—that the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the old government, Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, owes his defeat very largely to the fact that this section of the law was engrafted on our Franchise Act. Mr. Ballantyne has publicly declared on many occasions that the women in the district in which he lived, the foreign born women, voted against him. How could he expect otherwise? One would almost have imagined that the late government wishing to rid themselves of the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries and throw him overboard—if I may so use the expression—just tacked on this provision in order that he might be left behind. I think I ought to state that perhaps there were other and sufficing reasons why he was left behind. Still it may be, as I say, of interest to the hon. gentleman to know that practically every woman of foreign birth in the St. Lawrence-St. George division—and there were about three thousand of them—voted en masse for the present member of that constituency (Mr. Marler) to show their detestation of the government which could stoop to such methods as the last government did in order to disfranchise them.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker: I think that what women really want to-day is perfect equality with men, and therefore if the striking out of section 29 of the Dominion Elections Act in its entirety does not confer upon women perfectly and entirely equal rights with men, then, I think, it is not going far enough. To me it would seem that if a woman were herself a naturalized Canadian it would not matter whom she married, or whether she was married at all, because she would still be permanently a Canadian, a naturalized Canadian. On the other hand, if she were not a naturalized Canadian herself, it would not matter whom she married, or whether she was married or not—she would not be a Canadian citizen. If that is not true then women must simply be deemed to be part of the goods and chattels of man—she is not an individual at all. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) say that women from the United States were much more eligible to become Canadians than women from Europe; I was not aware that the party to which he belongs was so friendly to the people of the United States.

I think that in the very few remarks I have made I have voiced the opinion of Canadian women. I think women just want to be individuals, as men are individuals—no more and no less. And so I would like to see that principle embodied in the law, rather than that a woman should be made a citizen by marriage to a man who was himself a citizen.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I shall not allow the taunts of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) to deter me from discussing this question in, I hope, a fair manner, and, as I have some aspiration also, in an illuminating way, I cannot say that his remarks have added anything to the understanding of anybody as to either the legislation itself, its origin, its purpose, or its effect. The only impression my hon. friend made on me was this: If such was the character of the discussion of a law he thought fit to offer this Parliament, what must have been the character of the representations he made regarding it before the electorate of his constituency. The hon. member says he was elected by the votes of five or six thousand of those whom he calls foreign women. Well, I can imagine five or six thousand women—perhaps not speaking either of the two languages of our country and recently come to the city of Montreal—getting a most remarkable view of the law of Canada if they had to sit at the feet of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier. I can imagine how prejudice would permeate his hearers just to the extent of his political activities.

4 p.m.

There is undoubtedly in the law as it stands to-day a distinction between British subjects in the matter of the conferring upon them of the franchise—of that there is no question at all. Pass the motion of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), bring in a bill and make it law, and there will still be a distinction between the rights to the franchise on the part of British subjects in this country, and a very great distinction and discrimination; and, I venture to say, this session will close without that discrimination being removed by hon. members opposite.

What is the discrimination we are treating of now? It is a discrimination which puts an additional burden on a certain class of women—on a class of women who have acquired naturalization by methods that have always been recognized, in this and every other country, as perfectly sufficient, which because of the relationship between man and woman as arising from marriage has always been recognized as perfectly sufficient, but which does not put the same restraints, qualifications and conditions around citizenship in the case of the woman as it puts in the case of a man. A man coming from another country to this Dominion in order to secure citizenship by the law of our land—and in principle our law in this respect conforms with the law of every other country in the world—that man must show not only that he is a resident here, but he must show that he has done certain things entitling him to have placed upon him the imprimatur of citizenship. He must, for example, now show that he has lived in our country for five years; he must show certain qualifications of citizenship; he must take a certain oath. He must show, as well, as I am informed by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), that he is able to converse in either of the two great languages of our country. Having done all these things, all men are treated alike and they are admitted to the citizenship of this Dominion. In the admission to citizenship, there is not equality. Let me repeat that sentence because it is at the bottom of this whole difficulty; it is at the bottom of the

question that we are discussing now; it is the very heart of it. There is not equality in the admission to citizenship. Were there equality in the admission to citizenship, there would be no reason in the world for inequality in the admission to suffrage. The man must undergo examination; he must live up to those tests. But not so with the woman. The women come to this country, perhaps from Central Europe, but, at all events, from a country in which a different language from our own is spoken, a country in which the people live under different customs. No one is saying anything about their living under different moral conditions or anything about moral customs. Those were only words put by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier into the mouth of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), indicating, no doubt, the practices that the former indulged in during the election. Our contention is that, perhaps, the woman comes from a country in which the people live under conditions which would justify the presumption that she would know little of our institutions, of the obligations of our citizenship; in a word, from a country in which there would be no presumption that she was fitted to be admitted to all the rights of citizenship in our country. But she comes to Canada. Possibly within the first week in which she arrives in this country, the first day, for there are many such cases; or the first year, she marries a naturalized subject; perhaps she marries a citizen by birth. Let us take the case where she marries a naturalized subject—it does not matter which case we take—that moment she is a British citizen; that moment she is a Canadian citizen, and she has reached that status without having met any of the tests whatever which this country has placed around the admittance to that status of naturalization, and without having shown any qualification of any character whatsoever for citizenship.

Mr. JACOBS: If she came from Mexico, what would be the situation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will come to that in a minute. They do not come from Mexico. The assumptions of the hon. gentleman are just about as far-fetched as his arguments and, indeed, his assertions of fact. I wonder how many of the five or six thousand who put the hon. gentleman in this House were from Mexico.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. JACOBS: They were intelligent enough to vote against the right hon. gentleman and his government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The further away they came from, the less they would be likely to know, and the more likely they would be to vote for the hon. gentleman. I am endeavouring to make clear to the House the reasons for the distinction. I am not particularly concerned as to what weight those reasons are given; but I am concerned that the reasons which actuated myself and those with whom I work, shall be known and shall be in a position to be weighed and given such weight as hon. gentlemen ought to give them. I have explained the distinction that has always existed in this country, as everywhere, in the admission to citizenship. Can any hon. gentleman tell me a reason why there should be discrimination in the qualifications for citizenship and no discrimination in the qualifications for suffrage?

Mr. EULER: Is the right hon. gentleman not aware that that discrimination which now exists in the granting of citizenship to man and woman respectively is because of the action of the government of which he was a member, in removing from the Naturalization Act of 1919 the right which married women had to become naturalized? That is a fact.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has missed the point altogether. That difference has existed all the time in this country; it exists in every country. Does the hon. gentleman know a country in the world where a woman, upon marriage, does not become of the citizenship of the man?

Mr. EULER: I am saying that by the Act of 1919, when a new naturalization law was passed, the married women of this country had a right to obtain personal naturalization, and that the government of 1920 dropped that clause from the amended act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That matter is not pertinent at all, but I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in fact. I have asked the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and his opinion is the same as mine. It may be that we should have a law which would prevent women from becoming citizens except by process of naturalization.

Mr. EULER: We had it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Never. Never was there an hour in the history of this country when a woman did not become a naturalized citizen by reason of marriage.

Mr. EULER: I am not saying that. She had, as a married woman, a right to personal naturalization which she does not have now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good. Admitting that the hon. gentleman is right; that a woman could have become naturalized by process, the same as a man, even though she were constructively naturalized by marriage, even so the fact remains that the woman always did become naturalized by marriage, and the man never became naturalized by marriage. He had to undergo all those tests, to live up to all those requirements, whereas, the woman did not have to do that at all.

Mr. EULER: You removed it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman from his seat state that that distinction has not always existed, that a woman has always been admitted to citizenship by marriage and that a man never has?

Mr. EULER: That is not the point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is my only point. If the hon. gentleman really wants to dispute that point, I should be glad to have him rise. That distinction has always existed. It may be a wrong distinction—I am not arguing that at all. What the hon. gentleman says is that, although a woman always became naturalized by marriage, we in 1919 took away a method by which she could otherwise become naturalized. Assume that he is right and that that method was taken away in 1919—from memory, I express the opinion that he is wrong—the woman did not need to become naturalized by that method; she could become naturalized by marriage and in no other way. She does not need to take the other process, the hon. gentleman says, but by becoming naturalized, and by that fact alone, she should be admitted to the suffrage. What I am seeking to impress upon the House is that there has been inequality in the admission to the status of citizenship all through the history of this Dominion, of the British Empire and of every other civilized country under the sun.

Then we came to that stage in the development of our nation when it was thought wise to admit women to the right of suffrage. This situation at once presented itself, that men, admitted to the right of suffrage because of citizenship, had around them those safeguards, but women admitted to the right of suffrage, merely because of citizenship, in all those cases had around them no safeguards at all. Consequently if the mere admission to the status of citizenship in itself gave the right of suffrage, then necessarily there would be inequality, then necessarily, in the case of women, there would be an absence of those safeguards that have been thought wise in the case of men. Let me ask this question again, for after all, reason in these matters is infinitely better than passion, than taunt and quip. Does anyone know of any reason why there should be distinction in admission to citizenship and no distinction in admission to the right of suffrage? Does anyone know why, if we should admit to the right of suffrage merely on the unequal basis of citizenship, we should not go back and so alter the law that all would be admitted to citizenship exactly on an equal basis? If hon. gentlemen can answer that, I will admit that they have at least reached the point which they have never reached before in a discussion of this question. Will hon. gentlemen from their places state that citizenship is something in respect of which all sexes, all races, should be treated precisely alike? The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier shakes his head indicating a negative. Is that not strange, coming from him who has just sat down with that speech in favour of unlimited equality on his lips? If hon. gentlemen will take the stand that they propose to legislate in this Parliament that admission to the status of citizenship shall be the same for man as for woman, then all right, this question is solved, and they are in a strong position when they say that admission to the right of suffrage should be the same for both man and woman. Place the first on an equal basis and the second follows automatically; leave the first on an unequal basis and then, if the second follows automatically, it is not equality at all but inequality. Now, it was with the view of removing that inequality, which arose out of the inequality in the elevation to the status of citizenship, and of doing so with the least possible infringement or impairment of right of suffrage consistent with the safety of the suffrage itself, that that amendment was introduced. I know, speaking on purely theoretical grounds, that there is a discrimination in it, in our endeavouring to

have it apply only to those cases where you could not possibly argue against its application. We did eliminate all the women born in the North American continent, which in effect meant the women born in the United States.

Mr. JACOBS: Why did you not say so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is better legislation, and my hon. friend knows it just as well as I do, not to mention countries in any act. We mentioned the district and got the desired result. I know that the theoretical argument can be advanced, that these women, who are admitted to the right of citizenship by marriage, are foreigners just the same as the women of Central Europe. That is true. But they were born under institutions and conditions, and brought up to a character of citizenship, very much akin to our own. Consequently we felt, in our desire to make the restriction just the least that it could possibly be made, that we could safely eliminate those women; and we felt as well that, as respects those women whose very near relatives had fought for us in the war, there was no cause for restriction. That is why we brought in the amendment.

Mr. JACOBS: What about France?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was felt to be part of wisdom not to name countries; but if hon. gentlemen want to get down to these fine points, they know as well as we do that we really have no immigration from France. The immigration that we have is, as a matter of practical fact, from Central Europe. That is the immigration of non-English speaking people, who certainly cannot be presumed, upon one week's or one month's residence in this country, to be of that character and qualification which this Parliament, as all Parliaments, has felt to be necessary in granting the status of citizenship. That was the object we sought by the legislation. Now, we did not disfranchise any one, in the first place. The statute itself admits the women to the franchise. That was the first admission, and this is a restriction placed upon it for the reasons I have given. And hon. gentlemen are free to attach to those reasons just what weight they think fit. I gave them because they were sincere reasons that actuated the Government, reasons that were strong then and are strong to-day. But we did not make the restriction absolute. We said this: As regards those women who have been naturalized by act of marriage, or, as it is sometimes put, constructively naturalized, those who have not undergone any test at all, all we ask is that they shall do what the men had to do, namely, go before a court and show that, if they had not been naturalized by marriage at all, they could qualify anyway. We asked that they should prove just what the men had to prove, and then the franchise would become theirs. Is that autocratic legislation? Is such a woman put under any hardship in being required to do precisely what the man had to do in order to attain the same goal she is seeking to reach? There is no hardship whatever. Hon. gentlemen say that they did not go. I do not know whether they did or not. I do not know of any reason why they should not, any more than the men, to attain the same ends, go and get their qualification established under the imprimatur of the court itself.

If hon. gentlemen have a simpler way to suggest by which this qualification can be established—and it is undoubtedly a sane and reasonable qualification—then I shall be only too happy to accept the simpler method, so long as there are fair safeguards. I do not even use the word "fair", but I say the same safeguards that heretofore have always existed in the case of men. If there is any foundation in the world for the attitude of mind—for that is about the best, or at least the most dignified expression I can use, and I do not refer in these words to the hon. member for North Waterloo, who did fairly argue the question—if there is any foundation for the attitude of mind displayed by those who make speeches of the character delivered by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, the best that can be said in respect of them is that they have determined that absolute equality of suffrage shall prevail. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite, nay, I do not defy them, I invite them, to consider the question of absolute equality of suffrage. It will be before them for consideration. They are now the responsible government, and they will have the question to face. If they are going to take this action and decide upon absolute equality of suffrage, then it will carry them to lengths which perhaps they do not contemplate just now. There is no absolute equality in suffrage to-day, aside altogether from this question. I did not hear the hon. member for North Waterloo make a plea for it, though possibly he might; but I have an idea that there are some hon. gentlemen opposite who would not. Those people coming from the oriental coun-

tries into the Dominion to-day cannot, under the law, vote in federal elections, at least in certain of the provinces of Canada. Is it the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite now to be logical in their position and to admit to the franchise those people from oriental countries who are citizens of this Dominion, citizens of the Empire and of Canada, under the new Naturalization Act? Is it their intention to admit them to the federal suffrage?

Mr. JACOBS: You are sidestepping the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are you thinking of sidestepping already? If the attitude of mind being reflected now has any basis of reason at all, it has this basis, that citizenship means suffrage and that there shall be no distinction of races or of sexes. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that he will stand in this House and vote for that?

Mr. JACOBS: Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof";—again indications come, first here and then there, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to accept the consequences of their position at all.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the right hon. member say that the Chinese inhabitants, the orientals, are not allowed to vote now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said, in certain provinces of the Dominion under the federal law to-day—the law which the hon. gentleman wants amended—citizens of Canada who are orientals by birth cannot vote.

Mr. CARROLL: That is federal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. In that respect the federal law follows the provincial franchise; and the provincial franchise, mark you, is the franchise of governments controlled by the Liberal party. Let them carry the fiery cross and preach this doctrine of equality in British Columbia, yes, and elsewhere in western Canada, and then we shall find how sincere they are in trying to impress upon the House the inconsistency and autocracy of hon. gentlemen in this corner of the Chamber. No! We were not moved by any anxiety to discriminate against anybody at all, save to the extent that discrimination and care have always throughout the history of our country been considered necessary, in the case of men, in connection with the franchise. I was one of the members of the Government that admitted the women to the franchise, and that against the Opposition of some hon. gentlemen who sit right opposite us now, some of whom, even in the late contest, denounced that Government for having granted the women the franchise. One hon. gentleman among them, a distinguished member, denounced the late government for their women suffrage legislation because he said it admitted bad women to just the same status as good women. Was there any distinction and discrimination there? We admitted women to the franchise, and the admission was wide and sweeping. Herein is the only restriction. And that restriction was not invented by ourselves; it could be overcome by the woman herself, if she were qualified to do so, by going before a judge and getting a certificate. It is an admission to the franchise the same as applied to men historically in this Dominion.

Mr. MARTELL: Do I understand my right hon. friend to say that his Government was the first to admit women to the franchise in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member may have understood me to say so, but I never used the word "first." We were the first in the history of the Dominion.

Mr. MARTELL: But in Nova Scotia we admitted women to the franchise on an equality with men long before the Dominion franchise was extended to women.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be. I do not know about the province of Nova Scotia; but I do know this, that the hon. gentleman has quite a number of colleagues around him who sought votes, and no doubt got them, by denouncing us for admitting women to the franchise.

Now then, I repeat, that we felt we had limited this safeguard to the narrowest limitation possible, and that instead of discriminating against women in favour of men, or discriminating against any class of women in favour of any class of men, it went as nearly as you can go by legislation to put them on an effective equality in consideration of the fact that with respect to admission to citizenship they were not on an equality at all.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed perhaps to bring back the debate from wandering into British Columbia and the Orient to a consider-

ation, I trust calm and impartial, of the resolution before the House. The leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has stated that there is in effect a difference between the naturalization of men and women. He states that we have gone in this country, as they have in most other civilized countries, along the lines of the proposition expressed so well in the old French adage: "Qui prend mari prend patrie"—who takes a husband takes the husband's fatherland. He states that that discriminates in favour of the woman, because the man who comes before the tribunal to get naturalization must undergo the prescribed examination; the woman gets it by the mere fact of marriage and is put really in a more favourable position. Well, the gallantry which should distinguish a House now led by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mackenzie King) and which was led by the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) should accept that position with pleasure.

But here is wherein, it seems to me, consists the fallacy—and I put it with all respect—of the right hon. member who leads the official Opposition. He says: We allow this constructive naturalization to take place with safety in regard to people that come from the North American continent; but it would not be safe to allow it in regard to people who come from Europe, whether they come from Central Europe or from France or Italy. Now, with all respect to him I say that it is a perfectly absurd distinction that there is any danger to Canadian people in the fact that the woman who has come from Italy and who has married a Canadian citizen should have the advantage of constructive naturalization; while it would be perfectly safe to allow it to her sister or cousin or aunt if she came from the state of Massachusetts. What was the idea? The idea was not to disfranchise, but to make the voting a little more difficult among those classes of the community that the then government thought were going to vote against them. I am sorry to have to say it, but that was the real foundation cause for the legislation.

But let me speak for one moment about another point raised by the right hon. member as the result of an interjection by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), whose careful and impartial treatment of the subject, without heat and passion, I am sure has commended itself to the judgment of all hon. members. It is quite possible to take the view of the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) that women are individuals on an equality with men, and that therefore if a woman who is a foreign-born citizen marries a British subject she should not become a British subject but should remain an individual entitled to the benefits and subject to the disabilities of her birth. That is an understandable situation, but that situation was varied when in the session of 1920 the right that a married woman had to apply for personal naturalization was taken from her. That right was taken away by the legislation of 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of 1920?

Mr. McMASTER: Of 1919. In 1919 we had a naturalization law whereby a married woman had a right to be personally naturalized and receive her naturalization certificate; but that was taken away by the legislation which was passed, I think, in the same year. So the only way in which a woman born out of the British Dominions and married here could get naturalization was through the naturalization of her husband.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sending for the statute, but I really cannot follow the hon. gentleman's reasoning. Does he say that prior to 1919 a woman naturalized by marriage could become naturalized again?

Mr. McMASTER: No. As I understand, the law was that a woman born outside the British Dominions and married in Canada could apply for naturalization in her own right supposing her husband did not want to become naturalized.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not if she were naturalized already by marriage.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose she could not be naturalized twice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly; that is the whole point.

Mr. McMASTER: No, this is the point. I am dealing with the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Southeast Grey, which is to this effect: That it would be a proper thing if the law of this country did not recognize that old French adage of, "Qui prend mari prend patrie,"—if women stood on their own feet, so to speak, quo ad naturalization. I say that is an understandable position to take; but I say further that the right of a woman married to a foreigner in this country to obtain British naturalization for herself was taken away by legislation passed in 1919, and

women of this class were driven back to what I might call constructive naturalization through the naturalization of their husbands. I say there never was any just reason why a woman who was born on the North American continent should be put in a position of superiority over one born elsewhere. Once you allow marriage to a British subject to open the door to the franchise, that door should be opened to any woman no matter in what part of the world she was born. That is my point; that is where I say the unfairness comes in.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? Would he favour then, under those circumstances, extending the franchise to a woman who entered Canada, married, we will say, to put the extreme case, the day after she arrived, and who would if given the franchise vote within the week?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, I would, because the number of cases where that would happen would be so infinitesimal as not to affect the general principle. As a matter of fact, if a woman comes in from the United States to-day that is precisely what she can do. But if she comes from France; if she is the mother of a hero who has gone from Canada to France to fight the battle of the Allies—and I know personally of such cases—she would be debarred from voting unless she went before a judge and was able to satisfy him that she had lived in Canada for five years before the election. I do think that when the leader of the official Opposition casts aside that somewhat worn attitude of mind he sometimes adopts; when he sits down as a lawyer and not as a leader trying to encourage his decimated ranks, he will agree with me.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): May I ask a question? I do not know that I have interpreted the Act correctly, but in the practical working out of the clause to which the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has referred—that is, the placing of American women in a different class from that applying to those coming from Europe—it would appear to me that an anomaly has arisen. Now, my view on this point has been disputed so often that I am quite prepared to discover that my interpretation is wrong. But this is as it appears to me: A woman who comes from the United States, becomes naturalized in her own right, and then marries a foreigner, is not allowed to vote; and a woman coming from Europe, becoming naturalized in her own right, and then marrying a foreigner—that is one who is not naturalized—takes the nationality of her husband and cannot vote. Is there any difference between these two cases?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As the question appears to be directed to me, I ask permission of the House to answer it. The law gives every woman, no matter what may be her history, the nationality of her husband, whatever that nationality may be. Though she may have previously been naturalized in her own right, upon marriage to any one of foreign nationality she takes that nationality and becomes a citizen of that country; she is no longer a citizen of Canada and cannot vote in Canada.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to bring the debate back to British Columbia for a few minutes? I understood the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to say just now—if I am wrong, I assume he will correct me—that the Dominion franchise followed, on broad lines, that of the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did not permit the provinces to disfranchise soldiers, but with that exception, where a province disfranchised because of race, that disfranchisement was carried into the federal act.

Mr. NEILL: That is precisely the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House—the question of disfranchising Asiatics—or enfranchising them, rather, for that is what it amounted to. I charge the late government with proceeding against the wishes of the people of British Columbia by enfranchising orientals in the late election. Quite a number of Japanese enlisted from that province during the war and went overseas with our troops. Some of these men were naturalized and some were not. When they came back they made application to the legislature of British Columbia, which was then sitting, for permission to vote. The matter was brought up by the G.W.V.A., and through four soldier members of the provincial House, in consultation with the government, and it was their joint opinion that whatever British Columbia owed these Japanese who had gone to the front with our men and had in many cases fought with them, we did not owe them the vote; that it was for many reasons—for a thousand reasons that I need not go into, but largely on account of the precedent it would create,—not desirable to grant them the franchise. I am not here to deal with the merits of that point; I am

merely emphasizing the fact that that is what the G.W.V.A., the soldier members of the House and the government decided was in the best interests of British Columbia; and of those interests they were best qualified to judge. Therefore the application of the Asiatics to vote was disallowed and the act remained as it was before, disqualifying them. When the Dominion Government came to pass this Franchise Act, they were advised, presumably by members representing the Coast districts, that it might be expedient to allow these Japanese to vote. We had also the same complaint that my friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) mentioned, and in addition the then government were advised that it would be policy to let these Japanese vote; therefore it was so arranged.

Now, the leader of the Opposition has said that where certain persons were disqualified by provincial enactment on account of their race, a similar disqualification was made effective by the Dominion,—soldiers, of course, being excepted. I will read what the act says:

> Persons who, by the laws of any province in Canada, are disqualified from voting for a member of the Legislative Assembly of such province in respect of race, shall not be qualified to vote in such province under the provisions of this Act: provided however that the provisions of this paragraph shall not disqualify or render incompetent to vote any person who has served in the naval, military or air forces of Canada in the late war and who produces a discharge.

You will observe, Sir, that this provision applied not simply to those who had fought in France, but to any who could produce a discharge. Some Asiatic may have been peeling potatoes at an internment camp, and if he could produce a discharge from the military forces he would be enfranchised under this provision. Or an Asiatic might have been engaged on one of the naval boats which carried supplies, oil and coal, to the various lighthouses, and which came under the naval service; if he could produce a discharge from that service, he was allowed to vote,—contrary, as I have intimated, to the express and determined wish of the people of British Columbia. I am not surprised that the Dominion Government were ashamed to put that provision in plain black and white in the act; for instead of putting it among qualifications of electors in section 29 they stuck it among the disqualifications of electors in section 30, by means of a double negative. I was challenged on one platform to turn over from beginning to end the leaves of that book containing the Dominion Elections Act and show where it was stated by any possible construction that the Japanese were permitted to vote. The ordinary man or woman would find it impossible to discover any such provision, it was so subtly incorporated among the disqualifications. I therefore strongly hope that when the act is revised—and the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) has indicated that there will be revision—this provision and many others of a similar character will be eliminated.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, what I have to say with reference to the resolution now before the House will be in a very few words. I rise not for the purpose of discussing any election or proceedings at elections, but merely to attempt to place before the House what seems to be a very grave injustice now imposed upon certain Canadian citizens in this Dominion. As I understand the situation, it is this. Under the Naturalization Act of 1914, which is, I believe, the law at present in force, with some minor amendments, it is provided that the wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject. There is practically the same provision in our civil code in Lower Canada, in Article 23, and if I mistake not, the provision is general practically throughout the world. Now when the Elections Act was framed, British subjects were given the right to vote with the exception provided in subsection 2 of section 29, the effect of which was simply this: many foreign-born women married to Canadian citizens, naturalized or native-born, and therefore themselves Canadian citizens, were deprived of the right to vote unless they went before a judge and obtained a certificate in the form set out in the act. That is the situation as it held at the time the lists were in preparation. As my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has very clearly explained, possibly a situation may have existed then that does not exist now, but he also stressed very clearly that this provision of the act certainly imposed some other liability on these foreign-born women although Canadian citizens at the time. Some of the arguments used in the debate were that these foreign-born women did not understand our laws, our language, or our customs and temperament of the Canadian people. If that is the case, if these foreign-born women do not understand our laws, our language, or our temperament, how do they understand

them any better by going before a judge and getting a certificate entitling them to vote? It seems to me that when they can get a certificate by going before a judge that argument falls to the ground.

All that any fair-minded person could ask in regard to this section of the Elections Act is that these women be placed in just the same position as other Canadian citizens, so that they will not have to go before a judge, but before the registrar the same as every other voter, and the registrar can inquire into the facts and accept or refuse a particular person's claim to the right to vote. That is all that this resolution seeks to do, and I am therefore in favour of it. There was, without the slightest shadow of a doubt a great deal of injustice done to women in the division which I represent owing to the operation of this section in the last election. These women had lived there not one, two, or three years, but for many years; they understood our language, and affairs in this country and were quite as capable of exercising the franchise as many others who were placed on the voters' lists, but instead of being able to go before the registrar as the ordinary citizen could, and simply give their name to the registrar and then be permitted to vote, they had to go before a judge of the Superior Court or one having jurisdiction in naturalization proceedings and obtain a certificate, and then present themselves before the registrar. That, of course, placed great difficulties in the way of very many women, who had the right to vote, exercising their franchise. It is quite true that many of them took advantage of this provision in the act, but I claim that there was, and is, an injustice placed upon these women, who are Canadian citizens just as much as many other women who are placed on the electoral lists. For that reason I think this subsection ought to be repealed.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Before this resolution carries, I should like to present the view of the Government on this matter. In a word, I might say that I think my colleagues and I agree with every word uttered by the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). He has stated the case so clearly that anything that might be added would simply be in the nature of reiteration.

As to the relation between the franchise and citizenship, I think we ought to do all we can to see that our citizenship is kept strong and well selected; but once a person becomes a British subject, I think we should do all in our power to instil in him or her a pride in British citizenship, and the first duty of every citizen is to take an intelligent part in governmental affairs. No one can exercise the full privilege of citizenship if he is deprived of the right to vote under the conditions prescribed in the electoral law. If, therefore, Mr. Speaker, the House will approve of this motion, I would say that the Government will at a later stage bring in an amendment to the Elections Act with a view to giving effect to the intention of this resolution.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): I hesitate very much indeed intervening in this debate. I rise, not with any desire to question the good faith of my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). I listened with intense interest to his very able argument to-day, as I have done to his arguments during the past two years. I do think, however, that the House is perhaps losing sight of an important point. I am not desiring to reflect on the intelligence of the House at all, but sometimes we stress one point and lose sight of another which perhaps may be of greater importance. There is no desire on my part whatever to interfere with the widest privileges of the franchise being given to foreign-born women citizens of Canada. I do not desire that at all, and I never have. I know that this question has exercised my hon. friend from North Waterloo in sessions gone by very, very much, but I think that the House must take this point into consideration, and if, later on, the act is amended, it certainly ought to be provided for. If this clause is repealed, we shall be giving to women aliens who enter Canada the right to exercise the franchise irrespective of the length of time they have been in the country and of their knowledge of our language and affairs, without any qualification whatsoever except one, and that is that they are married to a naturalized or native-born Canadian. Let us examine that from a practical standpoint. I put an extreme case to my hon. friend a moment ago, not for the purpose of misleading the House, but to illustrate the case as clearly as possible, but he took advantage of the fact that the rules of the House forbade me to speak, and rather ridiculed the idea. Let us look at it just

for a moment, because I think it very vitally affects the question. If a woman immigrant, I care not where she comes from, enters Canada and, as very frequently happens, joins the sweetheart who preceded her and who has probbaly established a home in this country, it makes no difference whether they are married that very day or within six months or one or two years, that woman, if this resolution carries, could vote within a week or a month after her arrival and marriage in this country.

Mr. CALDWELL: Two months' residence in the riding is required.

Mr. STEVENS: Two months' residence in the riding and a year's residence in the country but the point is—

Mr. MARLER: Take the case of an American citizen coming into the country and marrying a Canadian naturalized subject. She would under the law become a British subject but she might not be able to speak our language any more than a person coming from a foreign land in Europe. What about a case of that kind? I am simply asking for information.

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will be patient with me I will come to that in a moment. All I suggest is that the woman should acquire the right to vote on precisely the same grounds on which the man acquires that right. I appeal to the Prime Minister and the Government—because the former made a rather disturbing statement a moment ago—is it not reasonable and right that we should require the woman to comply with the same regulations that the man is called upon to comply with? On the other hand, if we allow the woman to vote simply by virtue of being married to a Canadian, she is given a privilege we have never extended to the man. If that point is fully met I have no objection to the disappearance of this clause and would vote for the resolution, but I certainly could not vote for the motion as it at present stands.

Now my hon. friend from St. George-St. Lawrence Division of Montreal (Mr. Marler) raised the question of the rather peculiar provision in the clause which really relates to persons coming from the United States. Well, my hon. friend knows exactly why that is in the act. He knows and the Minister of Railways also—

Mr. JACOBS: Knows what?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: Both these hon. members were on the committee that considered the legislation and both of them were the originators of that provision—

Mr. JACOBS: Who were on the committee?

Mr. STEVENS:—but there is no reflection on them on that account.

Mr. JACOBS: May I point out to my hon. friend that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George Division came into the House as a result of the last election; he never was here before.

Mr. STEVENS: I ought to have said that my hon. friend for George Etienne Cartier was one of the originators of the proviso in this clause. It was to meet his views very largely that the proviso was put in, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. JACOBS: May I tell my hon. friend that I am not complaining about the concessions which were wrung from the late government but of the things we failed to obtain.

Mr. STEVENS: The proviso is more or less absurd. I grant that, but if, as he says, it is a concession which was wrung from the government he was responsible for it. Now he is complaining about its inequality; now he bases his whole argument this afternoon upon the fact that it is—what shall I say?—a discriminating proviso. But that is not the point. The point is whether or not the right for women to vote in Canada is to be upon the same basis as the right for men to vote. That is the broad general ground, I think, that we must stand upon; and we must also insist upon the right of women to the franchise being surrounded by the same safeguards that obtain in the case of men. The Government ought to be very careful before allowing this resolution to pass, because we do not want them to put themselves in the position of saying when the bill comes before the House "Well we are committed to the principle by this resolution." I think the suggestion made to let the resolution stand until the bill comes down is a good one. Then we can take the clause up under the illuminating intelligence of the hon. members who now occupy the Treasury benches and we will be able to work out something that will be satisfactory. Personally, I do not want to seem

5 p.m. to vote against the general idea behind the plea of my hon. friend

from North Waterloo, but I am certainly opposed to giving the franchise to women—alien women coming to this country—on any other conditions than those which apply to manhood franchise. It is upon that point that I personally desire to protect the act and in order to protect the principle I shall feel myself called upon regretfully to vote against the resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. THOMAS LANGTON CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the object of this motion is to repeal section 2 of section 29 of the Act of 1920. This legislation was passed only after the most mature, ample and thorough discussion in this House and in the country. There was a demand for it from the returned soldiers and patriotic organizations. I regret to have to differ with what has been said on the other side of the House to-day. Those who argue for this motion advance the doctrine that naturalization and the franchise are kindred subjects. Not so. No party since Confederation ever adopted that basic principle as a franchise test and hon. gentlemen who have argued in favour of that doctrine were themselves parties to the disfranchisement of many citizens of this country. The Act of 1920, gave the franchise to British subjects and no man or woman who was not a bona fide British subject, under this act, had a vote.

I have known some of those who have had the ballot taken away from them. Many of these persons were of alien origin who came to Canada years ago, in infancy, and grew up with the country in the belief that they were British subjects. But, after careful legal inquiry, they found it impossible to show that they were British subjects. Under the Act of 1920, no citizen of any country but Canada, whether man or woman, had a right to vote. I am not aware of any country in the world, or of any British possession, that applies any other principle to its franchise legislation. No country that I ever heard of has ever called on anyone not a citizen to take up arms and defend the country, and no country in the world ever gave the franchise to any person not a bona fide, legal, citizen. No British legislature that I am aware of ever gave the franchise to any one not a citizen.

I regret that this matter has come up at the present time. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in looking over the country, find a lot of people without the ballot and they are anxious to get them on the list because they believe that those who were left off under the Act of 1920, will vote for them and will vote in the way they want them to. That is why they now seek to repeal section 2. There is no demand for this legislation and it is too soon to repeal its provisions. It was not even an issue in the late election. This enactment was a war measure. This is a British country, it is going to continue to be one and that is a fact that we want to make sure of.

Under the operation of the War-Time Elections Act in England no citizen of any other country than Britain was allowed to vote; only a British subject was permitted to cast a ballot. Practically the same thing was adopted in this country; the franchise, under the War-Time Elections Act was denied to all but Canadian citizens. The indispensable requisite before being allowed to vote is that a man shall be a Canadian citizen. That is the primary condition of the franchise in every country in the world. Certainly, it is the law in the United States. Over there they assimilate their population; a man must be an American citizen and fight for the United States, no matter what country he comes from, before he is allowed to cast his ballot. I admire the American people for the firm manner in which they carried out their draft law during the war; everybody had to toe the mark, obey the law and become an American citizen. Citizenship is really one of the principles of the American constitution; if you want to live in that country you must be a citizen and be prepared to fight, and if need be, die for the Union.

I think the hon. member's motion should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Such a provision as this should not be allowed to be passed without mature consideration, or before all classes are heard from and given an opportunity to present their views. We are here to give effect to public opinion. This proposition, I repeat, was not an issue in the last general election and there is no demand now from the people of Canada for the repeal of this war time measure. In his addresses to the people of North York the Prime Minister never even referred to the subject and the Government have no mandate to repeal this provision of the statute.

As this is only the first session of this Parliament, I would suggest that the hon. member allow this motion to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, pending the introduction of the bill, so

that we can have a fair discussion of the question before the proper tribunal. I know that in the constituency from which I come very strong objection is taken by different patriotic and soldier organizations to the repeal of this legislation. During the election campaign in my constituency I was asked if I was in favour of the repeal of the War-Time Elections Act and I said that I was not. I do not agree with the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail), whom we are always glad to hear from. I understood her to say that she claimed no special privilege for women. She thought all they desired was to be considered equal with men in relation to the franchise. That is all very well as far as it goes, but it does not touch the principle involved here. Let me say to the hon. member that she does not represent all the women in this country, or all the women of Ontario, or even all the women of Southeast Grey. The women in the constituency from which I come, and the women's patriotic organizations, are thoroughly opposed to this proposed amendment.

The act was a war measure; it was passed after most mature consideration and it was favoured by a patriotic body of soldiers who had just returned from the front and been demobilized and who had seen the condition of affairs in the old land. It was at their request and at the request of patriotic organizations throughout Canada that this legislation was placed on the statute book. Therefore, if no reasons are given, I do not know why some of my hon. friends are so anxious that this motion should carry. It may be that in our country a large number of people do not have the vote and perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks they will vote for him. It seems to me that something might be said in reference to that. I think it would be far better as the session is early yet, and we have been here only a few days, to go slow and postpone consideration of this resolution. I regret very much that this matter has been brought up at the present time, because we want this country to continue to be a British country with British institutions flourishing and we do not want to be unfair to any citizen, no matter who he is. I think, therefore, it would be far better if the hon. member would allow his motion to go to the Privileges and Elections Committee, so that the various soldiers and patriotic and other organizations could be heard from in order that we might see whether there is any demand for this proposed legislation. I am thoroughly opposed, Mr. Speaker, to any repeal of this statute and will vote against the motion.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): I should like to say just a few words on this subject, because I believe it affects the Prairie provinces probably as much as any other part of Canada, as we have to assimilate perhaps a greater percentage of that population than most other provinces have. I should like to say just a word as to the way in which the act has actually worked out in the permitting of women, who were absolutely qualified in every way to vote, to exercise the franchise. I am not going to go into the question of whether men and women should all be admitted to citizenship on an equal basis. That is a question of personal naturalization, and it hardly comes into this discussion; it is a question of amendment of the Naturalization Act. I have not considered the matter sufficiently to say whether or not I would oppose an amendment to the Naturalization Act, putting every man and woman on an equality as regards becoming naturalized, and eliminating the right of naturalization by marriage. The point is this: whether intentionally or not, that act prevented a large proportion of foreign-born women, who had been in this country a sufficient number of years to have assimilated our customs and acquired our language, from casting their ballots when election day arrived. Why did it do so? Partly, because of the distances which had to be traversed in that country in order that they might reach a judge. I am not reflecting on anything the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) or any other hon. member has said. Many members have no realization of the actual conditions which prevail in those prairie constituencies; they have no realization of their size, or the distances which must be covered, or the hardship which is inflicted on women who have to travel to meet the judge on a day which the judge has set, and obtain their certificates. We know that in the actual working out of that act, it was almost impossible, because the district was so large, to obtain judges to issue those certificates when the certificates were required. In all parts of those constituencies, in all parts of that prairie country, there were women requiring those certificates within a certain time, and with the number of judges we had, it was probably impossible for them to reach convenient points adjacent to all those women. In my

constituency—and I am speaking of that, not because this is a personal matter, but because conditions in my constituency are probably much as they are in other large constituencies in the Prairie provinces—when it was possible to get a judge to come down, women had to travel anywhere from ten to fifty or sixty miles in order to meet that judge and get their certificates. The practical working out of that meant that they were debarred from obtaining those certificates, and they were thus debarred from voting.

Mr. JACOBS: That was why the law was enacted.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am not making any reflections; I am simply making a statement of fact as it exists. I am not reflecting on the intentions of the hon. gentlemen who passed that act; possibly they had absolutely correct intentions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do men not have to do just the same thing?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Not necessarily, so far as I can see.

Mr. McMASTER: It is easier for a man to travel than for a woman.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is not the point. A man can, to a certain extent before he is naturalized, choose his time for naturalization. In the case where a women has to receive her voting certificate in a comparatively short time preceding an election—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is mistaken, I think. She can do that at any time at all. She has exactly the same privileges as a man.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I stand corrected, but neither I nor any other of the people in my constituency knew that a woman had the same right. The bulk of the women affected were not women who had come to Canada within a week or a month or a year of the date of the election. This legislation affected, to a large extent, the old-established constituencies, the old districts; it affected women who, for years, had understood that they were full Canadian citizens, women who had, so far as women could, fulfilled all the duties of Canadian citizenship. In actual effect, whatever the intention of the law was, it debarred those women from enjoying the full advantage accruing to the citizenship which they had acquired. I consider it was particularly a hardship in those pioneer districts. If ever any women on God's earth deserve the franchise and the full right of saying what legislation shall be passed affecting the rights and lives of every man and woman in this country, it is those women who went into those pioneer districts and, with their husbands, attempted to extend civilization into those wildernesses. The actual effect of that law which compelled those women to obtain such certificates before voting was to deprive a large percentage of them of the franchise.

On those grounds, on the grounds of common justice, on the ground that men and women who are full-fledged Canadian citizens should enjoy the fruits of Canadian citizenship, should enjoy the honour and fulfil the highest obligation of Canadian citizenship, I shall support the resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I think there is one principle that we have somewhat forgotten in this discussion, and that is that, with war, there comes penalizing legislation.

Mr. CALDWELL: The war is over.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The war is over, therefore, the penalizing legislation ought to be modified. That will present itself to people in a broad way. For instance, our sentiment towards German citizenship is changing every day, and we are going to forget a lot of things that happened during the war, especially in the matter of legislation. The world is going to try to get together again and to get along as it used to do. As the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) pointed out, there was a reason for framing the law as it stands.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do you not know that this legislation was enacted two years after the war was over?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Even granting that, there are a lot of people in this country, of whom perhaps I am one, who cannot forget that the war is over; and although we may forget some of the hardships and penalties that were necessary for national safety in time of war, we must bear in mind that we should not go too far in mitigating the law. We want to have a democratic franchise in this country, and we should try to suggest such means as will give us the best election system we can have. As an hon. member from Toronto suggests, a question of this kind should be

submitted to a committee, and it might be wise for the hon. member for North Waterloo to let his motion stand until we ascertain what the Government submits to the House later on.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up much time, nor do I rise for the purpose of opposing in any way the motion before the House. I simply rise to indicate the consequence which might follow if the motion were passed, in the exact terms in which it is couched, and the Government felt called upon to implement the resolution by legislation exactly expressing it. Possibly the House is aware of the condition of affairs at the present day, let us say, with regard to Italy. Suppose two Italian women came to Canada both absolutely ignorant, as they might well be, of a single word of either French or English. One of these women, let us say, is married, the other unmarried. After the lapse of one year the unmarried woman, without perhaps having acquired the slightest facility in the use of either language, and without being able to understand the political conditions of the country, or to transact the slightest bit of business, will become franchised by the mere fact of marriage, if my hon. friend's resolution is carried directly into effect. In the case of the woman who is already married, however, some five years, I think, must elapse; and, I think, she must satisfy some official that she has a sufficient knowledge of one or other of the languages of the country in order to be able to communicate intelligently. Now, would it not be well to pause and, whether by means of a committee such as has been referred to, or by direct consideration by the Government, let us have all these possible phases carefully considered so that we might have legislation which would extend the franchise as far as it ought to go without creating any absurdities? I think that we, and all the people of the country, agree on the principle that the franchise should be as broad as is consistent with the safety of our institutions; and the safety of our institutions depends upon the capacity of the intended voter to apprehend the political and social questions which confront the people of Canada from time to time. Without a good working knowledge of one of the languages used in Canada, it is impossible for a voter intelligently to exercise the franchise. Do not let us rush in and alter the existing legislation in a spirit of ineffable charity, in order that some one shall be enfranchised without the slightest possibility of obtaining, through the natural community channels, a conception of what is going on in the country. That is not a real charity; it is not a prerogative; it is not a gift; it is simply a wasting and a debasing of the franchise that confers no real benefit on the individual who receives it.

On the other hand, I am forcibly struck by the remarks made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman). I can well apprehend the difficulty that would occur in many of the rural constituencies when people did not seek to register until practically the last few days of the campaign. They thought nothing of the vote until they wanted to use it, and then distance became a great obstacle. I have seen, and I fancy hon. members have all seen, precisely the same thing within the limits of densely settled communities. Very often people object to travelling a few blocks, or spending an hour or two, in order to reach the official. There is plenty of time during the whole year in which they can do this, and practically without inconvenience; but people complain, because, forsooth, everything is not ready for them right at hand at the time they realize that they want to make use of the franchise. Notwithstanding this statement, I do sympathize with the difficulties which distance imposes on a great many people in the rural communities, in the East just as well as in the West. Let us, then, give consideration to the other provisions of the election law and see if we can devise some tribunal that will exercise proper and reasonable discrimination that will not pass people through at the rate of several hundred in an hour, as was done in one of the most populous centres of the country. Let the officials get closer in touch with the people, so that they will not have to travel scores of miles. We should so arrange it that people could be accommodated at convenient seasons and, if they realize the importance of the franchise themselves, given the opportunity to be properly enrolled and enfranchised. Let that be confined, however, to the people who can speak one language or other in use in the country, and let us put the women on the same basis as the men. For myself, I would do away with marriage—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BAXTER: —as a qualification. Hon. members will observe the qualification I make. I am like the leader of the House

(Mr. Mackenzie King); we have both done without this popular institution for a good many years. If my hon. friend intends to change his attitude in this regard I shall not follow his example. It is one of the characteristics of the members of this particular group that they pursue the same policy right along. I would suggest that the women should be naturalized just in the same way as the men, on the same basis as to literacy and the question whether or not they would be desirable citizens of the country. There is legislation to come before the House, possibly within a day or two, by which would-be assassins or exponents of assassination as a means of changing government are not to be deported without trial. I do not think that the sober sense of the country intends to permit its election law to be so broad as to include elements of that character. Until we resolve to break down such barriers as these we must have some tribunal before which intending citizens shall submit themselves to a reasonable test as to their fitness to take part in the government of this country.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH PREFERENCE AND CANADIAN SEAPORTS

On the motion being called:

That, in the opinion of this House, the British tariff preference should be confined to goods brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John): When does my hon. friend for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) intend to proceed with this motion? The subject matter is very interesting to me and very important, especially to certain parts of the Dominion. I had intended putting a similar resolution upon the Order Paper myself. I am very glad my hon. friend has done so, and I should like to be assured that he will proceed with his motion.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland): I have been waiting for some information from the Customs Department which I have only just received, and as it is now nearly six o'clock I did not think it was worth while to proceed with the motion to-day.

Mr. BAXTER: It will be duly proceeded with?

Mr. LOGAN: Yes, I can assure my hon. friend that it will be brought forward at the next opportunity.

QUEBEC FISHERIES

On the motion being called:

For a copy of the correspondence and all other documents regarding the transfer of fisheries to the Province of Quebec.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (leader of the Opposition): The intention that this motion would be taken up to-day has not been realized. I do not want to speak on the motion myself; I merely want to see it carried with as little delay as possible.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I had intended proceeding with the motion to-day, but it being nearly six o'clock I did not think it advisable to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no discussion.

Mr. MARCIL: I shall take it up to-morrow.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

On the Order being called for the second reading of Bill No. 16 to amend the Immigration Act:

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Might I ask the sponsor of this bill (Mr. Woodsworth) if he would be agreeable to allow it to stand until the Minister of Immigration is here?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Order stands.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On the order for the second reading of Bill No. 17 to amend the Criminal Code:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This bill has relation to the same subject matter, and therefore it had better stand, too.

Order stands.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917

On the Order for the second reading of Bill No. 18, to repeal The Military Service Act, 1917.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Stands.

SUPPLY

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Civil Government:—Labour—Salaries, $258.-755.

Mr. MURDOCK—I have been able to secure the further detailed information in

regard to outside employees of the Labour Department, which my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) was extremely anxious to have. The permanent staff of the Labour Department outside of Ottawa, is composed of: Mr. R. A. Rigg, General Superintendent employment offices at Winnipeg, at a salary of $3,000 a year; Mrs. M. Chesney, statistical clerk in the same office, at $1,200 a year. Mr. J. Shannon, also a statistical clerk in the same office, at a salary of $1,080 a year. At Halifax, Mr. K. G. Christie is employed as clearance officer at $1,980, and Miss A. M. Stewart as clerk stenographer at $960. The fair wage officers are as follows: at Calgary, Mr. F. E. Harrison, $2,220; at Vancouver, Mr. D. T. Bulger, $2,340; at Toronto, Mr. E. N. Compton, $2,340; at Montreal, T. Bertrand, $1,740. Miss O. M. Compton is clerk typist in the Toronto office, at $960. Mr. George P. Shields is a clearance officer now located at Ottawa. The information I have here with respect to Mr. Shields is that since his discharge from the C.E.F. he has been employed mostly outside of Ottawa, being for some time clearance officer at Vancouver. When this statement was prepared he was in Toronto making investigations; at present he is at headquarters, but for the purposes of this statement he was classified as an outside employee. These are the eleven permanent so-called outside employees of the Labour Department. The temporary outside employees are Mr. G. I. Duke, clerk-stenographer, $960; Miss M. B. Nesbitt, junior clerk stenographer, $900; Miss I. Thomas, junior clerk, $900,—all in Mr. Rigg's office at Winnipeg. Miss H. A. Frederick is junior clerk-stenographer in Mr. Harrison's office at Calgary at a salary of $900. Miss E. B. Mitchell is clerk-stenographer in Mr. Bulger's office, Vancouver, at $960.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What are the duties of a clearance officer, and why has that office been discontinued at Vancouver?

Mr. MURDOCK: I hold up for the inspection of hon. members the book containing the classification of the Civil Service of Canada. I am told that it does not contain one-half the present classifications of the Service, and I am unable to find in it a statement of the duties of the clearance officer.

An hon. MEMBER: Tell them yourself.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sorry to say that I have not been in the department long enough to know all the various classifications of the service, nor do I expect to be able to remain long enough to do so.

Mr. BAXTER: There is a Mr. Cochrane employed at Moncton who keeps in touch with the railway employees. Is he under the minister's department?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think so.

Mr. COPP: I think his appointment is made by the local administration, with the co-operation of the Dominion.

Mr. HANSON: I know the gentleman; he is an officer of the Labour Department, in charge of the Employment Bureau here. .

Mr. COPP: He is appointed, I believe, by the local government.

Mr. MURDOCK: This re-classification volume does not define the duties of a clearance officer, but I shall be glad to get the information and place it before my hon. friend. The Civil Service Commission establish the titles and define the duties of these various positions; the matter is not in the hands of the minister, or, I believe, of anyone in the department.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I was curious to know why the office had been discontinued at Vancouver while, apparently, there is still one at Halifax.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think the intention is to make a different classification for the gentleman at Calgary, carrying with it a slightly increased scale of compensation. The Civil Service Commission recently determined that so-called fair wage officers who devoted a considerable portion of their time to investigation of matters connected with the coal mining industry should be placed in a different classification from that of ordinary fair wage investigators who covered a wide field in other classes of employment. Accordingly, I understand they are rearranging the classification, slightly increasing, I believe, the compensation for fair wage officers having to do with matters affecting the coal mining industry.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Can the minister, now that he has the volume, state a little more definitely than he did yesterday what are the duties of the Industrial Engineer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If the minister will pardon me, I may say that I have been struck with the interest that has been shown by the minister's explanation of these numerous titles that are now attached to people in the Civil Service who,

in my previous days in the House of Commons were simply known as clerks, and I discovered that you will find in the Distribution Office a large volume, if not two or three prepared by this wonderful Griffenhagen firm which was employed by the late government, at very great expense to the country, to reclassify the whole Civil Service; and in it will be found the duties of all the positions classified. The minister of any one department has nothing whatever to do with the affixing of titles or assigning the duties of the office.

Mr. MURDOCK: As I happen to have under my hand the duties of the Industrial Engineer, I will read them:

Definition of Class:

To act as technical adviser to the Department of Labour; to investigate various industrial matters and to prepare reports thereon; to draft forms and draw up standard practice instructions for use in the branches of the department; to act in an advisory capacity in connection with industrial disputes; to gather data and to furnish information and assistance in connection with the establishment of Joint Industrial Councils pursuant to the recommendation of the National Industrial Conference; and to perform other related work as required.

Qualifications:

Education equivalent to graduation in arts, science, or engineering from a university of recognized standing; at least five years of experience in constructive investigation work, of which at least two years shall have been in an administrative or consulting capacity; initiative, tact and good judgment; good address.

Compensation:

Monthly:	$ 255	270	285	300
Annual:	$3,060	3,240	3,420	3,600

This was described by the commission as a new class at the time it was classified. I do not think it would be out of the way for me to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that these definitions of class and qualifications were prepared under the direction of or directly by gentlemen who were being paid at the rate of $7 per hour, which perhaps accounts for their being so exhaustive.

Mr. BAXTER: As the minister was reading the classification I felt like remarking with regard to the particular type of individual required for this work, "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," for it did not seem to me that you could add a single quality or a single bit of knowledge to such a wonderful combination of human intellect, resource and ability, as is there depicted by the Griffenhagen people or the Civil Service Commission.

I rose for the purpose of asking the minister, who I believe is a practical man, whether, stripping himself of all the attributes of the ministry, he does not feel like saying to this House that as regards the practical questions that have to be met in the labour world the real way to get at the root of any labour problem is to get a commonsense man or a body of men, who may never have had a university education at all, to go down into the thick of it between the capitalist and the employees and talk common sense to both sides, with a view to bringing them together. I believe that the minister and myself are absolutely of one mind there, and no matter what commissions the past government may have appointed, at no matter what cost, I trust that we are going to see from the minister within a very short time a scheme based on the real practical fundamentals of human nature. Perhaps he may be able to outline it later and tell us when we shall be able to get down to something less in the way of expense for what is almost a work of supererogation along the lines of education, and depend on the thing that really counts, human character in touch with human problems.

Mr. MURDOCK: I wholeheartedly agree that the hon. gentleman is talking common sense when he speaks of the proper methods of dealing with industrial disputes.

Mr. LADNER: There is a decided increase in these estimates over last year, apart from the statutory increases. Now, considering general world conditions and decrease in wages in all forms of labour, skilled and unskilled, I should like to ask the minister whether, when these Estimates were presented to him, he endeavoured to find out why there had been an increase, and whether some method could not be devised for bringing his estimates more into conformity with general conditions in the labour world outside.

Mr. MURDOCK: I did so. The proposed increase of $23,400 in the civil gov ernment estimates, so far as I know and honestly believe, is partly necessary in accordance with the provisions of the law regulating the statutory salary increases. I am sure my hon. friend will not hold me responsible for what is outside my control. Part of the increased cost is due to the appointment of some additional employees, but these I honestly believe to be necessary for the successful and proper functioning of the Department of Labour. Even with these additions to the permanent staff I am at a loss to know whether we will be even able to carry on, after dispensing with possibly twenty-five or thirty

temporary employes who were appointed during the régime of my predecessor and have been in the department ever since I took office.

Mr. STEVENS: Out of what vote were these forty-seven temporary employees paid?

Mr. MURDOCK: Partly out of the vote for contingencies and sundries. To some extent the cost has also been met out of employment services and the industrial training fund, and other sources. Now, what I hope to do is to come right out into the open and resort to no camouflage to shelter any employee in the Labour Department. If such does not appear to be my course at the present time it is because —and I frankly admit the fact—I have not yet got a sufficiently detailed grasp of the entire situation to know just what can be done. I believe, however, that something can be done to improve the situation as regards the number of employees and to meet what I understand to be the generally expressed wish of Parliament.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 30, 1922

The House met at three o'clock, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Hon. James Horace King, member for the electoral district of Kootenay East, introduced by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Sir Lomer Gouin.

MR. SPEAKER'S BEREAVEMENT

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Hon. members of the House will regret to learn that His Honour, the Speaker of this House, has just suffered bereavement in the death of his father at the advanced and venerable age of eighty-six years. I express what I know to be the wish of the House when I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to convey to Hon. Mr. Lemieux the deep sympathy of all its members. It will be the wish of hon. members that their sympathy should also be extended to other members of the late Mr. Lemieux's distinguished family.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): It was only as I entered the Chamber a few moments ago that I received the very distressing news of the death of Mr. Speaker's father. Filial affection is one of the strongest impulses and ties that have to do with human relationships, and those of us who have known the Speaker of this House for so many years are aware that in the case of his family, and particularly as regards his father, that affection has been of the most marked and deepest character. The loss he has suffered is therefore severe, and I associate myself most earnestly with the sympathy expressed by the Prime Minister.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): While, with other members of the House, I was aware of the fact that the Speaker's father was seriously ill, I was not aware of the fatal termination of that illness until the announcement just made by the Prime Minister. For myself and those who sit with me, I wish to say that we associate ourselves with all that has been said by the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition in extending the sympathy of the House to Mr. Speaker and his family in the sad bereavement that they have suffered.

RETURNED SOLDIERS

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RE-ESTABLISHMENT

On the Order, Motions:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): I move, Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, that before we take up this order we proceed to Government Notices of Motion, in order that a motion be made which otherwise we might not reach in the course of the day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose it is a matter that will not take up much time?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move the following resolution:

That a Special Committee be appointed to consider questions relating to the pensions, insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers, and any amendments to the existing laws in relation thereto which may be proposed or considered necessary by the Committee; with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its proceedings and the evidence taken, for the use of the Committee and to report from time to time; and that Rule 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I move:

That the Special Committee appointed in conformity with the resolution agreed to by the House consist of the following members: Messrs. Arthurs, Black (Yukon), Brown, Caldwell, Carroll, Chisholm, Clark, Clifford, Denis (Joliette), Forrester, Hudson, Humphrey, Knox, McKay, Marler, MacLaren, Miss Macphail, Munro, Power, Raymond, Robinson, Ross (Kingston), Savard, Speakman, Stork, Sutherland, Turgeon and Wallace.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will this committee be similar to the committees of the two previous sessions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King the House returned to routine proceedings.

COMMITTEES—CHANGES

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): If it meets with no objection, I move:

That the name of Mr. Stewart (Hamilton) be substituted for that of Mr. Stewart (Lanark) on the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the name of Mr. Stewart (Lanark) be substituted for that of Mr. Stewart (Hamilton) on the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

NOVA SCOTIA MINERS

MR. IRVINE MOVES ADJOURNMENT TO DISCUSS SITUATION

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the serious crisis developing at the present time in Nova Scotia between the miners of District No. 26 and the British Empire Steel Corporation.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman desires to have an opportunity of addressing the House on this subject. There is no objection.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I presume that already most hon. members are aware of the situation in Nova Scotia for the discussion of which I now move the adjournment of the House. It is generally understood, I believe, that a difficulty has developed between the British Empire Steel Corporation and the coal miners of Nova Scotia, involving about twelve thousand men. The difficulty began about 1st January, when the company made a wage cut of about 37½ per cent. Incidentally I might point out that the cost of living in Nova Scotia is about 17 per cent higher than in Alberta, yet the wages are 71 per cent lower. Naturally the men concerned resisted this reduction. A conciliation board was granted. I understand that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) appointed the chairman of that board because the representatives of the parties had some difficulty in agreeing on one themselves. The chairman was from Ontario. It seems that the conclusion which the committee arrived at was not very satisfactory to the men. It happened that the chairman agreed with the representative of the company, and I understand that his casting vote carried the day. The recommendation was that a 32½ per cent cut of wages should be put into effect instead of the 37½ per cent that was previously imposed by the company; but a minority report was submitted recommending a 14 per cent reduction on contracts and a minimum on the datal rate of $3.50. The majority report was submitted to the men and was rejected by an almost unanimous vote. Following this the miners considered the whole situation at a general convention, after which a delegation was sent to Montreal and negotiations were re-opened between them and the operators, which resulted in the latter granting $2.85 or slightly over that to the datal men. This was submitted to the men and was also rejected.

Now, immediately on the wage cut being put into effect by the company the men, of their own volition, naturally struck on the job. That is, they said to themselves: We will not continue to produce coal which will make very high profits for the corporation at a wage on which we cannot live; and this is commonly called "striking on the job." It might be pointed out here that the miners were not in a position to strike in the ordinary way for the reason that they had already expended almost their entire surplus funds in giving relief to their fellows who have been suffering from lack of nourishment and proper attention throughout the past winter. I do not know whether it was decided at any particular meeting or whether the strike leaders authorized it, but it was decided almost unanimously by the men that they would lower production of coal to a point about corresponding to what they are getting in wages.

The fact of the matter is that the coal is not being produced at the present time, which is an economic waste; and the second fact is that the men are not getting a liv-

ing wage, and the stories which are coming through of the conditions in Nova Scotia almost rival those that have come to us from the famine districts of the Volga. We hear of children under-nourished and suffering sickness; we hear of an increase in the death rate; we hear of parents being summoned by the educational authorities for not being able to send their children to school because they cannot buy them boots and clothes and properly nourish them. I do not think it necessary for me to bring that information to the notice of the Government, for I believe they are already well acquainted with it, but I may say that those stories are coming from authoritative sources.

Now, there are about twelve thousand men and their families involved in this situation; and we understand, both from the organized labour movement of that province, and from the delegation which is at present in the city of Ottawa to meet the Government in consultation on this matter, that the men have about reached the limit of their endurance, and must of necessity secure a settlement of some kind at the very earliest possible moment. In order to secure that settlement they have sought in a proper British manner to secure some amelioration through constitutional means. They made their appeal first of all to the provincial government, and I understand that that government has absolutely refused to have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Would my hon. friend tell us where he has received that information?

Mr. IRVINE: I have received that information, Mr. Speaker, from the delegation that is here waiting upon the Government to deal with this matter, and I have also received it from the organized labour movement of Nova Scotia. I have a copy of that information before me. Having failed to get redress at the hands of the local government, they have sent a delegation to Ottawa, consisting of mayors from the four mining towns of Nova Scotia, namely, Mayor Morrison, of Glace Bay; Mayor Ling, of New Waterford; Mayor McLean of Dominion, and Mayor Wilson, of Spring Hill. They have presented the miners' case to the Government, and I understand that they have not received a satisfactory answer. I am advised that the Government has practically refused to take any definite action. I have here the answer which was given to the delegation by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and I will read it to the House:

> Referring to the request made by yourself and Messrs McLean, Ling and Wilson at the interview with certain of my colleagues and myself in my office yesterday, that a Royal Commission be appointed forthwith to investigate matters pertaining to the coal mining industry in the Province of Nova Scotia, I beg to inform you that the Government has had this matter under consideration and is of the opinion that the situation is not one which in the public interest can be satisfactorily dealt with under the existing circumstances by a Royal Commission.

Now, while it may be perfectly true that a royal commission would not be able to do anything of very material benefit, yet apparently the Government does not propose to take any other course that would be better than the appointment of a royal commission. So we take it that the note virtually means that the Government has no intention of taking any particular action in the circumstances. I wish to read for the information of the House just a line or two from the manifesto presented by this delegation:

> We feel that the situation will never be understood until a commission of sympathetic, just and competent investigators have gone into the mining districts of Nova Scotia and seen things for themselves; until they have seen with their own eyes the conditions under which these people are expected to live and bring up healthy families.

The delegation asks that a commission be appointed to investigate this matter. I may say that these delegates are not representative simply of labour organizations, they are mayors of towns, representatives of the citizens of Nova Scotia; and the matter with which they deal is of vital concern to almost everybody in that province. I repeat that they are not here to put forward any particular type of labour propaganda; they are here as representative citizens to consult the Government on a matter of real public importance.

Now, the point I wish to make is this. The miners of Nova Scotia have appealed to the constitutional authorities of this country to deal with a condition which to them is unbearable. The provincial authority says that it cannot or will not act; this Government says, or virtually says, it cannot act. Well, who is going to act? If these men cannot obtain redress by constitutional methods, what are they to do? Will any hon. gentleman tell us what they are to do? If they are receiving a wage upon which they cannot live; if they are contracting disease and, in some

cases, dying through lack of nourishment, they must have some kind of redress; and if neither the provincial government nor the Dominion Government will take action, what is to be the outcome? It is too late for us to talk when things happen; now is the time for this Government—or some other government; we want to know where the authority is—to deal with this matter. Surely there is some constitutional authority which will face the situation and undertake to see that a fair deal is given both to the corporation and to the miners. I am not here to plead for anything that would not be fair to the corporation; I want to see the company as well as the miners get a square deal. But if we refuse to listen to the appeal of these men, I ask again, what is going to be the outcome? Human nature can only stand so much; if it gets a little more than it can stand, what is going to happen?

I would like to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and if I am not in order in doing so, it will not be much trouble to you to tell me that I am out of order. I would suggest that some one—say, Mr. Howard Ross, K.C., of Montreal, or some one else of similar standing—be appointed by this Government to investigate the whole situation with a view to arriving at a sane settlement.

I need not remind you of the history of this particular corporation; hon. members undoubtedly know what that history is. They know of the recent great merger under which there was formed a gigantic corporation which practically controls a monopoly of the coal output of Nova Scotia. I understand also that this company through its manager has been enabled to create watered stock to the amount of some $19,000,000. If it is necessary to pay dividends upon that amount of watered stock, surely it can only be done by reducing the wages of the producers, particularly when the corporation has to compete in the coal markets of the world. I am led to believe that that is exactly what is taking place: the company is seeking to reduce wages to the point which will enable it to make sufficient profits on its watered stock, as well as on its dry stock, if you like, to make it worth while to carry on business. Perhaps you know also that this great corporation was refused a charter by the late government of this Dominion and was granted it by the provincial government. There is a Liberal government in power in Nova Scotia, and we have a Liberal Government here. Sir, the question of politics does not enter into this matter; I hope it is not simply because a Liberal government happens to be in power in Nova Scotia that the present federal Government does not see its way clear to take some action. This is a matter of great importance; it involves not only the rights of 12,000 workingmen in Nova Scotia, but the rights and privileges of the people generally of that province. In fact, if you look at the question closely you will see that it is of national importance. Therefore I would like to hear this House discuss the matter in all its phases and decide upon some course of action.

Mr. DONALD M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): I wish to speak briefly, Mr. Speaker, in support of this motion. The Government cannot get away from its responsibility in this matter. Both Liberal and Conservative governments have given grants of large amounts to the companies that have been merged to form what is now the British Empire Steel Corporation and to that extent the Dominion authority is responsible for the establishing of this industry. Something like $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 has been granted to these companies. Therefore it is the duty of this Government to do whatever it can to bring about a settlement which will be fair in every way to the men who are doing the work in this industry. After all, is it the purpose of this industry merely to turn out coal, steel plates, and so on? Should it not also provide a good living for the men who are doing the work in connection with it? I think it is the duty of the Government to investigate the whole matter, and to do so in a sympathetic manner. Let it find the best men it can to assume the responsibility of getting at the facts and of trying to effect a settlement which will be fair and just to all parties concerned.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of the representatives from South Cape Breton and Richmond where the large bulk of miners of Nova Scotia work and reside. I am deeply interested in the success of the coal mines in that province, and I am equally interested in the welfare of the miners and workingmen generally, especially of those engaged in the coal industry on the island of Cape Breton.

The delegation to which my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine) has referred was introduced to the Government by hon. members from Nova Scotia including my-

self, and their case was fairly and vigorously placed before the members of the Government then present. The Government saw fit, yesterday evening I think, to advise that delegation that it would not at this juncture establish a royal commission to investigate the coal industry in the province of Nova Scotia and to re-canvass the whole situation in that province. That, in effect, I think, was the answer of the Government.

The situation in the coal fields of Nova Scotia at the present time is a most serious one, and if anything could be done to help bring together the coal operators and the coal miners and secure better co-operation in the operation of the mines of that province, it would be a splendid thing. I am in no way talking for the Government or any member of it. I have lived with the coal miners in the county of Cape Breton for the past sixteen or seventeen years, and a finer body of men does not exist in this Dominion. It is true that they did not treat myself very well during the last campaign, but that, of course, does not enter into the consideration of the question which my hon. friend from Calgary has brought before the House.

The hon. member for Calgary has told us that this Government appointed the chairman of the conciliation board established by the Minister of Labour in the last Government, Hon. Senator Robertson. The facts are that the miners appointed as their representative Mayor Ling, an estimable man, who has been a coal miner himself. The Dominion Coal Company which operates the mines, refused to name a man, and Senator Robertson therefore appointed a gentleman to represent them. These two could not agree on the third arbitrator, and so when the present Government came into power the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) appointed U. E. Gillen, from the city of Toronto, as chairman of the board. That board held its meetings in the city of Halifax. Personally, I think it would have been much better if the board had sat in the town of Glace Bay, which is the centre of coal operations in the province of Nova Scotia, because the members would then have been able to see for themselves the actual conditions among the miners and could have had at a moment's notice any evidence which it would have been proper to bring before the tribunal. They sat, however, in the city of Halifax, and subsequently they made certain recommendations. That, of course, was the only thing they could do, because, as I understand it, neither the Labour people nor those who have put their capital in industrial enterprise in this country, wish to have compulsory arbitration; neither party wishes to be bound to accept the findings of an arbitration board. I remember that while discussing in Parliament, in 1912 or 1913, a coal strike in the province of British Columbia in which there had been an arbitration, the findings of which were very much in favour of the miners, I suggested that it might be well if there were some way of enforcing the findings of that particular arbitration and of future arbitrations. But immediately I had letters from all of the large labour unions in this country telling me that while I had done them some service in bringing this matter before the House and the government of the day, the unions of this country were not in favour of compulsory arbitration and I think, perhaps, when everything is said and done, that they are taking the proper stand. So there is no way of enforcing the awards of a conciliation board.

The conciliation board that sat in Halifax brought in its findings, and I am not here to say whether those findings were or were not based on the evidence which came before the board. I understand that the Dominion Coal Company, at the request of members of the board, introduced as evidence the cost sheets of the company, and that the arbitrators had the right to go into these cost sheets and ascertain for themselves just what it was costing the Dominion Coal Company to mine coal. With that and other evidence before them I think the board should have been in a position to bring in very fair findings, but I am bound to say that some of the findings in detail do not seem to me to have been well thought out. However, I am not here to criticise the findings of that board. The mine workers refused to accept the recommendations of that board, and the Dominion Coal Company, which is part of the British Empire Steel Corporation, went into further conferences with the men, through the executive of the United Mine Workers of America, to which organization the miners of Nova Scotia belong. Conferences took place in the city of Montreal, and after some time a majority of that board agreed to certain proposals made by representatives of the Dominion Coal Company. I think the executive board, while in the city of Montreal, consisted of seven members, and four of

that executive representing the United Mine Workers, signed a statement that the additional proposals of the Dominion Coal Company should be recommended to the good judgment of the miners of Nova Scotia and accepted by them as a working agreement until such time as further negotiations could take place. The recommendation was sent to various labour councils in the province of Nova Scotia, and a vote was taken upon it, but, strange to say, a week or so before the miners were to vote on the acceptance of that proposed agreement the executive of the United Mine Workers of America broke over it, and we found three members of the United Mine Workers, the secretary-treasurer and two district board representatives, going out among the miners in the various coal centres of Nova Scotia exhorting them not to accept the working arrangement which had been agreed to by a majority of the board in the city of Montreal. We also find those who favoured the agreement proposed by the company going out and opposing their brothers of the executive, and advising the miners of Nova Scotia to accept the proposals of the Dominion Coal Company. However, the result was that the miners, by an extremely large majority—I think seven to one—voted to turn down the agreement, and said they were not going to work under it. I want to point out that the proposals of the Dominion Coal Company and the arrangement which formed the basis of the agreement arrived at in the city of Montreal did increase the wages of the datal men beyond what were recommended by the members of the conciliation board, although the increase was small it is true. The wage, which had been cut down to $2.68, was increased to $3. Under the recommendations of the board it would have been $2.85. So that a minimum wage of $3 was established for these men who are not paid by contract but on a basis of what is ordinarily termed piece work. However, the agreement, as I have said, was turned down, and so the miners of Nova Scotia have reverted, as far as their wages are concerned, to the findings of the conciliation board of which Mr. Gillen of Toronto was chairman; and they are in a worse position than they would have been had they accepted the further proposals contemplated by the agreement entered into by the operators and by a majority of the board.

Knowing the career in this country of my hon. friend (Mr. Irvine) who moved the adjournment, I know that he is wholeheartedly in favour of the labour people of this country getting a fair show. So am I, Sir; that is the position I have taken ever since I first participated in the politics of this country, and even before that. Now the trouble seems to be that, so far as legislation enacted by this Parliament is concerned, there remains nothing else to be done, and the federal government has refused to appoint a royal commission to consider the question. My hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) has stated that the United Mine Workers have done everything they could to cause the Government of Nova Scotia to act, but without avail. I can tell my hon. friend that he is somewhat mistaken in that statement. I have kept in the very closest touch with the situation since coming here, and I am aware that last week the Minister of Mines for Nova Scotia, Hon. Mr. Armstrong, wired Mr. Baxter, who is president of the United Mine Workers of America in that district, inviting him to come to Halifax,—and I may say in passing that Mr. Baxter is one of those who recommended to the miners under his charge, the adoption of the agreement entered into in Montreal. At a joint meeting held in the New Savoy theatre in Glace Bay last Sunday night, at which Mr. McLachlan, the secretary-treasurer, and Mr. Baxter, the president—who are taking opposite sides on this matter—were present, Mr. Baxter made the statement that Mr. Armstrong, provincial Minister of Mines, informed him that if the miners in the district would go back to work and not loaf on the job—as they were advised to do and as I think they are doing to some extent—he would appoint a royal commission to investigate the whole coal mine situation in the province of Nova Scotia. I am sorry to say that, according to my advices and instructions from that meeting his recommendations in effect were turned down. My hon. friend from East Calgary says that the coal miners have exhausted all their appeals so far as the government of Nova Scotia is concerned. Well, I want to point out that there is on the statute books of Nova Scotia the best piece of legislation—in so far as arbitration between miners and operators is concerned—that could possibly exist. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it excels, far excels, what is commonly called the Lemieux Act, or Conciliation Act, of the Dominion under which conciliation boards are held. I want to point out that this legislation is embodied

in Chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900. Now, there is no appeal from an arbitration board instituted under Dominion legislation; there is no way of compelling either party to the negotiations to accept the recommendations of the conciliation board; there is no higher tribunal to which either party may appeal. May I point out that under the arbitration provided for between miners and employers in Nova Scotia, if those on either side do not agree with the finding of the arbitrators, they may appeal to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia consisting of seven judges—who have always been, and I believe yet are, eminently fair men.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the government of Nova Scotia doing in this matter? And is it the case that certain members of that government are shareholders in this particular corporation?

Mr. CARROLL: Answering my hon. friend's second question first, permit me to say that I do not know who the shareholders in the British Empire Steel Corporation are. However, I can take my hon. friend into my confidence and tell him that, happily, I am not one. In reply to his other question let me remind him that I have already stated what the Minister of Mines in Nova Scotia was willing to do if the miners would come to the conclusion that they would give a fair day's work for the wages which they were receiving. That communication was made to the miners through Mr. Baxter, President of the Union, at a mass meeting in Glace Bay on last Sunday evening, and was turned down by that meeting. In further answer to my hon. friend I may say that the government of Nova Scotia does not take the initiative under the provincial legislation to which I refer; the initiation must be taken either by the employees, that is, the miners, or the operators. They must make application to the Minister of Mines of the province, and if he is satisfied that they have established a good case he will grant a board. The men appoint two arbitrators and the operators appoint two and—as is usual in other arbitration cases—if they do not agree a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia appoints the fifth arbitrator. Whatever may be said of the present or past Ministers of Labour of Canada, whatever may be said as to the character and political affiliations of the men whom they have appointed as chairman of these conciliation boards—whose appointment is part of the minister's duty—surely little fault can be found with a provision that a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia shall appoint the fifth arbitrator of a provincial board. And in that respect I say the act governing arbitration between miners and employees in the province of Nova Scotia is away ahead of the legislation which has been passed by this government in the Lemieux Act.

I am not going to criticise the leaders in Nova Scotia who think they are properly advising the men when they ask them to strike on the job. That is a matter for the executive of the United Mine Workers of Nova Scotia, and I suppose they know their business better than I do. But I think it passing strange that the executive of the United Mine Workers of the province of Nova Scotia have been so poorly advised by these legal lights who have been giving them legal advice in the past two years, that they have not yet been informed that there is such a magnificent piece of legislation upon the statute book of Nova Scotia to arbitrate and settle wage disputes. Neither am I here to say, Mr. Speaker, anything concerning the telegraphic communications between Mr. McLachlan, the Secretary-Treasurer of the United Mine Workers, and my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). That is their business. But something should be done to attempt, at least to bring those people together again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARROLL: I say that I believe—and I am not saying this on account of the fact that Mr. McLachlan and myself had some little controversies over politics in the last election—that Mr. McLachlan broke faith with the executive after he left Montreal, and he broke faith with the executive when he went down to Nova Scotia and did not assist them in putting through the agreement which was reached there. I believe that the miner, in common with every other class of labour in this country, is entitled to a fair and living wage. I think I can go so far as to say that there are some classes of labour in the province of New Brunswick, as in other parts of the Dominion of Canada, who are not paid a fair or living wage.

I did not know this discussion was coming up to-day. While my hon. friend from East Calgary was perfectly within his right in moving adjournment in order to discuss this matter, I am sorry he did not give notice of the discussion. He was perfectly in order in the course he has taken, and he did give notice to the Minister of

Labour (Mr. Murdock). I regret that I did not have some time to prepare myself on the various phases on the findings of the conciliation board. As a matter of fact, I think the findings of the conciliation board were somewhat worse than described by the hon gentleman from East Calgary. Not only was there a cut of 22½ per cent on the wages which certain men were receiving, but the 55 cents which was granted to those men by a previous board was taken off. It meant 22 per cent in some cases, plus 55 cents. In other cases it meant a 15 per cent cut plus 55 cents. Those getting $3.80 before, got more as a result of the findings of the arbitration board than did those who were getting $4. These were some of the little inconsistencies of findings of the board, and, perhaps that was the reason why the Dominion Coal Company went into further negotiations after that finding had been made.

I might tell the House, in reference to the question of loafing on the job—I forget the other word; oh, yes, sabotage—that that is where the war is on between the Dominion Coal Company and the men at the present time. The Dominion Coal Company tell the men: "You know what you are going down into the mine for. You know when you go into the mine you are going to receive $3.00 a day, and we want you to do a good day's work for that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman enlighten me on a certain point? I have been informed that the great body of the men, indeed all the coal miners, are what we always called piece-workers, who received so much a ton. Therefore, they only get as much pay as they earn, whether they follow the order of which he complains, or whether they do as they did before. Consequently, how does he describe that as "loafing on the job?"

Mr. CARROLL: I think my right hon. friend is right. I think about 70 per cent of the employees are datal men at the present time. They receive so much a day. The remainder of the men get so much for the amount of coal taken out. Those are the men who work at the face of the mine. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with mining know what that means. But the men who dig the coal and blow out the coal, are all paid by what they produce, and those are the men who are hurt by loafing on the job. They will not loaf on a job. It is in their interests to produce all the coal they can. The more coal they produce the more money will be in the envelope on Saturday evening. But the men who take the coal from those producers, and get it to the top of the mine, are paid not less than $3 a day. It does not make a bit of difference whether they take out one ton or twenty tons, they get their $3. In that way the war is to this effect; that the men are trying to enhance the cost of production in order to bring the Dominion Coal Company to their knees and get better terms. As my right hon. friend says, the only men who suffer are those who produce the coal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are they not parties to the arrangement by which they produce only so much? And are not the other men reduced by the company to such numbers as will only take care of the production of piece-work men?

Mr. CARROLL: I was coming to that. If a datal man refuses to carry the produce of the mines to the surface, he is immediately dismissed; and my latest advice from the mines last Tuesday was that 96 such men have already been dismissed from two mines of the Dominion Coal Company, who operate twenty-three or twenty-four mines in that area. Now, regarding watered stock, if what the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) has said is correct, it is a most unfortunate thing that a corporation operating a basic industry should secure an act of incorporation by which they could have $1,000,000 or $2,000,000, or, as my hon. friend has said, $19,000,000 of watered stock. I think the time has come when legislatures and the federal Parliament of Canada should say to such people: So far shall you go, but no further. I do not know how much watered stock the British Empire Steel Corporation has, but my hon. friend has stated that they have so many millions. A man does not need to be able to read or write to see that if there is $2,000,000 of watered stock in a company, when the accountant goes over the books to see how much they can pay their employees and get fair dividends for the money invested in the business, the men will have the worst of the bargain and will get lower wages than if the capital of the company consisted in actual dollars duly paid into the coffers of the corporation.

As regards the investigation into the affairs of this company, I fully agree with certain members of the Government, with whom I have discussed the matter, that if there is anything wrong in the company's organization, if it has any watered stock—

I have no reference to their votes—it is the duty of the government of Nova Scotia, not of this Parliament, to investigate the matter. I do not think that the federal Parliament should investigate the affairs of a company incorporated under the laws of a province. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell) that it is not only the duty, but it would be to the material advantage of the province of Nova Scotia, to make every effort possible to bring about a settlement of this unfortunate difficulty. On every ton of coal produced by the Dominion Coal Company in Nova Scotia the local government receives a royalty of 12½ cents, and if the output of coal falls off it is obvious that the revenue of the province must decline. And, while I in no way represent any member of the provincial government and do not speak for any member of the Provincial Assembly or the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, I feel that if an application were made to the Government of the province, under the provisions of Chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900, and the men did their part while the negotiations were in progress, and stopped loafing, the government of the province would jump at the chance of giving them a board under that statute. I am saying this not so much in answer to my hon. friend, because I am not attempting to answer him, since I think he and I feel much the same way about the matter. But I am trying to show that the mine workers of Nova Scotia have not taken the opportunity of having their difficulties settled under the local statute and by a government which must of necessity be deeply concerned if the production of coal is curtailed.

I am deeply interested in this dispute because of its public importance. It not only affects 12,000 coal miners in Nova Scotia, but, as well, every man and woman in the province living east of the county of Hants. In the county of Cape Breton, at Sydney, we have a great steel corporation which employs 8,000 or 10,000 men, and if the coal industry goes down the steel industry will naturally die, because there is an agreement between the Dominion Steel Company and the Dominion Coal Company whereby the former gets its coal for practically nothing. The dispute, therefore, not only affects the 12,000 miners to whom reference has been made, but it affects 9,000 steel workers in Sydney, 3,000 or 4,000 more steel workers at Sydney Mines, and 3,000 or 4,000 steel workers in the county of Pictou. Furthermore, it affects the bread and butter of every man living in the vicinity of these large industrial concerns. For these reasons I believe that the government of Nova Scotia will do everything in its power, when the proper procedure is followed, to get the miners of Nova Scotia and the operators together to discuss the difficulty under the provisions of the Act I have cited. I know what I am talking about, because Mr. Armstrong sent to the president of the United Mine Workers a message which was delivered to the coal miners in the town of Glace Bay last Sunday evening, to the effect that if peace reigned for the time being he would institute a royal commission to investigate and re-canvass the whole coal mining situation in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend says, "If peace reigns once more." I do not know just what he means by that.

Mr. CARROLL: If peace should reign for the time being, I said. Mr. Armstrong sent a message to the president of the United Mine Workers asking them to proceed for the time being and get as much production as they could, and that he would then institute a royal commission. But I would say to the mining population of Nova Scotia that as a lawyer I would give them this advice: Do not ask the Government for a royal commission, because the findings of that commission, whether they are against you or are in your favour, cannot be enforced, and you have no appeal from them. Go to a board, the chairman of which is appointed by a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, the findings of which, if against you, can be reviewed by five of the Supreme Court judges of the province. If that procedure is followed I believe that the miners will get a fair deal and that peace will reign once more in the mining areas.

I am deeply concerned from the personal standpoint in the early solution of this difficulty, because if the trouble continues it will mean that the large industrial centres which have grown up in the locality during the past twenty years, and of which we are all proud, will decline, and the population will ultimately have to get out. Further, it will mean that the provincial government will be unable to carry on its legitimate business because it will lose the royalties, amounting to millions of dollars, which are now being paid by the Dominion Coal Company and other corporations. It will

also entail untold sorrow, trouble and suffering to the men and their families, and that to my mind is the most serious feature of the situation. I hope it is true that the delegation has been advised by the Government that no royal commission will be appointed at the present time. This morning I conferred with the four mayors —very estimable gentlemen—and I told them of the Arbitration Act, and I advised them to go back to Nova Scotia, and get the miners to instruct their lawyers to put that law into operation.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, for having taken up so much time, but this is a serious matter and must be settled without further delay. Whether it will be settled by the authorities of Nova Scotia or by the federal authorities, it must be settled, for we cannot afford to have a continuance of the situation which prevails in Nova Scotia at the present time. I am not going to say whose fault it is that the present conditions exist, I am not going to offer any criticism of the parties to the dispute. I am here simply to outline in a general way the causes and the results of that unfortunate misunderstanding between capital and labour, and to advise, if I may, those interested how, to my mind, the misunderstanding may be settled. Having done that, and having assisted the delegation in every possible way, I hope, Sir, that this House will at least feel that I have done my duty as I see it.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) did not advise me—no doubt through an oversight —that he proposed to bring this matter up to-day. It is, however, only fair to say that a newspaper gentleman, a friend of mine, notified me at ten minutes past one. I am indeed glad that this question has been brought to the notice of the House, because I find that hon. gentlemen in this chamber and elsewhere appear to be, and quite rightly, very much interested in this grave situation as it concerns the miners and other citizens of Nova Scotia.

The commencement of the dispute between the miners and the British Empire Steel Corporation and other employing coal companies was prior to the 29th December last when I became Minister of Labour.

My predecessor, Hon Mr. Robertson—a gentleman for whom, by the way, I have always had and still have the greatest admiration and respect as a representative of labour and as an exponent, so far as his understanding goes, of the proper aims, and ambitions, and contentions of labour, —took the initiative in dealing with the situation, as was quite proper that he should do. He had instituted a board of investigation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and appointed to it Mayor Ling, of New Waterford, one of the delegation of Nova Scotia mayors now in Ottawa, to whom my hon. friend from East Calgary has referred. On the declination by the company to name a representative my predecessor also appointed a Mr. Thompson of Halifax. So I came into office as his successor to find the board formed thus far and waiting for the appointment of a chairman. It was my first appointment of a chairman of a board of investigation, and I have no regrets to express or apologies to offer for my choice of chairman. Indeed, if I had it to do again I would make the same choice.

In the light of certain suggestions that have been made during the past few days by the deputation from Nova Scotia and by certain hon. members, the belief might be indicated that the board should have been instructed to go on the ground and investigate at first hand all the facts and circumstances in connection with the everyday life of these miners, and of the organization of the British Empire Steel Corporation.

But the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act contemplates giving some latitude, to a reasonable board of investigation appointed to inquire into a matter of this kind. As I understand it, it has not been considered altogether proper for the Minister of Labour to suggest to any such board just how or in what manner or where they should conduct their investigation with a view to arriving at a proper decision. The board, as has been stated, was formed, and while it was in session I presumed to send to Nova Scotia a very capable officer of the department in order that he might go on the ground in the mining towns of Cape Breton and ascertain what the actual conditions were. At that particular time much publicity was given in the press to the statement that riots had broken out, that stores of the Dominion Coal Company had been robbed, and that, on the whole, a very serious situation had arisen. It was intimated that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be sent down there to assist in bringing order out of chaos. But so far as I was concerned I felt that nothing of the kind should be done, I did believe that as Minister of Labour I was entitled to

have from a trusted employee of the department a first-hand statement as to the actual conditions prevailing in the mining villages of Nova Scotia. I am sorry to say that I must have been too presumptuous in sending a federal employee to that district and in that capacity, because when he got to Halifax he was given to understand, in substance, that he had better mind his own business and get back to Ottawa. I wired him, however, to proceed forthwith, and to furnish a report with regard to the conditions in the various mining towns.

The first result of the investigation was that Mayor Ling, one of the deputation of Nova Scotia mayors now in our city and representative of the miners on the board could not agree with the other two members, Mr. U. E. Gillen, of Toronto, chairman, and Mr. Thompson, representative of the British Empire Steel Corporation. It seemed to have been impossible to arrive at a unanimous understanding, consequently a majority and a minority award were filed with the department. The majority award was very voluminous indeed. It is about half an inch thick, comprising typewritten matter, and covers the entire situation as the chairman and the representative of the company saw it. The report of the majority was accepted by the General Manager of the British Empire Steel Corporation. The representatives of the employees declared that they would submit the matter to the men, which was very proper. I wish now to take you through a few of the stages in connection with the handling of the matter since that time, in order that you may see whether this Government; whether this department; whether this youthful, and, in a parliamentary way, inexperienced Minister of Labour,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURDOCK: Admitted, before you applauded. I want you to see whether we have stood ready, in season and out of season, day and night, to do anything constitutionally possible to secure for these men in Nova Scotia a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. I hope that no hon. member of this House, that no individual throughout the length and breadth of Canada, has any doubt as to where my sympathies are in the matter of securing for the labouring man a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. But I am not ready to concede now, nor shall I be in the months and years to come, that if—

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. MURDOCK: The Toronto Telegram, you know, said that the Murdock voice could reach to the farthest corner of any hall. I would not like to have anybody come to me after the House rises and intimate that he had been unable to hear me.

I am not ready to concede now, nor shall I be in the months and years to come, that the belief on the part of some employees or their representatives that a fair day's wage has not been given justifies their pretending to work for an employer at that particular wage while at the same time declaring to the world that they are going to cut the output and thus penalize the employer. I have never, in something like twenty-five or twenty-six years' experience as a labouring man and as a representative of labour, held that view, and I do not now, as Minister of Labour, intend to hold it or to follow any such policy.

Shortly after we were able to get the majority and minority awards in such shape that they could be given to the parties concerned, we received from Mr. McLachlan copy of a letter addressed to Mr. E. P. Merrill, general manager of the Dominion Coal Company, dated February 6, reading as follows:

> This is to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 4th inst., stating that your Company is prepared to accept the finding of the U. E. Gillen Conciliation Board with certain minor adjustments to preserve rate differentials not fully covered by the wording of the award.
>
> Replying I wish to state that the question of accepting or rejecting the award shall be voted on by our people on the 10th instant. However, in order that they may know the attitude of your Company, I shall mail to-day to each local union a copy of your letter for their information. In the absence of the other members of the Executive Board and using my own best judgment I shall be unable to recommend to the local unions the acceptance of your offer as a settlement of this wage dispute.
>
> I am,
> Yours truly,
> J. B. McLachlan.

As I see it, that letter is couched in absolutely proper and consistent language. I blame not at all Mr. McLachlan for coming out frankly, in man-fashion, and indicating to Mr. Merrill, the general manager, that he could not recommend the acceptance of the award to the miners. He had a perfect right to do that. Let us proceed to further developments.

Under date of February 17, Mr. McLachlan wrote another letter to Mr. E. P. Merrill as follows:

> Replying further to your letter dated February 4, 1922, I wish to advise you that the members of District No. 26, United Mine

Workers of America voted on the award made by the Gillen Conciliation Board and the vote resulted as follows: for the Award, 468; against the Award, 10,305; all of which means that the proposition made in your letter of the 4th instant has been overwhelmingly rejected by the miners.

No doubt your Company must feel by this time that a great mistake was made in Montreal when your officers informed the representatives of the miners that the Company would now look after its own interest and refused to allow negotiations to proceed along the legitimate lines followed with fair success during recent wage contracts. The almost unanimous condemnation by the press, the pulpit and the public of the drastic action of your Company in slashing the miners' wages in the manner you did, and the complete alienation of the sympathies of some of your own most loyal officials must indicate that the day has gone forever when one-sided wage bargains can be made effective.

When men have made such mistakes as your Company has made, mistakes which have brought down on their heads wholesale condemnation, there is only one thing left open for them to do, pocket their pride, and retrace the fatal steps at the first opportunity and remove the cause of the condemnation.

The miners are having a convention in Truro on the 23rd instant, and I would suggest that the coal companies comprised in the British Empire Steel Corporation send representatives there for the purpose of negotiating a new wage agreement. Until a wage agreement is arrived at mutually I cannot see where your Company can reasonably hope to have any stability in the coal industry of Nova Scotia.

Trusting that your representatives can be present at Truro on the 23rd instant, I am,

Yours truly,

J. B. McLachlan,
Secretary, District No. 22, U.M.W. of A.

Once more I express the view that there is nothing wrong whatsoever in the statements made by Mr. McLachlan in that letter. Had I been in his position under the existing circumstances, I might have written more insistently even than he did.

Then, under date of February 22, the Minister of Labour, new on the job, was interested in trying to see if something could not be done, and so he wired Mr. J. B. McLachlan, who was to be at Truro with the other representatives of District No. 26 the following day, as follows:

Your letter seventeenth enclosing copy of communication same date forwarded to General Manager Dominion Coal Company not received until to-day. Terms of same noted, also fact that miners are holding convention at Truro, Thursday, twenty-third, and have invited British Empire Steel Corporation to send representatives for purpose of negotiating new wage agreement. Minister will be pleased to have word from you at your earliest convenience as to outcome of any efforts in direction indicated.

To that the reply was as follows, under date of February 23:

Telegram received. No coal operators present here. Would be pleased to have Department use good offices looking towards settlements. Convention may continue until Saturday.

At once I instructed the deputy minister to send the following telegram, dated February 23:

D. H. McDougall, Vice President, British Empire Steel Corporation, Montreal.

Minister asks me to bring to your attention communications exchanged between J. B. McLachlan, Secretary District 26 United Mine Workers of America, Glace Bay, and the undersigned. Mr. McLachlan forwarded under date 17th instant copy of letter mailed same date to Mr. E. P. Merrill, General Manager Dominion Coal Company, Sydney, N. S., notifying Mr. Merrill that miners were having convention in Truro on 23rd instant and suggested that "coal companies comprising the British Empire Steel Corporation send representatives there for the purpose of negotiating a new wage agreement." On receipt yesterday of Mr. McLachlan's letter following wire was by Minister's instructions addressed by undersigned to Mr. McLachlan:

"Your letter seventeenth enclosing copy of communication same date forwarded to General Manager, Dominion Coal, not received until to-day. Terms of same noted, also fact that miners are holding convention at Truro, Thursday, twenty-third, and have invited British Empire Steel Coroporation to send representatives for purpose of negotiating new wage agreement.

"Minister will be pleased to have word from you at your earliest convenience as to outcome of any efforts in direction indicated."

To-day undersigned is in receipt of message from McLachlan as follows:

"Telegram received. No coal operators present here. Would be pleased to have Department use good offices looking towards settlement. Convention may continue until Saturday."

Minister observes Mr. McLachlan's statement that, "no coal operators present here" and asks if you do not think would be desirable Company should take steps immediately to be represented at miners' convention, accepting workmen's invitation, and thus doing its part in endeavouring to negotiate a wage settlement. Minister will be pleased to have word from you.

To that Mr. D. H. McDougall replied by wire as follows:

MONTREAL, February 25, 1922.

In reply to your telegram yesterday would state we mailed Department 10th instant copy of our letter fourth offering to negotiate contract with our mine workers on basis Award of Gillen Conciliation Board appointed by Minister at request of mine workers, and also copy of J. B. McLachlan's reply. This reply, together with McLachlan's letter to our General Manager Merrill, under date seventeenth, inviting us to send representatives to mine workers' convention at Truro (being a further reply to our letter fourth) we regard as being merely expression McLachlan's personal opinions and not as authorized official communications from District 26.

Said communications have been written by McLachlan in absence of President Baxter and other responsible executive officials in attendance on Indianapolis convention.

Truro convention is being held for purpose of considering offer made in our letter of fourth, and we understand is confined to officials and delegates of union. We anticipate that when matter has been discussed in convention a further official communication may be addressed to us outlining the attitude the executive officials of the union are empowered to take in regard to further negotiations with the coal companies.

In the meantime, as notified you by letter from our general manager under date twenty-first instant, we have put into effect the Gillen award with some necessary adjustments that have substantially modified the award in favour of the mine workers and are making retroactive payment to January first of difference in rates of wages betwen our schedule of January first, and the schedule as modified by Gillen award.

D. H. McDOUGALL.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with some of the later phases of this condition. On the same date, February 25, we received a telegram from Mr. E. H. Armstrong, Minister of Public Works and Mines of Nova Scotia, as follows:

Personal. Truro convention to consider action miners *re* Gillen award. Requested further conference with officials Besco Monday next but am advised no answer. Have just wired McDougall and Wolvin urging favourable and prompt consideration. Believe under all circumstances this course advisable and will bring about more satisfactory solution. Appreciate any co-operation you can reasonably suggest.

E. H. ARMSTRONG,
Minister of Public Works and Mines.

At once we took the matter up with a view to getting a representative of the Labour Department to see if a further conference could not be brought about. The later developments were that the representatives of the miners came from Truro to Montreal to meet the officials of the British Empire Steel Corporation, and I want to read to you a report made to the Deputy Minister of Labour by the gentleman representing the Labour Department who was present at that meeting. It is as follows:

MONTREAL, March 2, 1922.

F. A. ACLAND, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Acland,—I enclose for record, text of the agreement reached between the United Mine Workers of Nova Scotia, through Robert Baxter, president, and committee, and the British Empire Steel Corporation and constituent companies, represented by Mr. D. H. McDougall.

The agreement was negotiated in Montreal by a conference extending over a period of three days, i.e., Feb. 27th and 28th, and March 1st.

The department representative, E. McG. Quirk, was present at the conferences and assisted in an intermediary capacity.

Mr. J. P. White, of the International, was present in an advisory capacity, rendering very material assistance.

The sense of the agreement will be submitted to the locals for ratification. When ratified the company will be prepared to resume operations on an increased scale.

Yours truly,
E. McG. QUIRK.

The text of the agreement which is referred to in that communication is as follows:

MONTREAL, 1st March, 1922.

The members of district executive board of District 26, U.M.W. of A., having been authorized by a district conference held in Truro, February 23 to 25 to interview the management of the British Empire Steel Corporation and ascertain the best terms the management could offer as a basis for a settlement of the outstanding wage questions, the following was finally mutually agreed to:

First.—The management has already accepted and put into effect—

Mr. CRERAR: Do I understand that Mr. McLachlan was present at this conference in Montreal?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: And did he concur in the agreement you are about to read?

Mr. MURDOCK: I may say to my hon. friend from Marquette that the agreement is signed, on behalf of District No. 26 by Robert Baxter, who, I understand, is president. My understanding further is that Mr. McLachlan and other members of the executive committee were present, and I think that point will be proven a little later. To continue with the reading of the agreement:

—the rates recommended under the Gillen award, and, in addition thereto, has voluntarily made an adjustment of the datal rates between the minimum rate of $2.85 per day and certain other slightly higher rates, and agrees to increase the minimum datal rate to $3 per day.

2. The companies will not object to inclusion in this wage agreement of employees in the general machine shops and shot-firers employed at the collieries.

A committee equally composed of representatives of the coal companies and the men to decide on what others of the employees, excluded on January 1st, should be included in the scope of the agreement.

3. The conditions of the Montreal agreement to remain in force in all particulars except as regards the rates of wages and as herein modified.

The terms above written to become effective between the 1st January, 1922, and 30th November, 1922, when ratified by members of District 26, both sides to agree to meet twenty days before the expiration of the agreement, for the purpose of arranging a new understanding.

On behalf of District No. 26, U.M.W. of America,

ROBERT BAXTER.
DOMINION COAL COMPANY, LIMITED,
R. M. Wolvin, President.
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL & COAL COMPANY, LIMITED,
D. H. McDougall, President.
ACADIA COAL COMPANY, LIMITED,
D. H. McDougall, Vice-President.

Dated at Montreal, 1st March, 1922.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what the fact is, but one would rather gather that the men's representatives at that meeting numbered seven and that four of them were in favour of the offer which the minister has read, but that three, including Mr. McLachlan, were against it.

Mr. MURDOCK: My understanding is that at that particular meeting there were not seven; I think only three or four of the district officers came up for the purposes of this meeting, although my hon. friend is probably correct in understanding that there are eight officers of the district committee. Recently these eight officers took official action in connection with Mr. McLachlan's proposal to cut the output or "loaf on the job," the result being that three of the committee went with Mr. McLachlan and three against him. The papers indicate that some of them have since resigned. Mr. Baxter, who occupied the chair as president, did not vote. We can therefore reasonably and properly assume that the mine workers' executive committee of eight was evenly divided, four against four, on the proposition to cut the output or "loaf on the job." It seems that the agreement, which was tenatively entered into at Montreal as between representatives of the miners and representatives of the coal companies, was carried back to secure the votes of the individual miners, as to acceptance or rejection. I find no fault with the manner in which certain organizations or committees representing workmen undertake to deal with such questions, but, fortunately or unfortunately, my experience has been, in the representation of labour, that when an agreement was entered into and determined upon as satisfactory by the representatives of workmen, it should not be held as a football, to be kicked here and there, and decided out in the open by various individuals, even although some of my good friends and others will tell you they had a perfect right to do that. The point is that here was an agreement which, on the first day of March, in the city of Montreal, in the opinion of those directly representing the Miners' Association, was something better than had been conceded by the Gillen award, and something that could reasonably offer a basis of settlement. You and I know that, when that committee representing the workers went back to the miners of Nova Scotia, they were divided in their recommendations to these workmen and their families as to whether that award should be accepted or not. I am not criticizing that, but I regard it as indeed a distinct misfortune that it should have been found possible and consistent to make an agreement in Montreal on the first day of March that could not have been made by the board of arbitration sitting in Halifax some two weeks earlier. I do not know why it was that the direct representatives of these coal companies met in Montreal on the first day of March and offered more favourable conditions, some slight increases in compensation over and above what, evidently, their representatives on the board of investigation had been prepared and disposed to give when the matter was being dealt with in Halifax. It is one of the unfortunate circumstances in connection with this situation that it was possible to do that, and it is one of the phases of the situation that has given much ground and opportunity for alleging that boards of investigation, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, are weak and useless in dealing with matters of this kind. It is a misfortune it was done at that particular time. I would like to deal with a few of the references made by my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) in regard to this situation. In his opening remarks as I understood him, he told this House—and I am sure he will correct me if I am wrong—that the wages of the miners of Nova Scotia were 70 per cent lower than the wages for similar work in the mines of British Columbia and Alberta.

5 p.m.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Seventeen per cent, I think.

Mr. MURDOCK: I understood 70 per cent.

Mr. IRVINE: It was 71.

Mr. MURDOCK: We were both wrong.

Mr. IRVINE: I said the cost of living was 17 per cent higher in Nova Scotia, and the wages 71 per cent lower.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am obliged for the correction. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman had not the slightest intention of presenting an inaccurate conception of facts to this House, but what are the facts? As my hon. friend from East Calgary know, the facts in regard to the mines in District 18, British Columbia and Alberta, are that notification has been given by the operators in that territory

that wages will be brought down very materially, effective on Saturday morning next, April 1. So that my hon. friend's statement, which would indicate that the wages of miners in Alberta and British Columbia are 71 per cent higher than in Nova Scotia, is far-fetched indeed. I am sure he will concede that as a matter of fact.

Mr. IRVINE: Can the hon. minister tell me if the proposed reduction in wages has been accepted by the miners of Alberta?

Mr. MURDOCK: The answer to my hon. friend's question is, no, but according to the proposals of the operators in District 18, effective on Saturady morning next, wage cuts of materially lower standards than those that have, under war time and post-war conditions existed in that territory are, it is said, to go into effect. What is the comparison of those wages that have been posted as going into effect on Saturday morning with the wages we are discussing for datal men in Nova Scotia? In British Columbia and Alberta the wage for datal men is proposed at $3.25 for the lower standards of pay, as against the wage rate agreed to in Montreal on March 1, between the representatives of United Mine Workers and the officials of Nova Scotia companies. I do not hold for one moment that $3 or $3.25 is a living wage under certain conditions, and do not let any hon. gentleman in this House, or any gentleman outside of this House, understand that I am contending anything of the kind. I take the position that it is hardly fair for us to undertake to influence hon. gentlemen in this House, or the public at large, and to create the belief that there is such a wide margin of difference as between Nova Scotia and Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. IRVINE: Is it not perfectly fair for us to take into consideration in this comparison the actual wages that are being paid now in Nova Scotia with the actual wages that are being paid in Alberta? If that is not the proper way to consider it, what other method can we adopt?

Mr. MURDOCK: I will leave the question of the equity or the fairness of that method of presenting the question to be determined in the minds of hon. members of this House. The hon. gentleman from Calgary, as he spoke for to-day and to-morrow, was substantially, and, so far as I know, absolutely correct in his comparison of percentages as to wages. He may have been entirely correct for to-day and to-morrow, but I hope it will not be regarded as altogether improper for me to present, at least, the other point of view. Then my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine) laid stress upon the minority report which was filed in this investigation held in Halifax. Personally I should have been happy indeed had it been possible, and consistent with due regard to the rights of employer, employed and, above all, the general public, to have suggested that the minority report as handed in to the department on this question by Mayor Ling, of New Waterford, should be adopted. But my hon. friend surely knows that the only authority that this Government has in dealing with such matters is to be found in the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. We had no option then, and surely have no option now, being bound by that law, to compel the findings of one man directly representing the employees to be made effective. And then my hon. friend said, if I quote his exact words, as I think I do: "The men naturally struck on the job." In all reverence I say, Heaven forbid that the time should ever come when it should be regarded as necessary by labouring men, accepting a wage of any kind, to strike on a job. Again I repeat, red-blooded Canadian citizens will never do any such thing; and anyone who undertakes to countenance any such suggestion is only looking to the ruin of the constitutional rights and liberties of the citizenship of this country. I myself regard it as a misfortune that anyone should stand in the councils of the nation, and, even by inference or suggestion, convey the view that there is anything fair, honourable or decent in striking on the job. One of the greatest misfortunes that have existed in years gone by, and one that is with us at this moment in Canada, is the theorist who has cures for all the ills of labour, some of which contemplate being as indecent and unfair as may be necessary to win your point with the employer, while at the same time accepting the full demonstration of charity and decent treatment for yourself. Forget it, I say, to the labouring man or his representative who advocates such a policy. Even if any such policy might be desired by this Government or by the people of the country, I have more respect for my own conscience than to participate, even as a Minister of the Crown, in promulgating, or forwarding, or countenancing any such claim on the part of Labour directly or through anybody pre-

suming to represent Labour. Labour has got to be fair and decent, and in case someone might form an improper opinion on the matter, let me say this: In the sixteen years or so that I was an officer of a labour organization, I personally gave sanction to more strikes than any other officer the organization had, and I have no apologies to offer for having done so; nor should I lose my nerve, either, if I were back at the job. But I believe there is decency and equity in all things; and it was not, nor is it now, decent for us to be dallying with the suggestion that the men "naturally struck on the job," while accepting, or pretending to work for, a wage rate, be it ever so small. I do not argue that it is sufficient. Personally, I regard it as a misfortune indeed that the British Empire Steel Corporation, out of the sum of $3,000,000 paid to them from the demobilization funds, by the party in power on the 25th of November last, could not have utilized a portion and given a little more decent consideration to these mine workers in Nova Scotia. But they have not done so. I assume that that $3,000,000 has gone to do what my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) so well suggested, namely, to pay dividends on watered stock. I do not subscribe to any such thing, and so long as I may remain a member of this House or of the Government, my voice will be lifted and my effort directed against the continuation of such practices.

My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine) suggested to this House the name of a gentleman of Montreal, a Mr. Howard Ross, as eminently qualified to investigate this whole matter. It is rather peculiar that the gentleman who called me by telephone to advise me that this matter was coming up this afternoon also suggested the name of Mr. Howard Ross. I have not the honour of the acquaintance of Mr. Ross; he may be of the highest standing and the most responsible character in Canada; but, as a general proposition, I am not disposed, as Minister of Labour, to accept such recommendations coming in such a manner, because I have found by some experience that sometimes those who are sympathetic to labour make recommendations which are really favourable and consistent only from their own point of view. The representations made on behalf of Mr. Howard Ross, whoever the gentleman is, would unfortunately have made me suspicious of considering his appointment as possibly biased toward one side unduly, if anything of the kind had been contemplated.

My hon. friend referred to something about a fair day's work for a day's pay. I think that that is the entire question. It is true that a deputation from Nova Scotia mining towns came to this city and made representations to my honoured leader and other members of the Cabinet that a royal commission should be appointed. But I do not think that I am giving away any secrets when I say that those gentlemen, individually and collectively, advised us that they were speaking only for the citizens of their respective towns, who were not actually employed as miners, and that they could give no guarantee that even if a royal commission were appointed it would be accepted. Is that a fair view of the entire situation? In other words—and I do not want in any way to disparage the position of my hon. friend from East Calgary or those for whom he is speaking—is it fair for us to have suggested to us the appointment of a royal commission especially for the other citizens in these mining villages in face of the frank statement that maybe after the royal commission had thoroughly investigated the situation and made its recommendations the miners might not accept them? No, no, surely nothing so one-sided as that could be thought of for a minute.

My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) referred to the opportunities for these miners to get the necessary co-operation and, I hope, some assistance from the provincial authorities if the proper steps were taken. Last night there was given to the press a statement of the position of the Government,—not a statement of the position of the Minister of Labour, please, although I whole-heartedly subscribe to every statement contained herein. For the sake of accuracy I want to include this statement in Hansard. It is as follows:

Ottawa, March 29th, 1922.

Yesterday a deputation, consisting of D. W. Morrison, Mayor of Glace Bay, J. M. McLean, Mayor of Dominion, N. S., James Ling, Mayor of New Waterford, N. S., and Mayor Wilson of Spring Hill, Cumberland County, N. S., accompanied by Messrs. Carroll, Macdonald, Kyte, Chisholm and Logan, Members of Parliament for the various coal-mining constituencies of Nova Scotia, waited upon the Prime Minister, who was accompanied by the Hon. W. S. Fielding, Hon D. D. McKenzie and Hon. James Murdock. The deputation placed before the Government a memorial dealing with the alleged very serious situation existing in the coal mining industry in Nova Scotia,

and suggested the appointment of a Royal Commission to go on the ground and thoroughly investigate the entire question affecting the coal mining industry and the alleged attitude of the British Empire Steel Corporation in dealing with its employees.

Careful consideration was promised and given to the representations made by the deputation who were advised that the decision of the Government would be stated as early as possible.

Under all circumstances the Government has deemed it inadvisable to appoint a Royal Commission. It should be understood that in its decision the Government has been influenced by the attitude of Mr. McLachlan, Secretary of the United Mine Workers of America, who has indicated his intent to insist on the employees in the coal-mining industry cutting the output and doing as little work as possible for the wages being paid. To grant a commission in view of the declarations and attitude of Mr. McLachlan would in the opinion of the Government be placing a premium on the advocacy of the methods most prejudicial to the public interest and unfair as respects relations between employer and employees. Press reports also indicate that the miners have repudiated advice as to reasonable and consistent loyalty to the employer from other representatives of the employees and have proposed that Mr. McLachlan should be regarded as the dictator of the miners' policy, which policy as outlined by Mr. McLachlan cannot in any measure be countenanced by the Government. The Government regrets exceedingly the alleged existing conditions in Nova Scotia, but cannot be a party to countenancing the position taken by Mr. McLachlan and others who are following his instructions.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with every word contained in this statment. I think that labour, both in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, would be well advised to follow the principle, not merely to-day but all the time, of giving a fair day's work ungrudgingly for the wage accepted or that it is pretended to work for. I will countenance no other principle on the part of labour so-called so far as my responsibility or authority goes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the hon. Minister permit me a question? Apparently, according to the press reports, the information of the Government was that a number of the regular officers of the men had resigned. I should like to find out from my hon. friend what officers resigned and to whom they handed their resignations, so that we might have some idea of how the matter now stands.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am unable to give that information except as I have received it from press reports. When I made some reference to the resignation of certain members of the miners' executive committees a short time ago the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) shook his head at me, and therefore I assumed that he had some direct information showing that the press reports were not correct. I should like to ask him if he has any knowledge of whether any members of the executive committee of district No. 26 have resigned.

Mr. CARROLL: No, Mr. Speaker. I had a communication this morning from the town of Glace Bay to the effect that up to date none of them has resigned.

Mr. MURDOCK: We have had a rather extended discussion of this matter, which I have no doubt will not be entirely finished when I shall take my seat, but it seems to me an opportune time to give to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) certain information very closely connected with this matter as to which he made inquiries in the House yesterday, I think. My hon. friend wanted to know on Friday next—nothing like taking time by the forelock and getting into position as early as possible—

> When the Minister of Labour purported to give to the press written communications received by him from J. B. McLachlan of the United Mine Workers did he give such communications in full?

The answer is "Yes." The next question is:

> If not, why; and what is the text of the part omitted?

That is answered by the answer to the first question. But, for the information of the hon. member and because certain newspaper reporters appear to have thought it necessary to shield somewhat the Minister of Labour, I am going to read into Hansard the complete text of all these telegrams which I was not aware were not completely quoted in the press to-day. The House has the right to the complete context, and while of course I thank the gentlemen representing the press for being so considerate of me, I would say: Let the people have all the telegrams in full. The first telegram to Mr. McLachlan is dated the 18th inst.

> J. B. McLachlan,
> Secretary, District 26,
> United Mine Workers of America,
> Glace Bay, N.S.
>
> My attention has been called to a despatch appearing in to-day's Ottawa Journal dated from Sydney, and reading in part as follows: "The war is on, class war. In those words of a manifesto issued to-night, J. B. McLachlan, secretary of District 26, United Mine Workers, calls on the twelve thousand miners of Nova Scotia to join him in a policy of cutting the output as the most effective method of waging a labour war against the British Empire Steel

Corporation." I have thought it well to bring the above statement to your attention, and should be obliged if you would let me have word immediately if any such document as is here outlined has been issued with your approval. I trust the published statement may prove to be without foundation, and take this opportunity, in any event, of expressing the hope that yourself and other officers and members of your organization will cast your influence definitely against any such policy as is indicated in the statement above quoted. You will, I think, on reflection agree with me that any strength which organized labour possesses at the present time is the result, not of the underhanded and dishonest methods of undercutting, or, as it is sometimes called, sabotage, but of straight and honest dealings, each worker giving the best that is in him for the wages agreed upon. Any union or trade practice which is not in absolute agreement with this principle will inevitably bring disaster, and workmen who unwisely allow themselves to be misled into the adoption of such methods will ultimately repudiate the leadership of those who have betrayed them. I trust I may receive from you an assurance that you are in sympathy with the view expressed in this message, and, since the despatch from which I have quoted and which has credited you with action on contrary lines has received much publicity I shall gladly do my best to see that any reply received from you by way of disavowal or otherwise receives equal prominence. I am handing this message to the press.

JAMES MURDOCK,
Minister of Labour.

And here is the full answer received, which my friend from Leeds (Mr. Stewart) wants to hear in its entirety:

GLACE BAY, N.S.,
March 20, 1922.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Replying to your lengthy telegram of Saturday, wish to state that in manifesto issued by me on the 16th instant, neither the thing known as sabotage nor the word itself were mentioned. Once, however, I did in that document strongly advise the miners to cut down production to a point where all profits for the British Empire Steel Corporation would vanish. This tactic as a method of retaliation for a highly unjust encroachment of the employers on the wages of their workmen and an invasion on an already all too slender living I have proclaimed openly and in the face of day and there is nothing dishonest about it, you to the contrary notwithstanding. I have preached this with the blessing of my friends and amid the curses of my enemies. I have preached it to individuals, to tens, to hundreds and to thousands. I have done it on land and on sea, in miners' halls and in churches, on the hillsides of Nova Scotia and on her busy streets, and Mr. Minister, what are you going to do about it? I shall do it again this week, knowing that a miner has a perfect right to work with his coat on if he wants to. But what kind of innocent or hypocrite are you? Did you not one year ago call a strike of the trainmen employed at the Sydney steel works, owned by the British Empire Steel Corporation, and did you not circularize the trainmen on the Sydney end of the Government railway to institute a blockade on all steel company products, and tell the trainmen to leave the cars with steel company goods in the sidings in the woods where there were no telegraph offices, and you made no exception to perishable goods? That was sabotage from top to bottom, from start to finish. Our method of fighting this unjust wage imposition is effective and within the law, and the prime reason why the stock gamblers of Montreal got you to wire a lecture to me is this: Listen—Caledonia Mine for the week ending December 16 hoisted 8,561 tons of coal at a labour cost of $2.02 per ton. That was before the cut in wages was made. Since the first of the year wages have been cut 32 per cent. For the week ending January 13 the labour cost per ton was $1.62; and then the miners refused to strip themselves naked to the waist, to give the best that is in them, as you put it, instead cut down production and for the week ending January 27 produced 2,322 tons at a labour cost of $2.25 per ton. Add on the other overhead charges on that miserable 2,000 tons of coal and you may be able to guess why the Hallelujah Chorus is ringing in the soul of the miners who are actively fighting an unjust wage, and why the stock gamblers at Montreal are reduced to seek the assistance of an innocent like you. There is no wage agreement of any kind here. The British Empire Steel Corporation is seeking to impose a rate as low as $2.85 per day and refuses to give men with that small wage anything like six days per week. They are imposing these miserable wages to enable them to pay dividends on huge blocks of watered stock and on acres of idle junk that they call steel works. We shall continue to fight the imposition of this iniquitous wage reduction, if we have to rock the ramshackle institution known as the British Empire Steel Corporation from its rotten sills to its bending and shaking rafters.

J. B. MCLACHLAN.

That is the telegram in full that the hon. member for Leeds desired.

Mr. HANSON: May I ask the hon. minister if he paid for that telegram? Was it sent "collect"?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, it came "collect." Now then, Mr. Speaker, I replied as follows, on March 21—

Mr. CHAPLIN: Did you send your reply "collect" also?

Mr. MURDOCK: "Charge to Labour Department—sundries."

J. B. McLachlan,
Secretary, District No. 26,
United Mine Workers of America,
Glace Bay, Nova Scotia.

Your telegram received and handed to the press. The written and actual record of the action authorized by the undersigned and others in connection with the strike of train and engine men in the steel works at Sydney in 1920 speaks for itself, and cannot be changed by any interpretation you may care to place on such action. Have no doubt whatever you have preached, as you say, so-called passive strike methods for some time, and still continue so to do. In my judgment it is un-British, un-

Canadian and cowardly to pretend to be working for a wage rate in effect while declaring to the world that only partial grudging service will be given. My experience has been that men quit like men and walk off the job when unwilling to work for wage rates or conditions offered, but the advice you give would place you and those who accept such advice surely in some other class. Be assured that the undersigned has no brief for or personal sympathy with certain methods adopted by the British Empire Steel Corporation, and I regard it now, as during the recent general election campaign, as one of Canada's tragedies that any corporation should appear to be able to undertake to dictate Government policy or to shape the course of public events to its own purposes. Two wrongs, however, do not make one right and red-blooded Canadian citizens will not, in my judgment, follow your advice in the pretense of loyally staying on the job for the purpose of penalizing the employer.

James Murdock,
Minister of Labour.

May I in conclusion say this. I, as Minister of Labour, would have been very glad indeed to do anything I could consistent with what I believe to be federal rights in such matters to assist in bringing order out of chaos and in securing a further consideration of this situation. The deputation of mayors which waited on us the day before yesterday suggested that the board of investigation should have visited all of the mines in Nova Scotia, and held their investigation on the ground. I have no doubt that that would have been very much the better way but Mr. Ling, the Mayor of New Waterford, and a member of that board, never by inference or otherwise conveyed such a desire or suggestion to the Labour Department. Had he done so, I would have undertaken as best I could to see to it that the board did go on the ground and there give that full consideration to the actual circumstances that he now contends should have been given. But there were no such representations whatever made to me at the time. I, of course, do not criticise Mr. Ling or other gentlemen for these after-thoughts which now occur to them.

Furthermore, if Mr. Ling and these other gentlemen had represented that the matter had not been fully and properly investigated, that there was ample reason for a further investigation of all the facts and circumstances of the situation in Cape Breton and elsewhere, I should have been only too glad to have undertaken, to convene again the board of investigation and insist on them going on the ground, as I understand the law permits the Minister of Labour to do and making a full and further investigation. But no suggestion of that kind comes to the Labour Department or to myself as minister. We simply observe in the morning press of March 18 that Mr. J. B. McLachlan, who, I understand, is a gentleman of broad sympathies—in this House and elsewhere I understand he has been referred to as a long-time friend of mine, but to my knowledge I never met the gentleman in my life—in substance declares to the world that he has adopted a really new policy, I hope so far as Canada is concerned of dealing with questions affecting the welfare and the rights of labour—the policy of "cut down production, loaf on the job, work with your coat on, be sure that you do not give anything more than you have to for what we call the small pittance you receive as compensation." That, Mr. Speaker, I describe as un-Canadian. I have heard in years gone by, while representing labour, of the I.W.W. under war-time conditions advocating that policy and nothing else. I now charge that the gentlemen who are advocating this policy are in heart and sympathy equal, no more and no less, with the I.W.W. in their every aim and ambition. I contend that they dare not come out into the light of our Canadian day and advocate that same policy under the standard of the I.W.W. They may be fooling themselves, and undertaking to fool someone else, but they are not fooling me with any pretence that that is anything like the policy of organized labour, red-blooded,virile and ready to do its share at all times. I challenge it now as I.W.W. propaganda, nothing more and nothing less; and as Minister of Labour, or back in the common ranks of labour again if that should occur, I will fight it, because it is wrong. So I say to hon. gentlemen opposite and to hon. gentlemen to their left and to my colleagues in the Government and its supporters, we cannot afford, as I understand the aims and ambitions and contentions of labour, to dally with or countenance for one moment any such propaganda or proposals as we have had confronting us in this Nova Scotia situation. I believe that I am as fully informed individually as any one of the urgent necessity that some means should be taken to alleviate some of the conditions existing in Nova Scotia; and I hope that even out of this discussion, and the notoriety that will ensue from it steps will be taken, by McLachlan and others with their I.W.W. theories, when reason has dawned upon them to discard and abandon any such policy. I hope that even then something may be done to assist the other workmen and the workers in the

mines in Nova Scotia who hold no such views and to assist their wives and families as well. You would have no respect for a Government—let alone an inexperienced, in a parliamentary way, Minister of Labour—who would show the white feather and knuckle down to challenges such as we have had from J. B. McLachlan and others. You cannot—I give this advice as the result of some years experience—countenance for one moment the tactics of the reds; you must meet it and fight it man-fashion wherever it is found. While I have the most profound sympathy for some of the contentions that have been advanced yet it is a fact that despite the actual first-hand knowledge of some of us respecting the proper aims, ambitions, and conditions of labour, there are theorists who come to us from time to time and advise us from a theoretical standpoint how to deal with labour questions. Well, we are not going to deal with these questions on any such basis. So long as I can exercise my voice and my vote I say that the tactics of the red element—for that is what it really is—and the I.W.W. propaganda that has been used, and used during a period of dire distress in Canada and the United States, shall not prevail. They are the same tactics that have been used in the forests of Washington, of Oregon and of British Columbia—I refer to the suggestions now being scattered broadcast in Nova Scotia by J. B. McLachlan. None of it for me. I have been fighting that propaganda too long to start now to countenance any such thing as Minister of Labour, and I do not believe that hon. members will for one moment do anything more in this matter than uphold and commend the judgment of this Government in deciding that under the circumstances that have been explained to you no royal commission will be appointed at the behest and at the dictation of these gentlemen in Nova Scotia, these men who are advocating such an un-Canadian policy as we have been hearing of during the past few days.

Mr. HENRY E. SPENCER (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I would like, for a moment, to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to the fact that although labour owes a duty to capital there is also a duty on the part of capital toward labour. As one who is an employer of labour I feel particularly keen on that point, and think I am in a position to speak with some definiteness concerning it. There are three reasons why, in my opinion, this must be regarded as a serious question and one demanding instant action on the part of the Government. The first reason is this: I understand that when two years ago this same British Empire Steel Corporation applied to the federal Parliament for a charter and an act of incorporation its request was refused. That refusal must have been based on some very good foundation. The second reason is that we are told this corporation has been allowed to water its stock to the extent of $19,000,000. Such a statement should not be allowed to pass without some effort made to prove its truth or falsity. It is a very serious charge, and if true I maintain that the employers of this Nova Scotia mine must consider their duty towards their men—they must consider whether it is right at the present moment to pay the miners practically a starvation wage and at the same time endeavour to pay a dividend on $19,000,000 of watered stock. Furthermore, the Government of Canada, I understand, has made a grant of some millions to this same corporation. If this be true, surely the federal Government should have something to say in a dispute of this character. It has been urged from the Government side that this is not a federal matter. I want to point out to hon. members that when you have men congregated in large numbers—such as they are in mining camps and in factories—and they are put on a low scale of wages, and hundreds and thousands of them are out of work, you have a responsibility towards those men. You can drive poverty in the country a good deal nearer the bread line, than you can drive poverty in the cities; and when a man gets down to a certain level, when he gets to the stage that wages are so low he has not the means of maintaining himself and his family, then neither a military law nor a civil law will restrain him: The only law he thinks of obeying is the law of self-preservation. That is one of the truths we cannot ignore. Even if this were not a federal matter, it may speedily be made so if the dispute continues, and the Government does not take a stand. Because if these men are pushed nearer and nearer the bread line and mob rule begins to manifest itself in Nova Scotia, what will you see? You will see the mounted police sent down to the mines and military rule will be invoked. Does not the matter then become one of federal concern? I would like to urge upon the Government: Is it not better to take hold of the situation now and prevent its going any further than to

contemplate what possibly may develop into dire results in the future.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): A great many of us were inclined to take it for granted that, when a labour man was appointed to the position of Minister of Labour, the Liberal party was showing its sympathy with the great labour movement across the country. It seems to me most regrettable that there should not have been revealed, in the speech to which we have listened, any real sympathy or intelligent understanding of some of the fundamental problems as they affect labour. I sincerely trust that it has been the heat of the debate that has carried the minister further than is his real position in regard to this matter. It would seem almost as if he had resented the action of Mr. J. D. McLachlan as a personal affront. I am not concerned—and I do not think the country at large is concerned—with the attitude of the Minister of Labour towards J. D. McLachlan. There is something more fundamental altogether for us to discuss here, and I can hardly conceive that constructive action should be delayed on account of anything of this character. The Minister of Labour spent a good deal of time making a very lengthy defence of the action which has been taken during the past weeks in this matter. I would like to say —and I am quite sure the Minister of Labour omitted the matter unintentionally—that perhaps it would be fair to read the last telegram of the series. If I remember aright the minister read the first three, but did not read the last telegram from Mr. McLachlan. This is dated March 22nd, 1922, addressed to Hon. James Murdock, Minister of Labour, Ottawa, and reads:

> Your telegram of yesterday to hand, and note that you state it as one of Canada's tragedies that the British Empire Steel Corporation should undertake to dictate government policy and shape the course of public events to its own purposes. I agree with you as to the corrupt influences of this corporation on the public life of the country, and desire to state that, to its other sins, it has added since January 1st that of a starvation wage for ten thousand workers. Your Government is young and surely yet uncorrupted by this corporation which you call one of Canada's tragedies. The starvation of ten thousand mine workers in Nova Scotia gives your Government right now ample justification to appoint a commission at once which shall tear wide open the rotten heart of this corrupter of public life and starver of the workers of Nova Scotia, if you and your young Government have the courage of your convictions, you shall appoint a commission now and give it this man's job of cleaning up this corrupt tragedy.
>
> J. D. McLACHLAN.

I submit there is nothing widely extravagant about that last telegram of J. D. McLachlan. It is rather a reasonable request to prefer to the Government of this country, and I take it that the Government assumes a great responsibility, indeed, if it refuses to accede to as reasonable a request as has been made by Mr. McLachlan, and by the delegation which has just waited upon it. The minister had a great deal to say about the I.W.W. methods and had a good deal of denunciation for those whom he termed the Reds. I think that is rather a curious thing, since the minister himself, on two or three distinct occasions, made use of the phrase "red blooded Canadian citizens". I take it that all this is a matter of the connotation of words. One party means one thing by red, and another party means something entirely different. The Minister of Labour believes in red blooded citizens. A good many of the Labour party use the term "red" not in so very different a sense, because they instruct one another, that just as there is red blood in all of us, and the same red blood runs through all the human race, they should emphasize the universal human note in dealing with matters of importance in their public policy. With the ordinary labour man, I can assure this House, that "red" does not connote anything of bloodshed, but that "red" as used by them is rather the emphasis of human brotherhood. It is in that sense that they use it. I can quite understand that the minister may try to discount it by using it in another sense altogether, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we ought, in this House, to get away from the idea of trying to settle problems by calling names. I wondered almost if we should hear the other term which has been so prevalent during the last few years, "pro-German". I thought that was the next word to come. I take it that we are not going to get further by calling one another red, or by retorting that somebody else is yellow. We are in a position where we ought to consider these questions on their merits, and this is one question which is worthy of discussion.

I cannot pass over some of the points on which the Minister of Labour dwelt, because they involve some things that are fundamental to an understanding of the labour position and, although I have not the privilege of an intimate knowledge of the situation in Glace Bay, I know that some of the matters that have been put forth here to-day deal with fundamental labour conceptions and labour positions. Those of us who represent labour here are bound to try to put forth the labour point of view with regard to them.

We have heard a good deal about loafing on the job. The Minister of Labour called upon high heaven to witness that he would always denounce that kind of a policy. Now, it is not the place to say whether or not that policy is expedient, but the ground was taken—a deeper ground than that—that it was utterly wrong. I do not know that I want to discuss a purely abstract ethical question, but I want to say that when we talk about loafing on the job, and when we sometimes make use of the French word "sabotage", or the Scotch expression "ca'canny" we are indicating a method of industrial warfare, which, perhaps, we could more accurately express as curtailment of output.

Now, I submit, that, leaving aside for the moment the ethical aspect of this question, curtailment of output is a natural, recognized mode of procedure in the business world to-day. There are factories all over Canada which, so soon as their managers think that profits are not sufficiently high to warrant further operation, curtail their production, or, sometimes, stop work altogether. Since the minister has put the question on high ethical grounds, if it is wrong for labour men to curtail production when they cannot earn even a living for themselves and their families, then it is a much greater wrong for any manager of a factory or corporation to stop work simply because he cannot obtain the profits he would like. I shall have to go a little further and mention an incident which I trust my farmer friends will apreciate rather than resent. I had a talk with the president of the farmers' organization of Alberta a year or two ago, when oats were selling, if I remember rightly, at about 16 or 20 cents a bushel. That gentleman informed me then that he was going to advise the farmers to stop planting oats and other kinds of grain until prices were somewhat higher, because, as he said, the farmers could not produce at the then current prices. Well, that also, I submit, is a curtailment of production, and the farmer feels abundantly justified in the matter because he says he cannot produce at a loss. Neither he can; that is obvious. I remember saying at the time to the president of the association that what he proposed to do would be rather hard on the people who lived in the cities. "Well," he said, "I don't see any other way in which we can bring the railroads and other large institutions to time." That is the selfsame step, apparently, which is being taken by the miners down in Glace Bay and in Nova Scotia generally. I do not say these things simply for the sake of talking, because I realize that we have an exceedingly difficult problem to cope with, an ethical problem if you will. We have been given one side of it by the Minister of Labour, and a great many of us have failed to realize that there is distinctly another side to the question. Sometimes the worker is driven to do some things he does not like to do. May I be permitted to give an illustration from my own experience during the time I was engaged as a manual worker on the waterfront? I used to have a theoretical knowledge of some of these questions, and I discovered that that knowledge had to be somewhat thrown to the winds in the face of practical experience. Men were unloading ships, and the day was supposed to be an eight hour day; but if the task was finished before the close of the day the workers were dismissed. The result was that when the pay envelope came they were short perhaps two or three hours of their day's work. Now, they needed every cent of the wages they were receiving in order to keep their families, or even to exist. They went to work at eight o'clock in the morning in the full belief that they would be able to work an eight hour day, but perhaps about two or three o'clock word would come that the cargo was almost through loading or unloading, as the case might be, and some times the suggestion would be made: "We must go slow and do not finish before the regular closing hour." And the men proceeded to adopt the policy ca'canny, of loafing on the job. No doubt it will be said, from a high ethical standpoint, that such a practice is reprehensible. However, let me say, on the other side, that there was no organization of labour on the waterfront at Vancouver as there has been, to a certain extent, at the docks at Liverpool and elsewhere; but a much larger pool of labour was kept for cases of emergency

than was ordinarily needed. Had there been a common sense arrangement between the various companies concerned, it could have been readily arranged that each man could work his eight hours, neither more nor less, and be guaranteed sufficient for a living. But under the maladjustments inherent in our present system he was unable, through no fault of his own, to obtain a full day's work; and under the circumstances about the only thing he saw he could do was to go slower if he wanted to obtain sufficient food for himself and his family. I can remember some of these men discussing the situation. They called attention to the fact, for example, that the Dollar Steamship Company was making millions out of the war trade which it had at that time, and they could see no reason why the steamship company could make its millions and yet not afford them a living wage. There you have the same situation as now exists in Nova Scotia, and I suggest that there are two sides to a question of this kind. I am not going to discuss here the larger question, upon which a great many of us feel very strongly, namely, that industry has increased to such a large extent that it ought no longer to be left in private hands. The group which I represent in this House has it as a part of its policy, the plank that the large fundamental industries of the country should be handled by the country in the interests of the country at large. I was glad to see a year or two ago that the Farmers' party adopted the principle of the nationalization of coal mines. They did it because they thought that a supply of coal was essential to the welfare of the country, and that from the standpoint of the consumer it was necessary to nationalize large public industries. Here we have another aspect of the question; because of control by an autocratic company, it becomes necessary in the interests of the men to see that they have fair play. This is a large question into which I will not go to-night, but let me say this: If private ownership is going to function and supply us with all the goods we need, and if it is going to secure us democracy and industrial freedom then let us continue private ownership. But I claim that private ownership is failing to do these very things. To-day we have 200,000 unemployed in Canada; we have factories closed down and men all over the country who say they have not the rights of free men. This is the challenge that comes from the labour world to-day.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) used a number of expressions which I have no doubt would win applause from a regular lecture platform audience. And they are true. But the use of them sometimes makes them only half truths, and a half truth is on occasion more false in its effect than a lie. The minister said that two wrongs do not make one right. Of course, we all applaud that. I may say, in passing, that I was very much interested to note that a good deal of the applause while the minister spoke came from the benches opposite rather than those immediately behind him. But let me ask: Is not this action which the minister himself is advocating—a policy of waiting, a refusal to deal with the one and the more fundamental wrong? I am not advocating strikes, I am not advocating slowing down on the job, I am not advocating violence or anything of the kind, but I do say that we have on the other hand, as has been stated by various hon. members, a company that is organized with millions upon millions of watered stock, and that conducts its affairs in the most arbitrary fashion according to the minister's own statement. Let me read it again:

> Be assured that the undersigned has no brief for or personal sympathy with certain methods adopted by the British Empire Steel Corporation, and I regard it now as during the recent general election campaign as one of Canada's tragedies that any corporation should appear to be able to undertake to dictate government policy or to shape the course of public events to its own purposes.

I think we are justified in asking what steps the minister is taking to change that state of affairs. That is the prior wrong and the greater wrong of the two.

What about the advice to walk off the job? I suppose that is the action that would be taken by a "red-blooded Canadian." It is all very well if you can walk off the job, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit that a great many of these men cannot quit work even for a single day without involving hardship on their wives and children. That is the other side of the question. I noticed in some of our campaign literature a phrase to this effect: Your job is your living. The working men would be willing to go a little bit further and say: A man's job is his very life. Can such a man quit work when his family is on the verge of starvation, and would starve if he quit for a few days? You may talk about individual freedom, but such a man who is bound down in that way

has no chance of enjoying individual freedom.

I am not sure whether the phrase was used. "Sacredness of contracts," but the idea was there, that under no circumstances must a man break his contract. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to advocate, nor to justify the breaking of contracts, but I do say that frequently to-day men are placed in such a position that it is absolutely impossible for them to carry through their contracts and fulfill their duties to others dependent on them. I am not going into questions of casuistry; they do not get us any distance at all; but I submit that even in law duress is recognized. If I point a revolver at a man's head and say to him, "You sign that document or I will shoot you," that contract, as the House is aware, would not be recognized as valid in any court of law. And yet that is precisely what it is in the employer's power to do when a man is at his wit's end, when he is at his extremity, when he has no food with which to feed his wife and children. Under the conditions the employer is in the position to point a gun, as it were, at the employee's head and say, "Take this job or starve." I hope to live to see the time when that kind of contract will by the laws of the land be declared invalid.

But we come back to the big question which we are apt to overlook: What else are the men to do? I am not justifying this course, let me say that again and again, but I do ask: What other course is pointed out to the men? We are told that there may be some danger of interfering with the provincial rights of Nova Scotia. I am informed by members of the delegation who are here from the East that again and again the miners sent delegates to the Nova Scotia Government to ask for some redress or some help, and that those delegates were told again and again that the provincial government had no power to act. There is the situation that we find. The federal government say: We cannot act. The provincial government say: We cannot act. In the meantime the men and their families are suffering.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), if I understood him aright, admitted that there was considerable watered stock in the capitalization of this corporation. But he asked: Why should the federal government interfere with a company chartered by the provincial government? Mr. Speaker, let me put the matter as the common men of Canada are beginning to put it. It is a crime if a man should put water in milk, and he can be tried under the criminal law and punished. I should like to ask: Why is it less a crime that a man should put water in stock? And I hope to see the Government during this very session introduce legislation that will make it criminal for anybody to water stock. Has the Dominion government no right to act? I submit that again and again, the Dominion government has interfered or taken action with regard to all sorts of industrial disputes from one coast to the other. Is there any reason why at this particular juncture action should not be taken in what seems a most serious situation?—a situation which has gradually been growing more and more serious for some months, and with respect to which the provincial authorities seem to have taken no action whatever. As some hon. member has already said, if there should break out any violent disorder he assumed that the Dominion government would be asked to send in the mounted police or the military to restore order. Have we not arrived at a stage in our civilization when we will refuse to adopt the policy of waiting till something serious happens,—something which we already see is likely to happen?

If I remember rightly, I was in the galleries of this House in 1913 when there was a strike in progress at Nanaimo. I think the Liberal party then in power—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no; the Tory party.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Was it 1909? I remember quite distinctly that some members of the Liberal party pleaded that action should be taken in connection with that dispute. I am not going into this phase of the question with the idea of stirring up party recriminations, but I would say that in the past action has been taken by the federal authorities at various times. The trouble in Winnipeg in 1919 is, I take it, fresh in the minds of a great many of us. Week after week that trouble went on. The municipality seemed almost helpless; the province seemed almost helpless. The federal Government took no action for quite a time; then at last they did take action, with a club. But for a long time nothing was done, though anyone could see that things would grow more and more serious. Surely we have come to the time in the history of civilization when we ought to be able to prevent some of these disputes eventuating in violence.

With the development of our large-scale industry, we have reached the point where it becomes necessary for the Government to take an active part in the management of big industrial enterprises. In a book published by Mr. Woodrow Wilson, containing some of the election speeches made by him during the campaign in which he was elected, he called attention to the fact that the old watchword of "individual liberty" with regard to carrying on one's business affairs was no longer applicable in our complicated industrial life of to-day. He used a very fine illustration to bring home his point. He said that in many cities of the United States the owners of tenement blocks were still taking the position that an Englishman's house was his castle and were refusing to allow the municipal authorities to enter those tenement houses for the purpose of inspecting the sanitary arrangements, and so on. He pointed out that even in England and Scotland—I think he referred particularly to the city of Glasgow, where this old doctrine that an Englishman's house was his castle had long prevailed—they had had common sense enough to recognize the changed conditions. They had said that it was only an accident that fifty families became herded together under one roof of a huge tenement; that in that case each particular suite was a private house, but the tenement itself was essentially a public highway; therefore its corridors ought to be policed and sanitary arrangements provided for it. Mr. Wilson said the time had come when all these large public corporations ought to be recognized as public in their character and ought to have the full light of publicity thrown upon every detail of their management and operation. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we must accept the necessity of regulating, of absolutely controlling, these big public enterprises, or go one step further and have the public, the Government itself, take them over and manage them in the interests of the people.

I take it that there is no dispute with regard to the fundamental facts of the situation which have been brought before us. First of all, the men are not obtaining in Nova Scotia a living wage. I believe that the minimum wage of some 8,500 out of the 12,000 men affected is $2.85 a day. A great many of us who draw our salaries by the week or by the month are not familiar with the way in which the workingman must count his income. In Nova Scotia very few of the miners, I am informed by the delegation here, are obtaining more than four days work in the week —and that through no fault of their own. Four days' work in the week at $2.85 means $11.40 a week. Now, I want to turn for a moment to the Labour Gazette, one of the valuable publications issued by the Department of Labour itself. According to the Labour Gazette for February, $21.52 was the cost of a weekly budget for a family of five. That included twenty-nine staple articles of food; wood, coal, light, etc. But the miners of Nova Scotia are receiving $11.40 a week, only half the amount which, according to the Department of Labour, is the minimum on which a family can subsist. Either the figures of the department are grossly misleading, or there is something wrong with the wage paid to the miners of Nova Scotia. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this figure of $21.52 makes no provision for medical service, for union dues, for church expenses, for newspapers, for books, for insurance, for any of the cultural needs that most of us believe to be necessary if men are to live according to Canadian standards. That is the situation which we must frankly face in this connection.

Not only are the men not receiving a living wage, according to these figures, but their wives and children are suffering. We are told that children are being kept home from school because they have not sufficient clothing. We are told that the school boards have notified parents to send their children to school and have been unable to enforce that order because of the conditions of poverty prevailing in the homes.

Now, that is one outstanding fact: the men are not receiving a living wage. The second outstanding fact in the situation is that the corporation apparently has got the province by the throat. I do not need to read again the statement made by the Minister of Labour himself.

The third great outstanding feature of the situation is that men, women and little children are suffering. Surely we ought not to underestimate that fact. And I hope the minister did not intend to say that no action could be taken because Mr. J. B. McLachlan had not shown sufficient deference to the Minister of Labour. I do not care anything about that. I do not care anything about whether or not Mr. McLachlan has taken just the right attitude. There is a bigger question than that. It is the welfare of the men, and the women, and the children living down there in Nova Scotia. The delegation that

came here from those towns has made a most just and reasonable request. They are not proposing to take the law into their own hands, but having gone repeatedly to the provincial house and obtained no redress; having been told that the province was incapable of doing anything, they have come to the federal House and have said: "Can you not do something for us?" Are we going to turn them empty away?

Two or three years ago, shortly after the war, we heard a great deal about the necessity for reconstruction, but it has turned out that reconstruction has simply meant in many cases construction along the old lines. I submit that the people of Canada, the ordinary people of Canada, the labouring men, the business men and the farmers, are looking for a new lead. They are tired of the old way of doing things and are looking for a new lead. This new Government is to-day on its trial. Either this new Government must give a new lead or it will not be very long before some other government will have to come that will lead. I often think as we sit here dealing with our papers and talking back and forth about one thing and another, and then going to our offices and reading statistics, and that kind of thing, that we are failing to realize the real thought and the real aspirations of the people of Canada. The common people of Canada believe that every man in this country ought to have a chance, and they are not very much concerned with the questions of procedure or with delicate questions as to provincial or inter-provincial rights. They send their representatives here to this House, and they say there must be some way out of the situation. It is not for us on this side to devise ways and means; we cannot suggest very much. But it is for us to urge upon the Government in power that action, and if necessary, radical action, of a constructive nature should be taken, and so far as some of us are concerned we can pledge the Government that if that kind of action is taken, it will receive the fullest support from representatives who are here primarily not for partisan purposes but in an effort to bring a better way of life to the common people of this country.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my excuse for entering this debate must be that I represent a constituency which is to a large extent a labouring one. A large proportion of my constituents work for wages, and a still larger proportion are workers in the very broadest sense of the word. We have very few drones in the Comox-Alberni district.

I do not wish to enter into the merits of the arguments in this case. Before I would venture to pass an opinion, I would have to have a very much clearer definition of the two sides of the question than have been presented this afternoon. But apart from that, as I live such a distance from the scene of this trouble, it would be presumptuous for me to pass an opinion upon it. I would rather leave that to the members who represent the districts concerned or those in the immediate neighbourhood.

I just want to express one argument for the consideration of the Government. We have heard a good deal about Bolshevism and the Reds. Bolshevism is the word I shall use, because I do not know what the noun of Red is, whether it is Redness or Redism; so let us call it Bolshevism. Bolshevism, like co-ordination, is a very much over-worked word. It used to mean only a majority—not a term of reproach under the constitutional conditions of this country. Then it drifted on to mean those principles, if we can call them so, or practices, promulgated and put into force by Lenine, Trotsky and their associates. The word went further in the last election and became a general term of villification for every one who had the audacity and temerity to oppose the candidates of the Government of the day. I think hon. members to my left will be fully aware of that fact. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie), in speaking the other day, said that he had some four thousand Reds in his district, adjoining mine, and that I had some thousands also. Well, he can speak for himself. They may be called Reds in the Nanaimo district, but in my district we call them intelligent voters. I am not at all ashamed, and I have no anticipation of being ashamed in the future, of the so-called Reds who gave me their confidence in the last election.

Coming now to the fourth meaning of the word, Bolshevism may now fairly be applied to a spirit of Radicalism almost revolutionary in its desires, and also rather vague. I think that might honestly be described as the meaning of the word to-day in ordinary conversation. Now why do we find these men so? If we examine into the conditions and industrial surroundings of these men that they are called Reds we can perhaps find out what makes them red. We have all had some experience with this class of men. Do we find that the man who

is well fed, well clothed, with a steady job and owning his little home, where his family grows up around him, with a wage sufficient to keep him in decent comfort and allow him to save a little for his old age, which is the standard we should aspire to, and often with a little leisure to read and inform himself, because ignorance has a good deal to do with Bolshevism — do we find that man becoming a Red? Never. It is never that class of men. The men of that class are always inclined to take a sober and, in the dictionary sense of the word, a conservative view of things. It is the man who lives with his wife and family under conditions of poverty, misery and above all, with a rankling sense of injustice that you find becoming a Red. I have even heard men in good positions, well educated men, say in conversation regarding some incident, "It is enough to make me turn Bolshevik." That indicates the idea that it is a rankling sense of injustice against social and industrial conditions that turns a man or a woman to talk Bolshevism and Redism. It does not matter if it is a civil servant who after years and years of service in anticipation of being promoted to a higher position sees some political has-been promoted over his head, it does not matter if it is a lumberjack or a miner who has been done out of his wages for months by some quirk of law invoked by some unscrupulous employer, the principle is the same; they have a rankling sense of injustice in the conditions immediately surrounding them.

Then if you admit, for the sake of my argument, that Bolshevism is caused, or tends to be produced, by injustice in our industrial and economic surroundings, you must also admit the next proposition I submit, that the spread of that sentiment is undesirable in Canada from every point of view. Then would it not be wise, granting those two postulates, so to speak, for the Government in the instance before us to seek in any and every way possible to remove any possible cause of injustice there may be in connection with these men's alleged —and I use that word because I do not know the actual circumstances—grievances. If that were done, the cost of half-a-dozen royal commissions would be well repaid.

It is true you can station Northwest Mounted Police at every street corner, and to a certain extent check free speech. I was surprised the other day to see my colleagues from British Columbia hasten to repudiate the suggestion I made that the Northwest Mounted Police were no longer needed in British Columbia. Sir, I have never said a word in depreciation of the Northwest Mounted Police. They are a fine body of men. I only said they were not needed. One hon. member, I think, claimed they had done great work for us in British Columbia during the war. I beg to remind you, Sir, and the hon. member in question that the Northwest Mounted Police were not in British Columbia during the war. Apart from that I can say that you may station mounted police on every street corner of the country and you will to a certain extent check the exercise of free speech. But a worse thing than that may happen. The dark thought in a man's mind rankles and he broods over it to a far worse extent if speech is repressed than if he were allowed to give expression to it. It is like trying to sweep back a stream with a broom—you cannot do it. But if you go to the source of the stream when it is only a trickle, a little drip, you can easily divert it there. It is the same with the spirit of Bolshevism. You may try to put your hand on unrest and say it is not there like putting your hand on a pool of water but it will exist and spread to a far greater extent by repression than if you had taken wise action at the beginning. The best way to deal with the problems arising in connection with our social and industrial relations is to enact wise legislation for the elimination of injustices; then Bolshevism will die a natural, and for that very reason, a permanent death.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine), and I congratulate him on having brought this matter to the attention of the Government. I cannot say that I admire in any way whatever the remarks of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) this afternoon. I am quite sure that labour will not be overjoyed to find such a type of minister at the head of this important department; and I am quite sure that all Canada and its press will be critical of the minister's remarks this afternoon. I would ask hon. members what they would do if to-day they were in the situation of these miners in Nova Scotia? The Minister of Labour this afternoon rose to the most extraordinary and perfervid heights of tragic-comedy when he endeavoured to demonstrate to the House the awful and terrible character of the doctrines that, he said, were being promul-

gated by Mr. McLachlan. However, I ask the Minister of Labour what he would do if he were himself in such a position? All that was asked of this Government was the inception of such a constructive policy as would meet the situation in the province of Nova Scotia. I wonder what hon. members of this House would do if they were face to face with hunger? I think they would look at this whole question to-day and with more sympathy than they perhaps now feel. These coal miners, as I view the situation, are confronted with this situation: Their union has not the means to carry on the strike; therefore, they are not in a position to go out on strike. They are not in a position to do what the Minister of Labour suggested this afternoon he would probably have done had he been in their place. The men are not merely faced with hunger themselves—if that were the case doubtless many of them would meet the situation bravely—but their wives and children are threatened with hunger. Now if hon. members were placed in that position I think they would do exactly what the delegation has done. I think they would send a delegation to this House to ask it to devise a solution of the problem. The Minister of Labour said a good deal during the election, and also since then, about the desirability of bringing employer and employee together to act in co-operation. Now I should think, Mr. Speaker, that as the head of the Labour Department he has the opportunity to evolve some plan that will bring employers and employees together. I think there is not an hon. member here but will admit that the most difficult thing in the world to-day is to bring face to face employer and employees who are fighting each other. They will not in the natural course of events, I think, come together of their own accord. The two parties should be brought together by somebody sympathetic towards both and animated with a desire to solve the problem which if left unsolved may develop into a heavy burden on the State. I ask the Government, or the Department of Labour, if they have no constructive policy calculated to meet this situation. I ask, are they going to meet it? Are they going to meet this delegation, talk to them fairly and squarely and then sit down and consider, and introduce as quickly as possible, the solution of the problem which the circumstances call for? That is all the Government is asked to do and I believe it is its duty to carry out the request. It is the duty of this Government, in my opinion, to meet a situation of this kind as quickly as possible.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency in which there is a large number of miners and in which one of the properties of the Dominion Coal Company is situated.

I believe we are having too much camouflage at the present time in reference to this question. We do not desire to deceive the miners of Nova Scotia and I claim that if we appoint a royal commission at the present time such action would be tantamount to deception. Because we have no power here to implement the recommendations of that royal commission as far as those mines and miners are concerned, and probably in two, three or four months time the same condition that now prevails would be found still existing only perhaps in a more aggravated form. No one in this House can have a more sympathetic feeling for the miners of Nova Scotia than we who know these miners well. No man can have more sympathy with the miners of Cumberland than we who know and appreciate their difficulties, and I would not to-night support any government or any party if I thought the action it was taking would betray the interests of these men. I desire to speak out plainly and to say that I believe the appointment of a royal commission would only postpone this matter and result in a more aggravated state of affairs than now prevails.

Let me briefly recite the facts. There was a dispute between the men and the company. The former applied for a board of conciliation and nominated as their representative Mayor Ling of Waterford in Cape Breton. Afterwards the government of the day appointed Colonel Thompson of Halifax representing the company. These two men not being able to agree upon a third member of the board the present Minister of Labour appointed Mr. Gillen of Toronto as the chairman. The members of the board proceeded to Halifax. Under the Industrial Disputes Act they could call witnesses from the four corners of Canada to testify and the witnesses would be paid out of the public exchequer. They did call a number of witnesses and an extended investigation was held. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been better had the members of that board gone to the mines. They should have gone to Springhill in the county of Cumberland and to Glace Bay and other mining towns in Cape Breton. However, they did not see fit to do so, but they did hold an investi-

gation, and heard all the evidence presented by both sides. Then why appoint a royal commission to take the same evidence over again and then find ourselves in the position of having no power to enforce the recommendations of the commission?

My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) said that the proper place for investigation was not here, but in the province of Nova Scotia. I endorse that statement, because in that province they have power to enforce the recommendation of any royal commission which they may appoint in that province. The decision in reference to the Board of Commerce shows how limited our power is in the federal arena to make any enforcement. The British Empire Steel Company is a Nova Scotia concern. It is incorporated under the laws of Nova Scotia. The mines of Nova Scotia are owned by the province of Nova Scotia, by the government of Nova Scotia if you like, representing the people of their province. It is the duty of the government of that province, I humbly submit, to appoint a royal commission to investigate the workings and operation of their own property, the coal mines of that province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would you explain what you meant by saying that the province of Nova Scotia, under the legislation in force in that province, has power to enforce the finding of a tribunal? Do you mean that they have the power, in case the tribunal makes the decision as to wages, to compel the men to work? What is the full extent of the implication, when you say they have power to enforce their findings?

Mr. LOGAN: Under chapter 21 Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, as read by the hon. member from Cape Breton South, they would have the power—

An hon. MEMBER: To make the men work.

Mr. LOGAN: No, you can never do that. You cannot force any man to work, if he does not desire to do so. There is no doubt about that. But Nova Scotia, owning the property, being the lessor of the coal areas to the companies, has the whip hand over the companies, who are only lessees from the government. Under the lease which it gives, the government has very large powers, and it has the power, I believe, as was decided in the case of the Board of Commerce, to enforce the findings affecting the miners of Nova Scotia. But that is a power which we lack. It is a matter of property and civil rights, and within the provincial powers.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Calgary (Mr. Irvine). If I felt that we could be of any service in the matter, I would support him, but it would be simply useless for us to appoint a royal commission to investigate this matter within the province of Nova Scotia without the power to enforce the findings and it would only deceive the miners.

Mr. MARTELL: Is not the whole trouble, as regards this particular unfortunate position in Nova Scotia, due to the fact that the British Empire Steel people are trying to make the coal industry of Cape Breton pay dividends for the stock of other corporations which are non-productive, which corporations they have taken into the amalgamation?

Mr. LOGAN: As to the accuracy of the statement, permit me to say that the proper place to investigate that is before a royal commission appointed by the province of Nova Scotia, to investigate the position of the company. That province incorporated this company and gave it a large capitalization, and this company is answerable, I submit, to the province of Nova Scotia, and not answerable to this parliament or to the federal authorities.

Suppose the intention of the hon. member for Calgary were carried out, what would happen? A royal commission would be appointed by this government. That would take some time. Then this commission would proceed down to Halifax. Probably weeks would elapse. They then would proceed to Cape Breton county, and Inverness, and down into Cumberland. More weeks go by, the children are still in want, the men are not working the mines, and there is trouble all over the province. What we do now should be done in the quickest manner possible, and the best thing for us to do is to say to the Legislature of Nova Scotia, "You have incorporated this company, and it is your duty to investigate the charges that have been made".

We have heard a great many statements made with reference to the watered stock of the British Empire Steel Corporation, but we do not know. Not a man in this House knows whether dividends are being paid on watered stock, or how much the stock is watered. It is all very well to make the statement. It should be investigated, before a commission which has power to investigate these matters.

If we appoint a royal commission, it would take them weeks to get the evidence together, and make findings. And then what could a royal commission do? It would be utterly powerless. A commission appointed here could make any findings they pleased, but could not enforce them. The men would then find themselves exactly where they are to-day, with that much lost time and that much more trouble in the province.

We do not concur in the recommendation of Mr. McLachlan that men should lie down upon the job. Cumberland men will not lie down upon any job—no mistake about that. We ought to recognize the fact that Mr. Baxter, the President of the U.M.W., is not in sympathy with Mr. McLachlan on this occasion. I suppose that Mr. Baxter has, at least in the past, had the confidence of the people of that province, and the confidence of the miners. He does not concur in the movement of Mr. McLachlan.

Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, do not deceive the men by giving them a commission from Ottawa. Such a commission could bring all the witnesses together, go to great expense, employ all the lawyers they wanted to prove the case, and at the end of the time we would find we were powerless and could do nothing to enforce the recommendations of the commission. Let us send this matter directly to the province of Nova Scotia where they have power to enforce the recommendations of their tribunal. It is within the purview of their legislative capacity to appoint a commission at the present time to investigate this unfortunate difficulty in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. T. H. McCONICA, (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to become involved in this debate and, under other circumstances, I should certainly have preferred to listen, but some things have developed in the discussion, even amongst my own friends, with which I am not in full accord. What is the controversy before us to-night? It appears that a corporation organized under the laws of Nova Scotia, engaged in mining in that province, has upon its hands a controversy with the citizens of that province, touching a question of wages. Some investigations have been made, and there was an attempt, I understand, by the Department of Labour to adjust the difference. That attempt failed. Now, what has occurred? A grievous situation exists there, no doubt. It is said that there is a corporation on one side in which the stock is very much watered—a deplorable thing, but something that did not come about by virtue of any action of the federal Parliament. The labour is organized, a very proper thing; but it was not organized by virtue of the laws passed by this Parliament. A controversy has arisen, not because of anything for which we in this Parliament are responsible, or over which we have jurisdiction. The controversy has arisen between the citizens of Nova Scotia and a corporation in that province. Under those circumstances, some gentlemen come to the Government and make representations. Are they parties to the controversy? Not at all. Do they bear any credentials from the miners or employees? None whatever. Are they here in a representative capacity? I do not so understand; they are here in their private capacity, when there is a remedy in the province itself, a remedy the efficiency and integrity of which have not been questioned by any gentlemen on this floor, and which has been pointed out to them, as was clearly set forth this afternoon by an hon. gentleman from the province in which the difficulty exists. Now, an hon. member from away west of us asks this Government to appoint a royal commission.

Mr. IRVINE: Do you mean to say that I asked for the appointment of a royal commission?

Mr. McCONICA: I am not so sure that I have correctly stated your position, but you have brought a motion before the House and consumed one-half day of mighty valuable time—to do what? I do not know, Sir, what he does want us to do, but the suggestion is that a royal commission should be appointed. Would such a commission have any authority to enforce its findings? Is it asked for by either the miner or the operator? Have we any intimation from either side that the findings of such a commission would be accepted? Not one suggestion of the kind. The suggestion comes from my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine), and the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). Now, I admire the sentiment expressed by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), when he said that a man should render an honest day's work for a day's wages; and I resent the idea that there is a parallel between the man who shirks his task and the farmer who finds that he cannot raise an abundant crop. The farmer did not put in his crop for some other man; it was his own crop,

and it was his own failure if he did not reap the harvest he expected. He did not accept any man's wages for which he was expected to raise a full crop, and then only try to raise half a crop. The difference is a very material one, in my estimation. What would be the effect of appointing a royal commission? What would it do? It would find out precisely what we all know, and nothing more. It would develop facts concerning which we are fully advised. And what would we do about it? We do not know. What could we do? Not a thing, so far as I have been advised by all the gentlemen that have discussed the question. We might just find out what we know already, but we could ascertain nothing more. It seems to me that we have had enough of this sort of business.

I deplore the fact that the miners of Nova Scotia are suffering. I deplore the fact that their employers are not able to pay them wages sufficient to maintain them. I do not know whose fault it is; the hon. gentleman does not know whose fault it is. If he were paying the wages he would probably be in a very different frame of mind. I know something about paying wages, and I have never had one hour's or one minute's controversy with any man I have ever employed. I have never had a labourer leave me that was not fully satisfied. But I do not like to hire a man and have him filled with the idea that he has to get even with me, for some fancied wrong, by neglecting that for which I am paying him. I do not like that doctrine, I am not here to endorse it, and I am sorry to hear it favourably expounded by gentlemen on this side.

Now, there is some talk about the Red business. We have nothing of that kind in the country I live in. I have heard some talk that the farmers of the West were not particularly loyal, that they were disposed to tear down government, and I remember a few years ago there was a great controversy in the city of Winnipeg. There seemed to be a concerted effort on the part of an element gathered in that cosmopolitan city for the purpose of sweeping a conflagration of anarchy over the western part of this great Dominion; and I heard it suggested that the farmers were organized and were ready to take up the fiery torch and cross and bear it through the West. I lived out in that country at that time, and I want to tell hon. gentlemen present that there was not, in my opinion, a man living on any farm in western Canada who would not have put his foot down with all the vigour necessary to stamp out any attempt of that kind. No such sentiment has ever existed there. The western farmer is a loyal Canadian citizen. Why is he in the West? Did he go to that wild country bent upon plunder when there was no one he could rob? He went to engage in a legitimate, an honourable, a respectable and a useful calling,—a calling that imposes hardship, demands labour, and requires long hours of toil in a rigorous climate. What did he come to Canada for? Was he unfriendly to the institutions of the country? If he had been, why did he choose that rigorous climate? He came because Canadian institutions appealed to him, and because the flag that was to float over him represented his idea of liberty. He came to establish the one foundation institution upon which all our liberties rest, he came for the purpose of building there that to which we all look as the great corner-stone of our civilization—he came to build a home. And is that man a dangerous citizen? No, indeed, he is not. He is there to engage in a useful and proper and arduous occupation; he is the busiest man in Canada; he is not asking for short hours; he is not asking for protection; he is there to render an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. And you can rely upon this, Mr. Speaker, that the torch of anarchy will never be kindled at the forge of industry.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to differ with my hon. friend from the West who has just spoken (Mr. McConica). He entertains a view of provincial or state independence that seems rather strange to a Canadian habit of thinking. Coming to this country from the South, he seems to have brought with him amongst his settler's effects that idea of state independence which prevails there, and which has not taken very deep root in this country, where we believe in a large measure of federal control. I do not concur in his view of the futility of a royal commission appointed by this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. BIRD: I have the consciousness that I am speaking rather loud—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No. you are not.

Mr. BIRD: —but by and by I shall be habituated to the conditions under which I am speaking. I fail to agree with the view that a royal commission appointed by this House would be futile, because there is another kind of force besides physical

force. I do not think anyone supposes that this Government would send down the Royal Northwest Mounted Police to enforce the findings of such a commission upon the British Empire Company. I do not think that for a moment. But there is such a thing as moral force which can be generated in the minds of the people, in other words, public opinion, which would be more effective than any physical force the Government could bring to bear. So for that reason I think the plea which has been put forward to-day is very sensible and reasonable, and it does not seem to me that our time is being wasted in its discussion. On the contrary, I think the time is well spent, for we are dealing with a big human question. Some of us are not very well prepared to speak on them, but these human questions are very alluring, and we cannot keep quiet while we listen to the pleas that are being made.

My own position is somewhat neutral, for I have no obligation in a political sense to Labour, none whatever; the only obligation I have is that which any right-thinking man must own towards the great mass of his little brothers—and I confess that I have a feeling that as opportunity arises I must put myself on the side of the bottom dog. I believe that sentiment is characteristically British. I believe in deference to hon. members opposite who represent another race, that it is also Galician. The word "sabotage" which has been interlarded in this debate considerably, had an honourable origin in the history of the race that is represented opposite, and arose out of conditions similar to those we are now considering.

I cannot speak for my group, and therefore I should like my words to be treated as purely the expression of my personal views, but it seems to me that the sentiments of the Progressive party and the sentiments of Labour are very near together at the root. The reason for this Progressive group being here is because of the widespread discontent, of which this labour trouble in Nova Scotia is a manifestation; it is the same root. Now, the immediate conditions which react upon the farmer are vastly different from those which react upon the labourer, but the ultimate conditions are the same! The difference is geographical, as some one has said of protection, that is all, but the root is the same; down beneath the ground there is a connection between the farmer and the labourer. And when we heard the talk about watered stock our hearts began to kindle, because we of the Farmer group have felt for a long time that we too have been suffering from watered stock. When the charge of sedition was imputed to our Labour friends on the corner bench to my left, our hearts began to warm again, because that epithet has also been applied to us. In our efforts to get just conditions for ourselves we have had to suffer obloquy in the same way. So there is a real kindred feeling betwen Labour and Progressives.

But this is where I come near to the sentiments of my hon. friend from Battleford. I do not believe the average farmer has much use for sabotage. The farmer in the West—and I am speaking now of the class that I know—on the average usually employs either a man or a boy for at least some part of the year, and it would be repugnant to him at any time to find that man or boy loafing on his job, not because his moral sense is more highly developed than any one else's—I do not think that on the average the farmer's moral sense is any more discriminating than that of any other class—but because his sense of self-interest has developed just a little further than that of any other class in the country.

Now, moral fervour, as a certain class of philosophers have alleged, has its main root in self-interest. I believe there is a measure of truth in that theory, but I rather fight off the thought that the moral fervour, the righteous indignation, manifested by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) was a reflection of self-interest as it applied to the industrial affairs of this country. I do not think it was, because it seemed to me that the note of sincerity was clear enough in his speech, and his past record would confirm that.

But I think he made a signal mistake; he has put his Government in a very compromising position so far as a large class of the working men of this country are concerned. Mark you, a large section of the workingmen, and a large number of the farmers, too, are not Red,—they repulse the very thought—and they will not read the minister's speech with any kindly feeling. I am even afraid that some of that feeling will be reflected upon the Government which he represents.

Now, I think the Minister of Labour was inflamed a little too much by that word "sabotage"—a word which is all right for ornamental purposes and which looks impressive in a big headline, but which has no relation whatever to the facts of this

case and has been very much misused. He could have safely taken that word for what it meant, and in reply to Mr. McLachlan he could, I think, have used more temperate language. He could well have afforded to overlook the gibes and sneers of that wily Scotchman; for I infer that he is a Scotchman,—not by his name, but by the fact that he sent that telegram collect. The minister occupies a position which enables him to overlook things of that kind, and I do think that the note of personal vindication entered a little too much into his discussion of the matter. I am sorry he is not in the chamber at the moment, because these remarks have been made for his benefit.

Now, I believe that the appointment of a royal commission by the Government to investigate this matter would have a very wholesome effect upon public opinion. It would have a very wholesome effect upon the Government themselves; it would make it easy for a good many of us from now on to give them that whole-hearted support that we have it in mind to give them so long as they array themselves with the forces in this country that are making for righteousness.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): That this subject is of sufficient consequence to have warranted the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Irvine) in moving the adjournment for the purpose of a discussion, no one can doubt. The solution of the difficulty that confronts Canada in the province of Nova Scotia goes to the very root of industrial and social life in that province, and has to do with the well-being and the happiness—possibly even with the existence—of many of our fellow citizens there. An area of Canada of very considerable size, one of the oldest settled areas of this Dominion, is affected to a degree perhaps unknown hitherto as respects any other part of the country. I want to examine as carefully as I may the circumstances that have brought us to the position we are in and to suggest a course, if it is in my power to do so, that may help. I am not sure that I agree with any who have addressed the House upon the subject, and I am still more doubtful whether I shall find any with me after I am through my address to-night.

We all know that an order went out some time last fall putting into effect a wage reduction of enormous extent—37½ per cent, on the average—applicable to some 12,000 miners in the Cape Breton district, employees of the British Empire Steel Corporation, distributed among its various component companies. That reduction completely wiped away the increases that had previously been given by what is known as the Montreal agreement—the first Montreal agreement—and, as has been stated to the Government in a document a copy of which I have been favoured with, represented as well a twenty-five per cent reduction in the wages that had prevailed before that agreement. This reduction the miners resisted, and the proper steps were taken toward the establishment of a board of conciliation. The company refused to name its representative on the board—why, has not been made clear; the reason they could have had I do not know. Their representative, then, in accordance with the law, was named by the Minister of Labour, as was also—the two representatives failing to agree on the point—the third member, who was named by the present minister. Of any of the choices made I have no criticism to offer at the present time. That board sat in the city of Halifax, heard evidence, and announced its decision. The decision was the decision of the majority, and a minority decision by Mayor Ling, representing the men, followed. The decision of the majority changed the reduction from 37½ per cent to 32½ per cent, and in bringing that reduction into effect there were certain amendments as well, applicable to the lower paid men, with the result that men below a certain wage were not to be reduced beyond 12½ per cent; to those above this wage the general reduction would apply. This award was, one might say, unanimously rejected by the men. It appears that in that award there were certain anomalies which indicated that the board had not exercised the care one might expect of it in arriving at its decision. For example, the award made the pay of some men who had previously been receiving a higher wage than others, less than those others were now to receive. Other anomalies also were embodied in the award; but no doubt the resistance of the men to the award arose not so much from the anomalies as from the fact that so little scaling was done and that a very substantial reduction was made from the wages that had before obtained. Whether or not such a reduction was justified, this Parliament is not in a position to say; I am not in a position to say. It does strike one, though, that it was a very substantial reduction indeed to take place all at one time.

The result of the resistance of the men to the award was that representatives of

the men again met representatives of the company and some slight modifications were made, not affecting in any way the main body of the findings; not affecting in any way the 32½ per cent reduction, but correcting certain of the anomalies that were found in the first report. It appears that some of the representatives of the men favoured the acceptance of the suggestion—which, of course, had no effect at all until accepted—and that others did not. At all events, the men declined to accept, and by a vote of about seven to one declared they would not be parties to such an agreement.

Consequently, the men were in this position, that all steps had been taken which they could take under the law of Canada. Whether there was a law of the province they might have resorted to or not that had any effect, I could not say. One has been referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) to-night, but under the law that comes under our purview here the men had taken all the steps they could take, the company had done the same, and still the clash existed. Now, having pursued the remedies provided for by the act in proper order, the fact remains that there is a class war on in the province of Nova Scotia. The fact remains that twelve thousand men are in a state of hostility against their employers, the British Empire Steel Corporation. In that condition of affairs one of their leaders, who appears, I judge, from press reports, to have behind him a vast majority of the men whether he ought to have or not, advises those men, and they accept his advice, to adopt a certain course, namely, to decline to work a full day's work at this reduced wage which now is in effect, but to give rather a partial day's work which they believe represents the full wage they receive, and which prevents the company making profits or piling coal as a reserve, which reserve the men believe would put the company in a position to fight effectually any further resistance on their part.

Now that this condition is a serious one, and a very serious one, none of us can dispute. Though there may be wrong on the part of Mr. McLachlan and on the part of the men who follow him—and I will discuss that later—though there may be wrong on the part of the operators, neither of these wrongs removes the fact that a serious condition of affairs exists in the province of Nova Scotia. Then the question comes: Is there anything this Parliament can do, is there anything this Government has failed to do or to-day can do, to improve the situation in the province of Nova Scotia? I hold in my hand what was given to me as a copy, and I have no doubt it is, of the memorial presented to the Administration by the mayors of the towns or cities in the bodies of this area affected so seriously by the present situation. These mayors do not come in their personal capacity. Surely it is not correct to say that they do. I have met only one, but we cannot ignore the fact that they are mayors elected by their people, representing all the people, doubtless, of the towns and cities of which they are officers, and they come here to make their representations because of the general concern of the whole community in a happy outcome of the present unfortunate condition of affairs. Those are men who ought to know what is really the trouble; they ought to be able to measure pretty well what the dangers are, what is to be avoided, and they ought to be able to judge fairly well what might be done. I read from their memorial in order to give their view of how serious, if not desperate, the situation is. They say:

> In this connection the delegation wish to quote a paragraph from a letter received since their arrival in Ottawa. This letter refers to conditions in the coal fields of Cape Breton and says:
>
> "The doctors here declare that there is more sickness among young children than they ever met with before. There are more children staying away from school than ever in the history of the mining towns of this district."

The delegation goes on to say:

> This sickness among young children has resulted from nothing more nor less than malnutrition. The children are kept home from school because their parents cannot provide them with sufficient clothing. The Supervisor of Schools in Glace Bay is authority for the statement that young boys are being kept away from school in order that they may earn something to help provide for the families; and any one who cares to investigate will find that children are actually going hungry in the mining districts and are falling ill because it is impossible to provide them with sufficient nourishing food and sufficient clothing.
>
> We have in Nova Scotia laws requiring the attendance of children at school; but when notices are sent out to parents of supposed delinquents it transpires that the children cannot attend because they are not sufficiently clothed.
>
> This is an attempt to briefly sketch conditions as they exist; but no one who has not seen these conditions for himself can be expected to understand what they mean in the lives of tens of thousands of human beings—

Because, be it remembered, while twelve thousand represents the number of miners, probably sixty thousand would more nearly represent the numbers in the families of those affected.

—and this is, we may say, the chief reason why we are here to-day asking the Government to investigate. We feel that the situation will never be understood until a commission of sympathetic, just and competent investigators have gone into the mining districts of Nova Scotia and seen things for themselves, until they have seen with their own eyes the conditions under which these people are expected to live and bring up healthy families. For we can assure the Government that this dispute that is threatening the industrial stability of the province of Nova Scotia has had rise in these conditions. It is useless to expect peace and harmony and contentment in a community, the citizens of which are forced to exist in this way. If men cannot earn enough to feed and clothe themselves and their families, to live in some degree of comfort, and provide means of even a common school education for their children, not to mention some provision for the years in which miners become too old to earn, then, we feel, we may well despair of the future.

The memorial goes on with reasonings and assertions of what they say are facts much of a character similar to that I have read and some of it, indeed, even more alarming. The House recalls as well the words of the hon. member who represents at least part of the district affected, the hon. member for Cape Breton South, and it was only too plain from what he said that a situation far more perilous than appears now may well follow unless by some means or another alleviation is brought.

In the body of the memorial I have read it appears to be their opinion that only by examining the condition of the families on the ground can the problem be understood or a fair solution offered. It is most unfortunate that the board that already has acted saw fit to confine its geography to the city of Halifax and was content to listen to what you might call inanimate evidence, instead of going right on the ground to the seat of the trouble, among the miners themselves, and seeing the actual conditions with their own eyes. All who have taken part in the debate, including the Minister of Labour, have clearly given the House the impression that the award could never have been expected to do what an award ought to do because of the failure of the board of arbitration in that regard. This delegation asked for a royal commission of men of sympathy and understanding and fairness of judgment to be selected to go down and, as it were, re-try the case, and re-try it under conditions that unfortunately were not brought to bear when the former board or arbitration met. That is their suggestion. There may be a better. I do not argue whether that is best or not.

The question I am going to approach is this: Whether or not this Government is justified in simply standing aside and saying: "We have had that board of arbitration. It did not do its whole duty by any means but all the same we have had it and here we have discovered a statute of the province of Nova Scotia. We are going to kick the whole thing out of Parliament and beyond our sight and push it over to the province of Nova Scotia for treatment." The Minister of Labour comes to Parliament, makes a speech of much passion and vehemence, declares against a certain line of conduct, and in an hour's oration and peroration denounces the suggestion with all the force of his personality. But really I think if he had given more careful consideration to an analysis of the facts before coming to the decision that he has announced here he would have better served the purpose of a Minister of Labour.

What is his position? He says: "I will have nothing to do with this thing at all. No royal commission for me. No action on my part. No dallying with the course of action on the part of Mr. McLachlan and his followers which is morally wrong and from which I turn my eyes in disgust." Were Mr. McLachlan assumed to be morally wrong, were all those following him wrong, were they indulging in something that is against the law—would even that be sufficient to justify the Government of the day in saying "Things can go right on until they step out of that line of conduct and comply with the law"? Let me give an illustration. Supposing Mr. McLachlan and his followers had declined to come under the Lemieux Act at all, that is under the Industrial Disputes Act? Suppose they had never negotiated with the British Empire Steel Company? Suppose they had never asked for a board of arbitration, following the failure of such a negotiation, but had simply gone on strike? They would be violaters of the law of this land, they would be violating the provisions of the Lemieux Act, but would that be sufficient cause for the Department of Labour to refuse its offices in every way, to decline to help them altogether or help the board; would it be a justification for the Minister of Labour

to say "Oh you did not ask for a board of arbitration, you never tried to negotiate, you did not obey the law of the Dominion of Canada, things can go on just as they like and men can starve. Whatever dispute arises I will not have anything to do with it because to do so would be to countenance and to encourage what is against the law of the land." Well, the Department of Labour has not taken that course in years gone by; the Department of Labour has stood always ready to help even though parties to the dispute might have been at the time acting in violation of the law.

Now let us inquire whether this case is worse than that? Are there reasons here for standing aloof in cold indifference that would not exist were the parties striking and acting in violation of law? What are these parties doing? Are they acting in violation of law? Are they in as bad a position as strikers would be who will not strike without asking for a board of arbitration? Well, I submit that they are not. I am not one who in the past has been noted for countenancing violation of the law. I have taken some risks, politically and otherwise, in order that the law of this land might be upheld; and I have no sympathy whatever with the conduct of men who seek to gain their end by violation of a law of any kind, whether it is the Criminal Code or any other statute. And there is another class with whom I would have no sympathy at all: I would have no sympathy with a man, or a body of men, who, accepting a wage schedule and contracting to work under it, would go to work and seek to give only a partial day's work for a day's pay although they accept it as a day's pay. I do not think that would be particularly a violation of the law but it would be, morally at least, a violation of contract. To pretend to be doing a day's work and not be doing it, that is what I would call loafing on the job, that is what I would call dishonesty—it is pretending to do what you are not doing.

Are these men even in that position? If they were I do not think it would be a violation of the law; but are they in that position? They may be but if so I have not understood the facts as adduced in this House. What have these men done? They have been requested, we will put it, to accept a wage reduction of 32½ per cent. They have declined to do it. They say "No, it is not a living wage; we cannot support our families, we cannot send our children to school. We do not want to go on strike or go out." Why? The reason they give is that they have exhausted their funds in mutual help already and that they would have great difficulty in supporting a strike. They say: "Here, you are giving us two-thirds of a day's pay and we will give you two-thirds of a day's work and only that: we won't pretend to give you any more." That is what I understand to be their position.

Now aside from the fact, aside from whether it can be criticized or not, is it any false pretence on their part? Really I cannot see that it is. Mr. McLachlan announced this position publicly and we take the men as announcing the same thing because we must assume that each man went to his employer and said: "You pay us so much a day and we will give you so much work." I am speaking now of the men known as the datal men who asked for so much a day, I will speak of the others in a moment. Very well, it is within the province of the employer to say "We will not accept that; we will not pay you for that two-thirds of a day's work;" and I cannot see how anyone could very well complain when the men go openly to the employer and openly announce "We will do so much work a day and will not do any more." That is the stand the men have taken. If hon. gentlemen see offence in that well at least you can measure the extent of that offence, and I ask the House is the extent of that offence so terrible that the Department of Labour of Canada must fold its arms and cease to function altogether, that they must say "Oh, until you stop that, until you cease to do that anti-British or non-British, non-Canadian cowardly act you can expect no more help from the Department of Labour; we will leave the community to its fate until you cease to tell your employers that you will only do so much work for the wage they have offered you."

As regards the piece-work men respecting whom I ventured to interrupt the member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), really I do not see how any complaint can be made against them at all—let me say that very frankly. A man who is taking coal out of a mine at so much a ton is offered so much a ton. Perhaps a day's work is twenty tons—I do not know what it is—but he says "I will only produce fifteen tons." Well that man will only get paid for fifteen tons; consequently, how any complaint could be levelled against him —and I am told he represents thirty-five

or forty per cent of the whole number—is beyond my power to imagine.

Mr. CARROLL: And he is anxious to work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. I understand that the piece-work men were parties to this arrangement to only do a partial amount of work.

Mr. CARROLL: My instructions are that ninety-five per cent of the men who have been dismissed by the coal company up to date are datal men who cannot lose whether they work or not. The great bulk of the men who are paid by the amount of their production are willing to produce all they can but they cannot get the coal out because the datal men refuse to carry it for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is that the piece-work men and the datal men are all parties to this method of seeking a settlement of this dispute. That is my information at all events. Now what I am saying is this—

Mr. CARROLL: I notice that the president of Local Dominion No. 1 has resigned and refused to carry out the instructions given by Mr. McLachlan; so that they are probably divided.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed that one man has resigned, but that is a very insignificant number compared with the size of the organization. Generally speaking, all have concurred in taking this course, but, really, it is not at all relevant to the argument I am making. I am arguing that, with respect to these workmen, if they choose to take this course, it is difficult for any one to criticize their action.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it be fair to the employer to have his machinery simply used at three-quarters capacity?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has the option of letting them all out. If a man comes frankly to his employer and says, "At that rate of wages I will produce so much, and the reason I am doing this is that if I produce more it places me at your mercy later on," the employer has the option of keeping him on or letting him go.

Mr. McMASTER: That is a new arrangement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the situation to-day. If I am wrongly informed, I should like to be corrected. They have openly said to the world and to the employer, "We are ready to do this and no more; if it does not satisfy you, you have your course." I have merely delineated to the House the facts as represented to me, and they are in no way inconsistent with what any hon. gentleman has to-day presented, and in no way inconsistent with any facts presented by the Minister of Labour.

Has the minister analysed the actions of these men? He makes great perorations about "loafing on the job." I can understand what loafing would be. Suppose there were a body of trained men on a railway line, or any other class of men, who had come to a wage agreement with their employer and agreed to work for a certain wage a certain length of time, expiring on a certain date, and that body of men, in the course of that time, declined to give a day's work, or declined to do a portion of the work it was their duty to do—that, I would say, was loafing on the job, a violation of the contract, and dishonest toil. But that is not the position of these men. That is what is alleged by Mr. McLachlan in one of his replies, whether correctly or not I do not know at all, but that is a very different thing from the position of men, particularly piece workers, who say, "This much we are prepared to do, and that wage we will take for it; there is our position, what is yours?" Let me ask again, is the assumption of a position of that kind so black and unforgivable an offence against social order that the Minister of Labour of this country will stand in his might and majesty and say "Not for mine," to use his classical language this afternoon? That is the position the Government has taken.

It is argued by the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), evidently in a spirit of fairness on his part, that there is no remdy open to these men, that to appoint a royal commission would be utterly valueless, because it has no power to enforce its award, but he says there is a remedy down in Nova Scotia by means of a commission that would have power to enforce its award. Let us examine that contention. A royal commission has not the power to enforce its award, any more than a board of arbitration has. It was never the intention, as the Prime Minister knows better than I do, because he largely framed the act, that any board of arbitration created under its provision should have power to enforce their award. The great object of the law, as I apprehend it, was this: that by means of boards of arbitration the facts would

be brought to light and the position and difficulties of each side would be revealed to the other. There would be means of mutual negotiation and consultation, and strikes would be avoided, and where strikes were not avoided, then the adducing of the facts and the revelation of the truth would so affect the public mind on the side of the party who had the major right in the case that those who were not right would be compelled to succumb. I have sought, in one or two sentences, to state the purpose and the spirit of the law of Canada as I understand it. That is the object of a board of arbitration, and that would be the main object of a commission were such to be appointed in response to this demand at the present time.

Is there any body in Nova Scotia that can enforce its award? A board of arbitration or a royal commission appointed by the government of Nova Scotia could no more enforce its award than a royal commission appointed by this Government could. There might be some lever that the government of Nova Scotia would have over the company. If an award were made against the company, they might be able, although it would be pretty hard to justify it, I would think, to say to the company, "We will cancel your lease if you do not comply with that award." But how would they ever enforce an award against the men? And what is the good of an award that is enforceable only one way? Therefore, that attempt at distinction falls at once to the ground. Any object to be served by a commission of inquiry, investigation and conciliation, appointed by any government, can be served by such commission as requested by the memorialists who have appeared before the Government. Why the Government should have adopted the statement indicated in the press statement read by the Minister of Labour to-day, passes my comprehension. But to say to these men "We do not dispute the value of a royal commission, or the need of further investigation, we do not dispute the dire conditions you present, and we do not dispute they may get worse and rapidly worse, although all these things are undisputed, because J. D. McLachlan advises the men, and they take his advice, only to do so much work for so much money, we will not have anything to do with it whatsoever." Is that not actually the position taken by the Minister of Labour, and the position the Government is in to-night? Can the Government hold that position? I do not see how they can sustain it in reason.

It surely is the duty of the Government not to be looking to the rightness or the wrongness of the act of a man or a body of men, but to be looking to the course it can take to help out a great community that faces a great calamity. Surely it is not too late to reverse or, for my part, modify the position the Government unfortunately took in this regard. Surely, it is not too late yet to intervene, and, if not by royal commission, by some other means, possibly a committee of this House, although I would fancy a commission would be very much better, because it could go down there and understand conditions with the eyes of humankind which a committee sitting here could not do. By some means, surely a way can be found to prevent what appears very likely to be serious happenings in Nova Scotia. Now, in what I have sought to say I have not in any way argued against the reasonableness of either side. I am not sufficiently versed with the facts to do so. Only a commission that hears evidence from every angle could do that, but what I have sought to argue is this: That there is nothing in the present state of facts, nor in the conduct of any parties in this dispute, to justify the Government in the course it has taken, and the duty of the Government to-day is to get between the parties, by means of a commission, or some better means if they can devise it, and seek to help both sides, but seek most of all to assist the community that faces the danger it does face, and that community is not merely the province of Nova Scotia. More than Nova Scotia is affected by it. There is a very large section of eastern Canada which will be affected. This is the appeal I make to the Government to-night.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, as I sat, an interested observer all afternoon, I noticed that a favourite expression was used over and over again, and that was the phrase "loafing on the job." I wondered how it was that the hon. members of this House became so familiar with that phrase "loafing on the job," and then it struck me that I had read some place in the dim past about certain large subsidies that had been given to some steel corporations in the vicinity at least of Nova Scotia. I thought that possibly that was the time that the people's representatives were loafing on the job. I think, like many others, that

we are not in possession of the concrete facts of the case; and after all we can speak on this matter only from a human standpoint. We do know something about this British Empire Steel Corporation. We know, for instance, that it is not a provincial corporation, in that its shareholders do not live in the province of Nova Scotia. We know that it is not even a national but an international concern. We guess, too, that the statement that there is $19,000,000 of water in the stock is quite true, and that the company is endeavouring to get dividends on this watered stock out of the labourers whose wages they have reduced so drastically.

I am aware, you know, that sitting here quite comfortably and well fed, it does not seem such a bad thing to have your wages reduced 37½ per cent. But if anyone got up to-night and moved that the indemnity, starting with the Prime Minister and coming down, should be reduced 37½ per cent, I think it would be generally felt that this was quite a reduction. And that is the only viewpoint in this matter after all; just that. It may be that there is a provincial law, or a national law, in the way. But do you know what I thought before I came to this House? I thought that laws were made for people, but I know now that that is not true; people are made for laws. And surely if there is something in the constitution that is in the way it can be removed so that justice may be meted out to those people, who seem to form a large part of the population of Nova Scotia. I believe that the mayors who came here did not come to represent labour at all. They did not come to represent the miners. They came to represent the people of the towns in which they live, who are not miners. Those people see the injustice of the thing and they feel that somebody must do something to remedy the situation. One of the mayors said that in his town there were 7,000 people, including children, of whom 1,600 were miners, and that he was not sent here to represent those 1,600 but the 5,400 who were not miners, because they want law and order in their land and realise that permanent law and order can come only through prosperity and happiness.

Now, I have here a copy of the notices sent to the parents of the children telling them that their children had not been to school and that under the law they were punishable by fine not exceeding $20, or in default one month's imprisonment. It strikes one that there could be but one object in sending them to prison; they would be fed during that month, because the county council of Cape Breton allows 40 cents a day for the food of prisoners, while the British Empire Steel Corporation pays 19 cents per head per day to men who have on an average five of a family to support. From that standpoint, therefore, it appears that it would be better for them to go to jail for the month at least. I do not in the least feel that I am competent to enter upon a full discussion of the case, but there is sitting in this House a gentleman who is a recognized authority on such things, and who has written a very learned book, and I shall be glad to quote therefrom for the benefit of hon. members:

> Of methods of industrial remuneration which are calculated to beget a sense of freedom in effort, and which therefore are specially adapted to promote efficiency, it is certain that experience has revealed no single method possessing a monopoly of advantage. On the contrary, methods wholly different have disclosed much of individual merit. The practice which in the long run is apt to do most by way of promoting efficiency, through harmonizing the interests of labour, capital, management, and the community, is pretty certain to be in the nature of a combination of features broader than any possessed by a single method.
>
> What labour is really concerned about as regards remuneration, is adequate reward of the effort put forth. What capital and management are really concerned about is adequate reward for their investments and services. What the community is really concerned about is adequate value in services and commodities for purchasing power. The method of remuneration of labour which helps most to secure adequacy of returns all round is the method which is likely to prove the most productive of efficiency, and, in the long run, the most advantageous to labour.
>
> What is earned, rather than what is received, or paid, is the fundamental consideration. Men should get what they earn, and should earn what they get. The amount of product must be looked to as the determining factor. The thing paid for is the result, not the time spent on obtaining it.
>
> Where remuneration is the incentive to effort, if effort is to be adequate, remuneration must be adequate. The real interest of the parties to industry lies in the incentive being adequate to call forth the best that is in the worker in energy and skill in other words, the utmost of his will and capacity. If the best is to be expected of a man, he must be given the fullest opportunity to make the best of himself.
>
> Wages, like hours, may be excessive or deficient. They are too high when they lead to laziness and indifference, and too low when they are insufficient to stimulate effort. Adequate wages are beneficial alike to labour, capital, management, and the community, in that they lead to a maximum of effort and a minimum of waste.
>
> It is seldom possible to determine readily what are adequate wages. Much depends on the class of work to be performed and the

amount of energy and skill required on the character and temperament, and even on the heredity of the worker.

Much depends, too, on circumstances and conditions such as the available supply and demand of labour, the hours to be worked, the quality of materials supplied, the efficiency of the plant and equipment, and other indeterminable factors. With remuneration, as with all else in industrial relations, to secure efficiency is a matter of proper adjustments. Account must be taken of human as well as economic considerations. The incentive must be adjusted to the individual. "The ideal condition economically", says Dr. Arthur Shadwell, "would be an automatic mechanism which would exactly adjust the incentive to the individual, or the wages to the work, thereby eliciting the best of which each is capable. This would be equally advantageous to the wage-taker and the wage-giver, and to the community to which both belong, because there would be no waste. Its perfect realization in industry is no more practicable than any other sort of perfection, but some methods of remuneration come nearer to it than others, and their comparative bearing on efficiency can be gauged accordingly."

Proceeding to estimate the various methods of remunerating Labour, by reference to the economic principle of "adjusted incentive" or "the differential treatment of varying capacity," this eminent authority finds that, of all methods, the farthest removed from the ideal is that of Time-wages at a uniform rate, in that it presupposes an equality which has no existence, and is therefore based on a false principle. Piece-work, on the other hand, he regards as obviously based on the sound economic principle that workers should be paid according to the value of their work. Where Time-work is adjusted to individual capacity, the principle is the same as that underlying payment by the piece.

That Dr. Shadwell in his analysis is right, must be apparent to all who, like him, have had a wide range of observation and experience. How is it, then, that Labour, which is primarily interested in the method of remuneration best calculated to assure it amplest returns, is so averse to payment on a piece-work basis, and inclines so strongly to payment of a standard wage on a time basis? To attribute this to sheer laziness, or to a desire to degrade all workers to the level of the least capable or industrious is as untrue to the facts as it is unfair to human nature. Workers in industry are just as inclined to put forth effort for the sake of reward, just as ambitious, just as eager for individual recognition, as individuals from any other class in society. Nor are the leaders different from others in these respects. If in appreciable numbers the workers fail in these qualities, it is because the path of bitter experience has bred feelings of fatality concerning the circumstances of their lot, and because, in the immensity of the struggle in which they are involved, they see little hope of gaining a reward which they consider adequate, little opportunity of rising to a higher level, and little scope for individual initiative or individual attainment.

As a matter of fact, it is not the desire to ignore talent, but a belief that in some manner beyond their control special skill or exertion will be ignored, or, what is worse, exploited, that provokes among working men a reaction against piece-work payment, and a desire for payment on a time basis. As Dr. Shadwell has pointed out, the minimum time-wage, on which Labour insists, is itself a sort of tacit and unconscious protest against a uniform rate, since a minimum implies possible variations which are not to fall beneath a certain point but may rise above it. Likewise, the real meaning of the "living-wage," he finds to lie in the fact that wages are the incentive to work, and must be adequate to produce it. Where men are forced by necessity to work below a standard which constitutes a living wage, labour, while apparently cheap, is really dear, because "sweated" Labour is either unwilling or without capacity.

If payment on a piece-work rather than on a uniform time basis is to be maintained in industry, it can be so only through affording grounds sufficient to lead to the substitution of faith for fear as respects the consequences involved. Foremost must come the certainty that if a man increases his output by working harder, he will continue to reap an advantage by so doing. This means that employers must refrain from cutting down the piece-price in order to reap, at labour's expense, the benefit of increased exertions on the part of labour. Such practice vitiates the whole principle of piece-work payment by destroying the capable worker's incentive. Since it inevitably results in a lessening of productivity, it deals a fatal blow at efficiency, leads to a consequent increase in the cost of production, and justifies the prejudice on the part of labour against this method of remuneration.

Piece-work, moreover, must not be rendered illusory in practice through employers providing bad material or machinery. The temptation to "speed up" machinery, thereby overtaxing energies of the worker, is something which must also be guarded against, though it is not likely to be a source of danger where the rate of speed is controlled by the worker himself. The fear that jealousy between workers may be excited through competition is less an evil than the danger that incentive may so vanish as to leave little room for competition. The example of the more capable and industrious should prove a stimulus rather than an irritant to less efficient workers where certainty of enhanced rewards is rendered apparent.

Once confidence is established in the piece-work basis of remuneration through the assured maintenance of the principle on which it is founded that, namely, of workers being rewarded according to the value of their work, the stimulus of ordinary piece-work may be increased in various ways by additional rewards based on evidence of different individual capacity. In technical language, this is the principle of the "intensive differential rate." Referring to intensive piece-work, Dr. Shadwell says: "It takes different forms, but generally consists in paying each worker a higher price (i.e., a differential rate) for each piece or job in proportion to the rapidity and quality of his workmanship. This automatically adjusts the incentive to the individual who has the choice of earning more or less according to capacity and industry. The employer is able to pay higher wages for quicker work because he gets a larger output for the same machine cost. He divides with the worker the advantage accruing from the difference."

Organized labour, in some trades, has protested against this method on the ground that it resembles the task system of wage payment and creates jealousy and ill-feeling. It is clear that a rare impartiality must be exercised in any attempt to apply the principle of the

"intensive differential rate," and that a just discrimination is difficult. Unless, in practice, suspicion of favoritism or of undue pressure can be avoided, this method may well serve to arouse rather than allay unrest.

Similar in purpose to payment by the piece is the premium or premium bonus plan. It consists in offering additional pay for more output in a given time, or for less time expended on a given piece, or for economies effected with respect to power, supplies or materials used in production. The premium may be differently calculated according to the nature of the work. It may be on a time basis, so much by the day or week with additional pay for curtailment of the time required for a given result, or on a piece basis with a bonus for the less time expended on a given piece. Or it may be on a basis of inverse ratio to quantities of power or materials consumed. The method is open to the same kind of dangers as payment on a piece-work basis, and prejudice against it can be overcome only by the same regard for the maintenance of standard rates irrespective of the premiums or bonuses allowed.

In the remuneration of labour, the fears of capital, management, and the community are just as important a consideration as those of labour. If productivity, in which all share, is to be increased through improved relations, capital, management and the community, as well as labour, must have their faith increased through the elimination of their fears. All payment based on the principle of "the adjusted incentive" and "the differential treatment of varying capacity," tends in this direction.

Labour cost is only one element in the total production cost. There are in addition the cost of premises and equipment, including plant, power, tools, and machinery the cost of maintenance, raw materials, and supplies; the expenses of management, including superintendence and direction of processes; and there are the risks of various kinds to property and person which become chargeable upon industry. It is quite conceivable that "the differential incentive," whilst it elicits the best efforts of each man by paying him according to value of output, offers no incentive to him to promote the interests of the whole by care of machinery, by economy of power or raw material. It may, through the effort to increase his own output, lead the worker to be extravagant of many things. If cost of production is to be kept down, something more is required which will give the wage-earner a direct interest in the success of the undertaking as a whole. Such an interest limits the tendency toward extravagance in the use of the property of others, and has the advantage of reducing the need and the expense of supervision. A direct interest in the success of an undertaking as a whole is the prevention of waste in production what a knowledge of industrial processes as a whole is to intelligent and sustained effort.

"A thoroughly effective method of remuneration," says Dr. Shadwell, "includes both principles, (1) the differential incentive, which acts on the individual as such; and (2) profit-sharing, which acts on him in his collective capacity, as a member of a body bound together by common interests and working for a common end. By increasing the efficiency of labour, they diminish its cost, and so increase profits though wages rise."

I thought it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Government had forgotten that he wrote this book. If he does remember, I am quite sure that some of his followers, judging by the sentiments they expressed this afternoon, are not in sympathy with it; and Hansard to-morrow morning may make good reading for them. This is the thing, however, that as a House of Commons which is supposed to represent the people of Canada, we should remember: the only thing worth while in industry, no matter what that industry is, is humanity. If the Government can, by appointing either a royal commission or a commission that is not royal, go to the ground and look it over—I think the Minister of Labour admitted this afternoon that the investigators in this case had gone to Halifax rather than to Glace Bay and Cumberland and the places where the miners worked and lived—if the Government can do anything by this means, they should do it. I felt that as the only woman member of the House—although I would rather be known as the member for South-east Grey than as the woman member of the House— I would not be fair to myself or to the women and children in Nova Scotia who are to-day really suffering for the lack of food and clothing, if I too, did not raise my voice in protest against conditions that are made possible by the special privilege and great power that have been granted to the British Empire Steel Corporation.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my hon. friend who has just taken her seat (Miss Macphail) will not be surprised when I say, that I agree whole-heartedly with the greater part, if not all, of what she has said. As to the conditions existing in the mining regions of Nova Scotia and the unfortunate and deplorable state of affairs which has arisen out of a particular industrial controversy, I am very much in accord with what has been said this afternoon. The question that we are called upon to consider, however, is not these conditions but how they can best be met.

The discussion to-day has arisen out of the Government's attitude toward a request which was made yesterday by a deputation that a royal commission be appointed to consider mining conditions in Nova Scotia. In order that the House may understand the significance of the Government's action, may I make perfectly clear just what powers a royal commission has and what powers exist under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, which has already been applied to deal with this dispute and the

provisions of which are still available should it be thought advisable to have further use made of them. To show the relationship, perhaps I might go back a little and trace the steps which led to the passing of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

One of the hon. members who addressed the House this afternoon pointed out that the old Liberal government had appointed royal commissions to deal with industrial disputes. That is perfectly true, but the reason why it did, was that at the time there was no other agency for conducting investigations under oath where the matters involved were in the nature of industrial disputes. The first legislation of this Parliament with special relation to industrial controversies was enacted in 1900, when a Conciliation Act was passed, based upon similar legislation in force in Great Britain. That act empowered the Government to appoint at the time of an industrial dispute, a conciliator who might go into the district affected and endeavour to bring the parties together, his powers were voluntary and failing adjustment of the controversy by voluntary effort, he was limited to making a report which might influence public opinion sufficiently to assist in ending the controversy. For a number of years that was the only legislation we had to deal with industrial disputes. Under it there were many interventions, but experience went to show that the act was insufficient in that it gave to the Government conciliator no power to get at the truth in the event of the facts being disputed as between the parties. He was unable to summon witnesses; he was unable, except with the consent of the parties, to investigate premises; his power was, in large measure, simply one of persuasion.

One or two very serious disputes arose, one, in particular, in western Canada which involved the interests not merely of the two contending parties but also of the general public, who in no way were responsible for the controversy and had no voice in its settlement. I have reference to the strike which took place in southern Alberta, I think it was in 1907. Because of a dispute in the coal fields there, many of the settlers in our western provinces found themselves at the beginning of the winter season without coal or fuel and threatened with the possibility of freezing to death. After that situation had been brought to the attention of Parliament the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was passed with a view of providing machinery which might more adequately deal with these disputes and which would give to all parties concerned the power of investigation. There was always this objection to a royal commission: that the Government might be accused of including in its personnel an appointee or appointees of their own who would be persona non grata with one or other or both of the parties to the dispute. It is seldom that a government can satisfy all parties to a dispute in the selection of the personnel of a royal commission. It was thought, therefore, that if a method could be found which, while protecting the rights of the parties, would at the same time give to each an opportunity to investigate through an appointee of its own, some one in whom it had confidence, that would be the wisest course the Government could take. That is the theoretical basis of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. It recognizes first of all that Labour as a party to an industrial controversy has the right to have its own investigator participate in the investigation; that capital also as a party to an industrial controversy has the right to have an investigator in whom it has confidence participate in the investigation. Then there is the third party, the public, which is vitally interested in most industrial disputes.

I must confess that except for a chance remark or two we have heard little said this afternoon or in the course of this debate as to the public interest in the matter, and it is in that regard that I wish particularly to say a word or two as to the Government's attitude in this matter. The public are interested in a just settlement and particularly in the prevention of industrial disputes. This fact the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act takes cognizance of by permitting the two parties to the dispute to agree, if they can, on a chairman, but failing agreement by the parties, giving to a minister of the Government, representing the people of the country, the right to appoint the chairman of a board; also if either of the parties to the dispute fails to appoint a representative then giving the minister as representing the public the right to appoint such member of a board. Once a board of investigation has been established under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, that board has all the powers of a royal commission. It can summon before it witnesses, it can compel the production of docu-

ments, it has the right to take evidence under oath, it can go on to the premises concerned and investigate matters there; it has all the powers that a court has.

Now, notice this, and it is an important point for hon. members to have in their minds: The Government might appoint a royal commission, place on it very honourable and estimable persons, but would it be possible for the Government to place on a board, representatives who were likely to share to the same degree the confidence of the parties concerned as representatives selected by the parties themselves?—and that is the right the parties have under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. When this dispute took place in Nova Scotia the parties to it were asked to name their members on the board. The miners named a member, and their member had all the rights and powers of a royal commissioner. He had the right to call before him any member of the company concerned, he had the right to demand the production of the books of the company concerned. I repeat he had all the powers and rights that any royal commissioner would have The other members of the board had similar rights.

Now, when those rights have already been given, when a board has already acted with that full power and authority, does it seem a wise course for the Government immediately afterwards, because the award that has been given has not been satisfactory to the parties concerned, and simply, because asked to appoint a royal commission, to go on and investigate the matter further? No one in this country has greater faith in the power of publicity to remedy certain wrongs than I have. I believe there are evils which publicity can cure that no penalty on earth would ever cure, particularly that class of evils which are of the nature of an injustice, or of meanness, arbitrary behaviour and the like. Things of this kind, which are more or less common to all industrial controversies, will not stand the light of publicity. I believe firmly and strongly in the wisdom of the widest publicity as the best agency for helping to solve industrial wrongs, but there comes a time when one has to decide just how many agencies of publicity must be set to work and in what particular circumstances they must be set to work.

I hope I have made it clear, as regards this dispute, that every member of the board appointed, including the representative chosen by the miners themselves, had this right of investigation and all the powers that go with it—powers equivalent to those of a royal commission. One of the members of the delegation which appeared before some of my colleagues and myself yesterday to ask for a royal commission was a member of that board. He mentioned that the board did not visit the different parts of the mining area affected, and he was asked the question by one of my colleagues whether any communication had been sent to the minister at Ottawa to request the board to visit these districts. He intimated that there had been none, but that he had spoken to his colleagues and they had preferred to sit in Halifax and have the investigation carried on there. Can the Government be held responsible for the board having failed to travel to different parts of Nova Scotia to make its inquiry when no member of the board brought that suggestion to the Government's attention? My colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) would have been the very first to have directed the board of investigation to go wherever any member of it wished to go, and I venture to say that if any useful purpose can be served by a further investigation, and it is desired to have the board re-convened, visit these different districts and take evidence, my colleague the Minister of Labour will be the first to try and bring about that effective means of investigation.

One thing I should like to point out, however, and it is this: The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has read to the House this evening part of a memorial which was presented to the Government yesterday. I think hon. members who heard it will recall that what he read had to do very largely with the condition of the children attending the schools, that they were not attending as they should because they were not properly clothed, had not sufficient food, and the like. Well, I ask hon. members of this House, is the question of the attendance of children at school primarily a question for investigation by this Government or by the government of the province concerned? If there is any truth in this memorial, and I am not calling it in question one way or the other, the matters that are brought to the attention of the Government in that memorial would appear to be matters primarily of concern to the province of Nova Scotia.

Let me direct the attention of hon. members to this further fact. The province of Nova Scotia has offered to appoint a

royal commission. Neither of the parties to the controversy in Nova Scotia is being denied a royal commission. The government of Nova Scotia, the province concerned, and this dispute relates only to that province, have offered to appoint a royal commission. True, they have attached a certain condition to its appointment. They have said that pending the time of the inquiry by the commission they will expect the miners to drop this policy of ca'canny, or sabotage, or loafing on the job, curtailment of output, or whatever you wish to call it. This policy is not, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition tried to make out, one of simply offering to do so much work for so much money. It is a method of industrial warfare which has worked all kinds of havoc in the Old World, and which we do not wish to see reproduced in this country. Let me tell my right hon. friend that his time might be better employed than in trying to defend such a course which is a species of industrial warfare, and one of the worst kinds of industrial warfare known to the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not state that it was not industrial warfare; nothing of the kind. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me wherein what I stated was wrong. If I misstated the facts, will he please state where and what the real facts are?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I notice that whenever I hit the nail on the head my right hon. friend jumps at once to his feet. I think hon. members of the House will be the first to appreciate whether I have given their true significance to the words of my right hon. friend. What I want to make plain is that so far as the purpose of this Government is concerned, we do not propose to take any action which can be construed as countenancing that kind of industrial warfare. It has not made any headway in Canada at the present time, and for this Government—after an attempt has been made to introduce such methods into an industrial controversy—to appoint, or to concede in the interests of those responsible a commission under such circumstances would be to countenance that kind of warfare and to encourage it in this country. The Minister of Labour made that very plain this afternoon and in doing so he stated unequivocally the position of the Government.

Mr. IRVINE: In what way would an attempt by this Government to settle the trouble in Nova Scotia be countenancing sabotage?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I said—and I hope I have not failed to make my meaning clear to every member—was this: There are times and seasons for all things. There is a proper time for the Government to grant a commission; there is a proper time for a Government to withhold a commission. There has been an investigation of this industrial trouble. A finding has been made by the Board of Investigators. Since that finding has been made a certain policy has been announced by one of the parties to the controversy, a policy which we think is not in the public interest. What we say is this: When those who are carrying out that policy or others on their behalf come to the Government and ask us to do something at the public expense, we expect them first of all to consider the public interest; and when they are prepared to do that we will be prepared to consider any further request they may have to make; in taking that stand our position is exactly the same as that of the province of Nova Scotia at the present time.

Mr. IRVINE: I would ask the Prime Minister this question: Have there not been statements made by the two parties in this difficulty? Has not the corporation itself made the very definite statement that it will refuse to pay any more than so much wages? In that case why should not the Government consider that just as much sabotage as it does the contention of the men? To put my question more clearly: If it is sabotage for the men to say "We will give so much work for so much money," is it not sabotage for the company to say "We will give so much money for so much work"? What is the difference?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There may be no difference whatever but the point I wish to bring out is this: In my opinion the most cruel act a government can perform in its dealings with labour is to raise the hopes of labour as regards any possible future improvement with the certainty of those hopes being disappointed in the course of a very short time. For this Government to tell the miners in Nova Scotia to-day that it will appoint a royal commission, with the miners being led to believe that the appointment of such a commission would mean the raising of their wages—when what my hon. friend has just said may be true, that the company concerned does not intend to alter its scale

of wages one way or the other—would be to raise false hopes in the minds of many. There are certain things that a government can do and there are other things that no government can do; and I think a government has to be very careful before announcing any policy, to view the end from the beginning, and not to raise hopes in the minds of men and women unless they see a possibility of those hopes being realized.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not wish to interrupt the Prime Minister too much, and I promise not to do so again for the present, but what about the killing of hope? If any promise of a royal commission by this Government will raise false hopes, will not the refraining from appointing that commission kill all hope? Which of the two is the worse?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I point out to my hon. friend—because I think he and I have the same motive at heart in this matter; I think we are each equally concerned in the welfare of the men and women involved in this dispute—the province of Nova Scotia has promised a royal commission. If there is efficacy in a royal commission, if further investigation is going to help the situation, there is the chance. True, the province of Nova Scotia has stipulated that pending the period of the investigation the employees of the company shall carry out their work in accordance with the terms of the existing contract. Now does my hon. friend not think—I do—that if there is virtue in publicity, if there is virtue in a royal commission dealing with this subject, that the miners would be well advised just for that period to carry out the terms of the contract and meanwhile discontinue this policy of loafing on the job? May I say further that when I spoke yesterday with the deputation I asked this question of its members: If the Government of Canada will undertake to appoint a royal commission at the public expense and to give them the power of investigating this whole question, do you think the parties to the dispute will agree to accept the findings of that commission? They intimated that they did not think they would. Under such circumstances is the Government to appoint commissions simply because and whenever it is requested to appoint them? The Government is obliged to take account of many considerations in all its actions. If it appoints a commission in Nova Scotia because of an industrial dispute there after an investigation under the Industrial Disputes Act has taken place, to-morrow it may be called upon to appoint a commission for like reasons in the province of British Columbia, and next day for similar reasons in the province of Ontario. There has to be some policy followed consistently, and the policy which the Government is prepared to follow is that of seeing that in so far as these industrial disputes can be fully investigated they shall be fully investigated, and that in so far as each dispute can be investigated by a board possessing a personnel in which the different parties concerned will have confidence, the effort of the Government will be to secure that personnel. In regard to the request of the deputation that waited upon it, all that the Government has said is—to quote from the words of the letter which I sent yesterday and which my hon. friend (Mr. Irvine) has read:

> —that having had the matter under consideration the Government is of the opinion that the situation is not one which in the public interest can be satisfactorily dealt with under the existing circumstances by a Royal Commission.

"Under the existing circumstances!" And that has reference to the policy which we think is not in the public interest but which is being followed by one of the parties to the dispute at the present time. We are prepared to consider the interests of labour, we are prepared to consider the interests of Capital, but we have also to consider, and to consider primarily, the interests of the public; and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in the public interest for the Government to issue a royal commission upon request of parties who are taking a course of action which cannot be defended in this Parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): It is the right of the hon. member for East Calgary to close the debate. If any other hon. member desires to speak he should do so now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are a lot of things evidently as to which we are all agreed. But apparently there is a situation in Nova Scotia which is an unfortunate one and something ought to be done to relieve it; but seemingly we cannot agree as to what ought to be done or, indeed, as to whether anything can be done. I do not for one minute question the stand taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) in many of the aspects of the case. But the fact remains that we have this serious trouble, and that we are doing

absolutely nothing to remedy it. Suppose we test this case on any of the grounds put forward by the hon. gentleman. Suppose we take the ground of public necessity. Here is a great big public interest involved, not only in connection with the men and wages, but also in connection with the mining of our coal. There is a public interest with respect to the coal, which we urgently require. It is not only Nova Scotia that is interested, but the whole of Canada, up to the city of Montreal is vitally interested in the question of the production of Nova Scotia's coal.

The case is absolutely parallel to the case my hon. friend refers to, where he justified the royal commission of 1907. My difficulty is to find out just exactly why we cannot do something. Only two nights ago, when the estimates for the Labour Department were under consideration, an hon. member, speaking from this side of the House, asked the Minister of Labour whether, in his opinion, labour disputes could not be better settled by men of strong common sense, who knew human character, and how to deal with men rather than by men of scientific attainments, and I understood there was a very cheerful assent given to that proposition by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). But there is no such man on the job. He has to-day given us two reasons why this request is refused. The first reason, is that the request was made by representatives, not of the men, but of the people down there, that they were not in a position to say that the men were to be bound by anything that was done, that they did not know the companies would be bound by anything that was done, and because these people came here, not representing the men, a royal commission could not be granted. That was his first point. Later on, as the theme developed the real reason apparently was that, upon a very vital question, in the minister's mind, a question of policy in connection with the railway matter, the attitude of the men as represented by Mr. McLachlan, was such that he would not give them any commission. I do not know which was the real reason for refusal, but I know the grounds were absolutely inconsistent, one with the other.

The Premier gives illustrations, and makes an argument, for example, as to the peculiar position of this company, the peculiar complaint, and the peculiar interest the province has in connection with it He refers particularly to the school question, but there was much more than the school question. It is quite true my hon. friend did refer to the school question, but the memorandum refers to lots of things that are very largely in the hands of this Parliament. The memorandum says for example—

> We feel that, unless prompt and effective action is taken by the Government, matters too long drifting may break out into open hostilities to the lasting injury of the entire province.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is something which at least concerns, and very closely concerns, the Dominion authorities. But we are not driven to that one particular thing; there are many grounds that could be raised. What is the idea of a Labour Department? That is what we are concerned with. Is it to say that, because one party to the controversy is utterly and entirely unreasonable, no attempt shall be made to bring him to his senses? Is it because the issue is grave and difficult that the department is rendered absolutely impotent to take action? That apparently is the attitude. Nothing is to be done because one of the parties to this issue is entirely wrong. Well, to the extent of the wrong, I should have thought there was all the more work for the Department of Labour to do, if that department is to properly function. Here is a very serious labour dispute, and we have not a single suggestion made by the Minister of Labour as to how that dispute is to be settled, except that somebody else is to take up the job, and that he is not worrying about it. He will not go into it, the thing is too serious and the department will not deal with it, because these men are going to such absurd lengths that the department will not have anything to do with it.

How are you ever going to get people into a reasonable and proper frame of mind, assuming they are all wrong, unless you apply some of the excellent principles to be found so splendidly set out in the first part of the Prime Minister's book. He says in that book that the first underlying principle in the settlement of industrial disputes is that of the open conference which, he points out, cannot be applied unless you first bring the parties together, and at least try to make an honest attempt to settle across the table all differences. It is admitted here that this board of conciliation did not go upon the ground, or at least did not familiarize itself with the local situation. I do not know that the Government is to blame for that. I would not blame it for that at all. The Prime Minister in his argument to-day, asked,"How is the Govern-

ment to blame for that?" The Government was not to blame for it. Absolutely not at all. There is no question of blaming anybody, but what we are finding fault with is the lack of action. The Government was not to blame one way or the other for what that commission did or did not do, and that commission may be absolutely all right, but the point is that the people there do not think it is all right. You have a deadlock. You have a Labour Department appointed for the purpose of breaking deadlocks, and I would have thought the more serious that deadlock, the more suffering entailed by it, the more necessary direct and urgent action on the part of that department.

I think the House is entitled to at least some statement from the Minister of Labour as to how this condition is to be properly handled, and to whom he has on the job, if he has anybody there. Apparently he has nobody there, and why? Because it is a mess, because it is a difficult proposition, the people ought to be left absolutely and entirely to their own resources. It is said that Nova Scotia can look after itself. You might say that about any labour trouble in any province in this country, but why have we a Labour Department? We are maintaining a Labour Department to settle these matters.

The same argument might be made as to the Alberta trouble. The Labour Department took action in that case and brought peace and production to the coal fields there. They did not do that by saying "We have no jurisdiction." They did it by going on the ground, and getting the parties together.

Mr. LOGAN: Does the hon. gentleman not know that the mines of Alberta are the property of the federal government while the mines of Nova Scotia are the property of the provincial government?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman is right in part of his statement. Some of the mines are and some are not entirely outside of the Government's jurisdiction. But in any event I do not think it would make very much difference to any government determined to see that no stone was left unturned in order that the differences might be settled. All we ask is an expression of opinion from the Government as to what they propose to do. More than that, there is that large public interest to which my hon. friend the Prime Minister refers. What is going to be done for the protection of that public interest? Because some man has gone too far here or there is surely no reason why public interest ought to be overlooked.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): At this late hour I do not propose to detain the House for any great length of time in discussing this question. That it is a question of very serious moment is quite evident from the information disclosed in the debate to-day, and it seems to me, with the present temper of the situation in Nova Scotia, there is a condition of affairs there that might easily and readily become more serious even than it is at the present time. That is a question which neither the government of Nova Scotia nor the Government of Canada can afford lightly to pass over. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the question of paying dividends on watered stock of the British Empire Steel Corporation. The question of watered stock in corporations is, in my judgment, a question that might well engage the attention of this House, because I think that a very great deal of the industrial trouble we have had in this country is due to the fact that the management of corporations are inclined to earn returns on stock that is very greatly inflated. I do not wish, however, to discuss that aspect of the matter to-night.

I rise mainly for the purpose of offering a suggestion to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the Government,, and it is one which under the circumstances might very well be accepted. As to the attitude they have taken in regard to the appointing of a royal commission, it appears to me that there is considerable force in the arguments advanced by the Prime Minister. There was a Conciliation board appointed several months ago to inquire into this whole matter. It seems pretty generally admitted by all parties to the dispute, and the public as well, that the board of concilliation did not discharge its duties as fully as possible in the way of seeking information from the miners themselves, and from a study of the question in the precise areas affected, as it might have done. I am quite sure that the man whom the miners appointed as their representative on that board is one in whom they had confidence. The atmosphere in which the board of conciliation approached this work several months ago is totally different from the atmosphere that exists at the present time, and I would offer a suggestion to the Government. It was hinted at by the Prime Minister, and I trust it will be acted upon.

The board of conciliation might very well be reconstituted now and asked to inquire into the whole question in the light of the present situation as it exists in Nova Scotia in the areas concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that the Minister of Labour has indicated that if any one of the members of the board asks to have it reconvened to inquire into the matters in dispute, he will take steps to have this done. If I am not correct in that statement, I do not hesitate to say that the Government will be glad to act on the suggestion of my hon. friend, if a request comes from any member of the board.

Mr. CRERAR: I am glad to hear that from the lips of the Prime Minister. I am not quite familiar enough with the law to know whether or not it would lie in the initiative of the Government to take that step. If it does, then I submit that the Prime Minister would be well advised in taking it. After all, the great force of public opinion is perhaps the strongest force that operates in the settlement of these disputes, and I have not seen, either to-day or yesterday, or even before, although it may have escaped my observation, that this way has again been tried in the consideration of this matter. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, a board of conciliation has all the powers of inquiry that a royal commission has, and if that board is reconvened—and I presume it is still in existence—and takes up its work again, making an inquiry in the light of the situation as it exists, you may find the temper on both sides of the dispute at such a point that the parties could find a common ground on which to arrive at a settlement. People have to quarrel sometimes for a certain length of time before they can reach common ground, and after a dispute has been accentuated and the atmosphere has become tense, people, not only the parties to the dispute but the great force of public opinion outside, have impressed upon their minds the gravity of the matter, and you have a situation that makes a solution possible. I do hope that the Government will take this step. I think it is their duty to do so, and if, as I understand, it lies within their initiative to do it, it can be properly said, I think, that they have discharged their duty fully in the matter. Then, if in the full light of what takes place, a settlement is not reached, at any rate the Government and Parliament will have the satisfaction of knowing that everything was done that could possibly have been done.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I do not indulge the hope that I shall be able to add a single new thought to the discussion, but I should like to concentrate the attention of the House upon what I believe to be the really vital point of the whole matter; and what I have to say is very much in line with what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has said. Most of my knowledge of this matter came from my presence at the interview with the gentlemen who waited upon the Government yesterday, the four mayors from Springhill and the three towns in Cape Breton. I had a general knowledge before, but the precise information that I have on the subject I have derived from these gentlemen.

Now, listening to the discussion in the early part of the debate, one would have thought that there had been no machinery for dealing with matters of this kind. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine) pictured the scene of the miners coming to the Dominion Government and finding that nothing could be done, and going to the local government and meeting with the same experience. He then asked what in the world was there for the miners to do but something which he did not suggest but left us to guess at. Is that a fair statement of the case? That would imply that we had no machinery whatever for dealing with such a situation, and if that were the case it would be deplorable indeed. But that is not a fair statement of the matter. We have machinery for dealing with these things, and too little attention has been given to the fact that such machinery has been employed. As a matter of fact it has been set in motion.

Let us see what was done. Under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act the miners named as their representative a Mr. Ling, a very intelligent, earnest and respected member of the mining community, who has the honour to occupy the position of mayor of his town. The British Empire Steel Corporation, for reasons of their own, did not nominate a man. The late government, exercising the power they had, nominated a gentleman in Halifax, Colonel Thompson. I have the pleasure of knowing Colonel Thompson, who is a most respected citizen, and who, I am perfectly sure, approached his duties with a sincere desire to act fairly to every one. The parties not being able to agree, the present

Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) appointed a Mr. Gillen, from Toronto. I do not know Mr. Gillen, but I understand that he is a man of large experience and is much respected all round. I spoke to Mr. Ling yesterday, who was a member of the board and one of the four mayors that came to see us. I said: "The burden of your difficulty appears to be that the tribunal met at Halifax and did not meet at Cape Breton or Springhill?" He answered, "Yes." "Well," I said, "you were a member of the board. Did you move that it should go to Cape Breton?" "No," he said, "I asked the question and I was told that it would sit at Halifax." I have no doubt he meant well, but it would seem that, had he attached much importance to a meeting at Cape Breton, he would have done more than merely ask a question as to whether the board would meet there. He would have appealed to the Minister of Labour. I turned to the Minister of Labour sitting next to me and said, "Were you ever asked to direct the commission as to where they would meet?" "No," he said; "had I been asked I would have gladly given such direction."

The picture they presented of the situation with regard to the schools and the children, and the general condition in those towns, is so deplorable that it has moved all of us to sympathy. But I do not think the right steps were taken, and I think Mr. Ling would admit now that he should have requested a meeting of the commission at Sydney. He did not do so. I suggested to him, "Would not that be now the best way? I am not sure," I said, "speaking from memory, whether the Minister of Labour would have power to revive the commission, but if that could be done would it meet the case?" Well, he was not prepared to answer for other people, he was not representing the labour men; as has been said, he was representing the community generally. I said, "Won't you admit, Mr. Ling, that if the commission could be revived and go down to Cape Breton and discuss the question on the ground, it might lead to satisfactory results?" He answered, "Perhaps it would." "I do not understand," I said, "that you are questioning either the integrity or the competency of the commission?" "No," he answered. I then put this further question to him, "You think Mr. Gillen was trying to do right?" "Yes," he replied. Then I added, "You have confidence in Mr. Gillen, and Colonel Thompson has the confidence of everybody. Why in the world cannot you get together and have the matter adjusted in that way?"

That is exactly what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has suggested. I think that can be done. Let us get the commission together again, if the machinery of the law will permit, and let them see with their own eyes the unhappy conditions which prevail—let them as good citizens and honoured members of that tribunal make an effort to bring about a settlement of this unfortunate misunderstanding. But I think the workmen and the company ought to be both asked: If we give you this investigation by the tribunal, and you bring before them all the evidence you wish, will you give us an assurance that you will accept whatever decision may be then reached?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand that this suggestion which my hon. friend made, and which still stands, that the old tribunal be reconstituted and go down to Cape Breton and make an investigation on the ground, is wholly irrespective of the order issued by Mr. McLachlan, or conditional on that order being revoked?

Mr. FIELDING: I made no condition about Mr. McLachlan at all, in fact I had not given that phase of the question much thought, but I think if we have legal power —and the Minister of Labour holds that we have—to revive the commission—I do not like the term "revive"; I think the commission is still alive—they should be asked to resume the inquiry, go to Cape Breton and acquaint themselves sympathetically with conditions on the ground. I have every hope that if that is done you will have a satisfactory conclusion of the difficulty.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, after what seems to be a very happy termination of this discussion—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil): I have to inform the House that once the hon. member for East Calgary has spoken the debate is closed.

Mr. IRVINE: After the very happy spirit which has developed, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to prolong the debate. The good spirit began to develop after the brilliant presentation of the case by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) who concluded by saying, "It is not yet too late to do something"; then the Prime Minister followed and exhibited a spirit of sympathetic interest in the great problems of the nation which I think was

helpful to all who listened to him; and, finally, the leader of the Progressives made a concrete suggestion, which was endorsed by the hon. Minister of Finance and accepted by the Prime Minister. I do not know if the course suggested will result in a solution, as a matter of fact I do not contend that any government can find an absolute solution for any problem, but I am very glad to see that so much interest has been created in this particular case.

In summing up the debate I wish to make it quite clear that I did not suggest the appointment of a royal commission. I have just as little faith in royal commissions as have hon. members on this side of the House. I never suggested that. But I have to a very great extent got all that I was trying to secure in the suggestion which has been made. It seems to me however, that it was not fair on the part of the hon. Minister of Labour to claim that the Government has the right to make a stipulation to the miners that it does not make to the other side concerned in this row. The hon. Minister of Finance suggested, if I heard him correctly, that they had the right to exact from both parties a promise to accept the finding of the commission. I think that is reasonable; but to expect that the men alone shall make that promise does not seem to me at all fair.

I am delighted that throughout this prolonged debate there has been no incursion into party politics, but that the question before the House and the country has been discussed in such an excellent spirit and with such excellent results.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil): The hon. member's object having been attained, will he consent to withdraw the motion?

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I consent.

Motion (Mr. Irvine) withdrawn.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Friday, March 31, 1922

The House met at three o'clock, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 20, respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—Mr. Charters.

Bill No. 21, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 22, respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill No. 23, respecting Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Mitchell.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. Ouimet be substituted for that of Mr. Papineau on the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills;

That the name of Mr. Kyte be substituted for that of Mr. Gordon on the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections;

That the name of Mr. Stork be substituted for that of Mr. McKenzie on the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries;

That the name of Mr. Macdonald (Pictou) be substituted for that of Mr. Gordon on the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce;

That the name of Mr. Copp be substituted for that of Mr. Robinson on the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith;

That the name of Mr. Robinson be substituted for that of Mr. Stork, and the name of Mr. Ouimet for that of Mr. Turgeon on the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization;

That the name of Mr. King (Kootenay) be substituted for that of Mr. Gordon on the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and on the Select Standing Committee on Forests, Waterways and Waterpowers;

That the name of Mr. Ouimet be substituted for that of Mr. Kyte on the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 25 to amend the Penitentiary Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Explain.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This bill is to amend two sections of the Penitentiary Act in order to permit prisoners suffering from infectious diseases to be returned from the penitentiaries to the provincial authorities for treatment. The amendment is being made at the request of the provincial authorities, who are in doubt as to their power in the matter.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask, partly for my own benefit and partly for the benefit of those who, like myself, live at a considerable distance from Ottawa, when the Easter adjournment will take place and for how long.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The custom in previous years has been to adjourn on the Wednesday prior to Good Friday until the following Tuesday. Unless there is desire on the part of the House for some other arrangement, it is the intention of the Government to follow that custom. However, the Government would like to consult the wishes of hon. members in the matter.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, SASKATCHEWAN COURT OF APPEAL

On motion of Sir Lomer Gouin (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 19, to amend the Judges Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—puisne judges of Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan increased from 3 to 4:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is struck out by this amendment?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: One clause is repealed and replaced by another. It is simply providing for four judges instead of three.

Mr. CRERAR: That is the only change?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: I have no desire to oppose this bill, but I wish to point out that there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction throughout the country with regard to judges of the High Court leaving their judicial duties for the purpose of serving on provincial commissions. The matter has been the subject of discussion by the Bar Associations of some of the provinces. The judiciary of Canada have always been on a high plane and have commanded the respect of everybody, and it would be well if the minister would lay down a policy under which judges of the High Court might not serve on these political commissions. In fact, an act was passed a few years ago prohibiting them from doing so. It is not in the interests of the Bench; it is not in the interests of the judicial business of the province. The practice to which I refer has prevailed not only in Ontario but in various parts of the West and the East. In Ontario three judges of the High Court have been leaving their judicial duties during several months in the year to serve on these commissions. Before we pass this bill the minister should give us an assurance that without the addition proposed the number of judges in Saskatchewan would be insufficient. If three judges in Ontario can leave their judicial duties for four or five months in the year, it means that there are too many High Court judges in that province, and the same thing may apply to Saskatchewan and other parts of the country. This practice must stop if the confidence of the people in the judiciary is to be maintained. I trust that the minister will see that the act passed a few years ago with regard to the matter is enforced.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The law which my hon. friend refers to has been enforced, and it is our intention to have it enforced in the future.

Mr. BAXTER: When this matter was before the Committee the other day I expressed the view that there was some disparity between the members of the judiciary in Saskatchewan and those in the other western provinces. On looking up the number of judges provided for in the Estimates I find that I was quite right. In Manitoba, which is very populous and wealthy and must have more legal business than some of the other provinces, there are eleven judges in all,—the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal and four judges; the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench and five judges. In British Columbia there is a Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal and four judges; a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and five judges, a total of eleven. In Alberta there is a Chief Justice and four justices of the peace; a Chief Justice of the Trial Division and five justices, a total of eleven. At present in Saskatchewan there is a Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal and three judges; a Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench and six judges, a total of eleven. Now, the western provinces have each the same number of judges, though they are not distributed in the same way as between the Court of Appeal and the Trial Division. It is now sought to add another judge in Saskatchewan; and I would like to ask the

Government and the House how long it will be before Saskatchewan will be taken as the measure and a judge added to each of the other western provinces. It seems to me that it is making in that direction. I suggested the other day that it was only necessary for Saskatchewan, if the division was not satisfactory, to increase the number of its Appellate Division, and reduce that of the Trial Division, by one. They would thus be able to adjust the present judiciary to the actual work of the province. I had investigated the reports very cursorily, but I examined them with a little more attention later, and I found that I had greatly overestimated the number of cases coming before the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan. In fact, ninety was the total in one volume of the reports, covering a year,—much less than I had thought. The Trial Division reports are put in with those of the Appeal Division and it makes it look like quite a large volume. I assume, however, that the excuse for this legislation is to be found in the newspaper reports, which indicate that the appointment of a gentleman as judge in that province has already been decided upon. In view of the political outlook in Saskatchewan, I suppose it is extremely necessary to provide for some one; therefore the country must pay an additional $9,000 each year for something that is not needed, except to support an appointee of the Government who might not be as politically fortunate, as his friends in this House have been.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We are informed by the legislature of Saskatchewan that the appointment is necessary. I have not heard any such rumour as my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. gentleman does not read the papers.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Well, I do not read all of them. The hon. member must himself admit that a tribunal consisting of four judges is not sufficient to carry on the work in that province. No additional judges in the Trial Division are needed. As I stated the other day when the resolution was before the Committee, we are merely supplementing the legislation of Saskatchewan. We have been advised by hon. members of this House that the cases before the Court of Appeal in that province are so numerous that a large number are in arrears. I think this is a sufficient answer to my hon. friend's representations.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE BILL

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 15, respecting the Department of National Defence.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): I rise to a point of order in regard to this bill. I sumbit that this is a bill which seeks to impose a public charge —it certainly does by clause 5—and that it should therefore come before the House in the usual way by resolution after the assent of His Excellency has been obtained. I think it is Rule 77 that covers the case. The practice we have always followed should be followed now, I submit.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend will find that the purpose of this bill is to reduce the public charge. So far from the bill proposing any extra charge on the country, its effect will be to reduce very considerably the present charge.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My point is this: This bill proposes a charge upon the people of this country. It is in regard to pensions, and gives the Governor in Council power to increase the pensions now allowed by law by adding from one to three years in the computation of the time, thereby largely increasing the amount the country will have to pay. That charge is being imposed for the first time, and I therefore submit that the bill comes within Rule 77 and should be preceded by a resolution.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia): As a matter of fact, I imagine, this bill will not impose any additional financial burdens on the country, but will rather lessen those burdens, although they may be carried under another name. This bill was submitted to the Parliamentary Counsel and declared not to be a money bill. He was strong on that point, before I introduced the bill in this way. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes to delay the bill, I am willing to bring down a resolution, but, of course, it will delay the beginning of the reorganization that much longer.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Does the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) press his objection?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not strongly insisting, but I do think that the rule should be followed, or a precedent may be set up that will be invoked later.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Rule 77 clearly provides that money bills must be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend will appreciate that I have postponed this bill for a good many days at his request, and now he is the first to object to our going on with it. I maintain that this is not a money bill, but in order that there may be no question I will withdraw my motion for the second reading, and proceed by way of resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

On the motion of Mr. Graham, the Order was discharged.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Labour—Salaries, $258,755; contingencies, $45,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At a previous sitting I asked the minister for information as to the amount of money expended last year on account of the forty-two temporary employees. Perhaps he could now give that information.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have here a list of the forty-two temporary clerks in the Department of Labour when I assumed charge of that office, most of whom, indeed, I think all of them except one, are still there. I will read the list:

No.	Position and Date of Appointment.	Salary per annum
1	Clerk-Stenographer, March 9, 1921...	$ 960
1	Clerk-Stenographer, April 20, 1920 ...	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, October 15, 1920.	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, August 25, 1920..	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, August 11, 1920..	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, October 6, 1920...	600
1	Office boy, February 13, 1920	300
1	Statistical Clerk, April 27, 1921	960
1	Statistical Clerk, May 21, 1921	960
1	Statistical Clerk, January 12, 1921....	960
1	Office Appliance Operator, Gr. 2, February 16, 1921	840
1	Office Appliance Operator, Gr. 2, June 8, 1920	840
1	Office Appliance Operator, May 11, 1920	840
1	Junior Statistical Clerk, June 25, 1921	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer (Winnipeg), October 17, 1921	960
1	Clerk-Stenographer (Winnipeg), December 9, 1920	900
1	Clerk-Stenographer (Winnipeg), November 1, 1920	900
1	Clerk-Stenographer (Ottawa), March 4, 1921	960
1	Statistical Clerk (Ottawa), April 28, 1920	1,320
1	Statistical Clerk, May 19, 1920	600
1	Statistical Clerk, April 17, 1920	600
1	Clerk Typist, November 24, 1921...	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, November 16, 1921	960
1	Clerk-Stenographer, December 5, 1921	600
1	Senior Clerk-Bookkeeper, January 8, 1921	1,380
1	Steno.-Bookkeeper, May 17, 1920	1,020
1	Messenger Clerk, March 16, 1921 ..	600
1	Office Appliance Operator, Grade 3, June 30, 1920	1,080
1	Clerk-Stenographer, April 16, 1921 ..	960
1	Clerk-Stenographer, March 10, 1920 ..	600
1	Junior Clerk, September 9, 1920.....	600
1	Statistical Clerk, August 18, 1920..	960
1	Junior Clerk, March 8, 1920	600
1	Junior Clerk Stenographer, December 6, 1920	600
1	Clerk-Stenographer, August 7, 1920..	960
1	Clerk-Stenographer, October 1, 1920	960
1	Private Secretary, January 9, 1922..	2,400
1	Confidential Messenger, September 11, 1920	960
1	Clerk-Stenographer (Vancouver), September 16, 1921	960
1	Junior Clerk-Stenographer (Calgary), June 13, 1921	$ 900
1	Investigator (Ottawa), February 4, 1921	3,000
1	Investigator (Montreal), January 1, 1919	$15 per day (when employed)

The appointment of private secretary was made after I took office. The confidential messenger was a temporary employee in the office when I came there, the date of his appointment being as specified. He was made the confidential messenger of the minister with the specified increase in salary whatever it amounts to—I think it is some $300 a year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the total?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sorry to say the figures have not been totalled but I can very readily make the count.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Never mind, we can get that information later. My hon. friend pointed out the manner in which the increases were made but what I want to find out from him, irrespective of that, is this: Are any of these salaries too high, and if so what are they?

Mr. MURDOCK: It would be entirely unbecoming, under the existing condition of the law, for the Minister of Labour to even hazard a view as to the consistency of wage rates now in effect with respect to the various classes of civil service as established and maintained by the Civil Service Commission, a body appointed

under the preceding government. While, no doubt, I might hold certain definite views in regard to these matters, it would appear to me as being entirely unbecoming that I should be called upon to express my individual opinion on the subject at this time, especially when I have no jurisdiction whatsoever over this question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have thought that the minister responsible for these payments would be able to give the Committee an idea as to whether the payments ought to be made or not. After all, he is the minister who has chiefly to do with the wage scales of the country, and kindred subjects. He is held to be an authority on what are considered fair wages and what rates ought to be paid in the respective cases, and surely we ought to be able to appeal with confidence to him for information as to whether, in these or other cases, the salaries we are paying are too high or too low.

Mr. MURDOCK: If the House in its wisdom should later assign to me the duty of determining what should be a consistent and proper wage rate for the various civil servants I should then consider I would have an absolute right to answer the question of my hon. friend. At present it would not be fair—and I am sure my hon. friend does not want to put me in such a position—to ask me to express my opinion as to any individual rate paid, because these rates are established by the Civil Service Commission, an heirloom of which has been bequeathed to us from the previous government, and whose recommendations we are now following.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If there is such an "heirloom", and it is bad in its character, I do not know why the minister does not puncture that heirloom, unless it is from any false sense of modesty, a sentiment I would not have ascribed to him. Now what I am asking is this: My hon. friend said, in connection with these estimates that there were large increases made in a particular way for particular reasons. I know my hon. friend is not in charge of all the other departments, nor is he sitting in general judgment upon the Civil Service Commission, but he is in control of his own department and he knows what kind of work the different members of his staff have to do. There is no use in talking about these things in generalities; there is not a bit of good in ministers coming here and saying "We have got big votes but it is the Civil Service Commission that is responsible". The thing they can say, and they will help us by saying it, is "In our department we know the work that is carried on and we ought only to ask for so much money for this man or that man". If the minister has not considered that view of the subject he ought to do so before these estimates are passed.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think I appreciate fully what my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) would like to get me to do, but he has not a chance on earth of inducing me to meet his wishes. I will, however, go in the direction of meeting the hon. member's desires by expressing this view: A few days ago a deputation waited on me in this city and said they represented some forty-five returned soldiers who have been discharged as physically fit under D.S.C.R. regulations. These men I was told—all of them under civil service regulations, and most of them married—were being required to work for $720 a year. I will express to my hon. friend the belief that a man cannot in decency, in this Canada of ours under the existing conditions, maintain a family as Canadians should, live on $720 a year. Of course it must be admitted that at the present time there is a bonus attached to that salary. I do not know what the result is going to be in that respect, but if my hon. friend wants to get my view on any question affecting the existing salaries that is the only opinion I would care to express. As regards the individual employees in my department, my hon. friend flatters me when he even suggests that I have even been able as yet to get a line upon the work of every individual employee. I find there have not been sufficient hours in the day during the past three months for me to accomplish anything of the kind. However, I hope that, if I continue in my present position, when I again come to this House with estimates I shall have a better grasp of the situation in that regard. I hope to know if the various employees in the department are worth the amount of this country's money that is being paid to them for the duties they are called upon to perform, but at the present time I doubt my ability to give you any detailed information as to whether any or all of the employees in the department are overpaid or underpaid.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that the employees of the Labour Department, as well as all the employees in all other departments in the inside civil service, have

to receive a certain salary until they get to the maximum, whether you want to give it to them or not, or whether they are worth it or not?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I feel very diffident in disagreeing with so final a pronouncement from the last court of appeal as that just given by the Minister of Labour, but I am compelled to. He tells this House that, no matter what may be the will of the Government, or of this Parliament, these men must get the salaries set opposite their names because the Civil Service Commission says so.

Mr. MURDOCK: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, if he understood me to say that, I can only say that I did not intend to convey any such impression.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What did the hon. minister say?

Mr. MURDOCK: I understood the hon. gentleman from Hants (Mr. Martell) to ask me if it was not a fact that these salaries and the increases in the salaries were set forth, and that I was compelled to pay them, whether I wanted to or not. I answered, yes. The Civil Service regulations so far as I know—and I have some things to learn yet—provide for just that, no more and no less. I am not dealing with what this House can do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see very much difference between what the hon. minister says and what I ascribed to him, but he will not get out of responsibility in that way.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not want to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And I do not want the hon. gentleman to get out of the responsibility, although he has been trying hard to. The Civil Service Commission has a duty under the act. That duty is to define the duties and to allocate the salary that is in their view commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of each office. With that duty they are intrusted by the Civil Service Act. But no civil servant has a right at all to any salary until this House passes upon it and decides that it is a proper one. And when the minister comes to this House with his estimates, he says: Those are the salaries that I think right, and I ask this House to vote them. That is his responsibility.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Fine hair-splitting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the hon. gentleman's hair I am trying to split, my idea is to get it into his head.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Thank you, teacher.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I only had his hair to deal with, it would be an easier task.

Mr. McMASTER: That is the barber's business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When a minister comes to Parliament he takes his responsibility for the fairness of the salaries. He is in a position to say, "The Civil Service Commission recommends these salaries, they believe they are fair and right, and I have behind me their support." But he cannot say, "I am bound to put these salaries in the Estimates because that is the view of the Civil Service Commission"—not at all. He may come to Parliament as a new minister and say, "I have the Civil Service Commission's recommendation of this schedule as a fair one. I do not understand the department fully. I have not had an opportunity of reviewing the duties of office, and, therefore, I do not feel justified in coming to the House and asking for an alteration." There might be some reason in that, but if he comes to the House and says, "I have no responsibility in this matter at all, the Civil Service Commission has done it, and that is an end of it", what is the good of coming to Parliament at all? Are we here merely to put our imprimatur upon what the Civil Service Commission says? Not at all. The minister's responsibility is that he recommends these salaries to this committee, each and every one of them, and he cannot escape that responsibility. He may appeal to the Committee not to ask him to take the responsibility of modifying any of these estimates because of his inexperience in the department. It will be for the committee to decide the value of that plea. But do not let him come here and repeat over and over again that he has not the responsibility; because he has.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will the hon. member state when and where I said I had no responsibility?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not need to, because the Committee heard the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will the hon. gentleman please not misquote me to this House. I will assume full responsibility now and ever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I have gone far enough.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister now says he has the responsibility, but I am sure no one in this House ever thought that he admitted the responsibility until he got up the last time. If the hon. minister came to Parliament and struck twenty per cent off each of those salaries, the reduced amount would be all the civil servants would receive, and there would be no violation of any law whatever.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Civil Service Act.

Mr. HOEY: As a new member, I would like to know if it has been customary in the past to change the schedules as brought down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have been changed. The government come to Parliament and say "We recommend salaries which the Civil Service Commission recommended to us. We accept them and take the responsibility to ask Parliament to pass them. We think they are right."

Mr. MURDOCK: Would the hon. gentleman answer me one question: Has the matter ever been handled, in the case of one individual, as the hon. gentleman indicates? If I thought for a moment of doing what the right hon. gentleman, no doubt, would like to have me do, would it not be necessary for the entire schedule and every salary in the classification so dealt with to go back to the Civil Service Commission for re-arrangement and re-classification before being submitted here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. If the hon. minister feels that he would be right in recommending to this House the reduction of $1,000 in any one salary, then the action of this House is final, and the reduced amount would be all that the official affected could receive. The minister would take the responsibility of doing so, out of line with the classification of the commission, but his decision, supported by this House, would be final. Suppose, for example, a motion were made to reduce the salary of any one, and that motion carried, that would prevail. The hon. gentleman would have to take the responsibility of saying whether he thought it should be reduced or not, acquiescing in the motion or not, but whatever the decision of the House is on these Estimates, that fixes the salary to be paid.

Mr. MURDOCK: Do I get an answer to my first question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, if it was ever done.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why, certainly it has been done. Votes have been struck out and votes reduced. But the Government asks for a certain vote. That is a Government motion, and, if it is not carried, the Government itself on that vote is defeated. If the hon. minister wants to stand by his estimates, let him do so, but it is his responsibility to stand by them. Do not let him lead hon. gentlemen to believe that he is powerless to reduce his estimates, because he is not powerless by any means.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will the hon. gentleman answer my question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the question?

Mr. MURDOCK: The question is—can the right hon. gentleman indicate to me one individual case of a civil service regulation where this House ever assumed the authority or taken the unquestioned authority to reduce a salary specified by the Civil Service Commission as equitable for a classified position? I want to know of one concrete case, and as a youthful person, inexperienced in a parliamentary way, surely, if there is going to be criticism, I am entitled to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the hon. gentleman asks is this—Has there ever been a case where a Government, coming in with its Estimates, which followed the Civil Service classification, has had the estimate of a salary reduced?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is not what I asked at all—a Government coming in. My question was whether it had happened in the past.

Mr .MEIGHEN: That is the case. The Government comes in with its Estimates, and the Government's Estimates, the hon. gentleman says, are supported by the Civil Service Commission and in accordance with the classication. I do not know of a case where the Government did not stand by them, or where the salary of a single man was reduced; but that was because the House supported the Government; the House never sought to evade its responsibility, never in the world, until the hon. gentleman came into office.

Mr. BELAND: Has the right hon. gentleman any recollection of the ordinary in-

crease provided for by the classification being challenged on the floor of the House by any hon. member?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not able to attend to the Estimates very carefully when I was Prime Minister, but I am told by hon. gentlemen around me that last session motions were made to reduce salaries.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not on Civil Government. I should like my right hon. friend to point out a case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Cannot such a motion be entertained?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not the point. My right hon. friend has made the statement that last session it was done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said that I was informed it was done. I do not know of any case where, on a Government coming in with its Estimates, there was a reduction in the Civil Government Estimates, if an estimate had behind it the Civil Service classification. But the Government is responsible for presenting its Estimates; the Government can recommend to the House reductions. If an hon. member moves that the salary of any civil servant be reduced, the Government can accept the reduction, and that fixes the salary of the man. That is what I am concerned to have the members of the committee understand. Does the hon. gentleman say that that is not right?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is perfectly right in making the statement in the form in which he is now presenting it. Certainly, as I have listened to what he has been saying, he has been endeavouring to convey a wholly different impression of what the minister had in mind when speaking of his responsibility. Let me put the matter to the House in a way that, I think, will make perfectly clear what the minister is seeking to demonstrate. The present Government comes into office and finds certain salaries attached to certain positions. It finds that those positions have been graded by the Civil Service Commission; that the previous government has asked for certain sums of money, and that Parliament has appropriated those sums for the particular positions mentioned in the Estimates. The minister, when he is about to prepare his estimates for Parliament, calls in the permanent head of the department, his deputy minister, and he asks him to state what, in his opinion, are the estimates required to carry on the work of the department. The deputy minister presents his estimates. The minister asks him: "Are there any increases here other than those which are required by statute? Are there any new appointments? Has any clerk been given a promotion which he should not have received or which he is not entitled to? Eplain the estimates in that way." The deputy minister then makes his statement, informing the minister that the estimates are entirely in accord with what they have been in the previous year; that the only increases are those that are required by statute, and that all have been approved by the Civil Service Commission. The minister may take one of two courses. He may say: "I am anxious to keep this whole matter out of Parliament. I am desirous of having the Civil Service feel a sense of security, knowing that there will be no interference on the part of the Government or the minister. Therefore, I will come to Parliament with the estimates exactly as they have been prepared and presented to me by my deputy minister." That is what my hon. friend is doing at the present time. On the other hand, he may take the opposite course. He may say: "I am minister of the department now; I am going to look into the salaries; I am going to cut down so many clerks, promote other clerks, ignore the Civil Service Commission altogether. I am master of this particular department at the present time, and I propose to exercise my authority in that way." That is the kind of responsibility that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has refused to exercise. As my right hon. friend says, he as the minister has the power, but to exercise it is to begin to interfere from a political point of view, and that is what hon. members on this side and members of the Government have refused to do. They have sought to respect the Civil Service as being outside of politics altogether, and, in the Estimates which they bring before the House, to be governed by the recommendations of the permanent heads of departments who know the service, and by the approval of the Civil Service Commission. My hon. friend has stated that, during the course of the year, once the ministry has been in office for a time, opportunity will be afforded to the different ministers to see whether there is a necessity for retaining in some of the departments the large number of clerks who are there at the present time. Up to the present, no minister has had the opportunity to become fully acquainted

4 p.m.

with his department. But at this moment, to strike out of the Estimates some sums which may be necessary for clerks who are there at the present time, might be to do a great injustice to many members of the Civil Service. All we are asking is that Parliament vote what it voted in previous years, plus the regular statutory increases, and allow the ministers time to look through their departments; and when we meet Parliament again, or before we meet Parliament again, if some of those services are overmanned they will be reduced and the money will not be taken out of the public treasury. But there is a great deal of difference between a minister saying: "I will not take the responsibility of interfering with the recommendations of my deputy head, those recommendations having been approved by the Civil Service Commission," and one saying: "I do not take any responsibility at all."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I take no exception to any sentence of the hon. member; what he has said is precisely the truth that I was trying to express myself; but it is precisely the responsibility that the language, if not the intent, of the minister was designed to make the country believe he did not have.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has that responsibility. It is true, if he takes this man and that man and reduces their salaries and recommends those reductions to the committee, he might be charged with favouritism, with politics. That is what the Prime Minister fears. But the responsibility is the minister's. I would suggest to him that if he really favours reduction and does not want to be charged with favouritism or politics, there is another way in which he can act. He can come to the committee and recommend a reduction of ten or twenty per cent all along the line. That is quite within his power; the responsibility of the recommendation is his; the responsibility of the decision is his and this committee's for every salary in the list. I am ready to accept the minister's plea that he has not sufficient knowledge of his department to convince him whether there are too many clerkships or not, whether the salaries are too high or not; but I cannot help making this reflection, that hon. members, before the last election, had much greater knowledge of those departments than they have now. Before the last election we heard all sorts of talk about the "barnacles of the civil service". Why, the Civil Service was cluttered and clogged, and you could not get through, and salaries were too high, and all the rest of it! They had their information sufficient to warrant them in making these assertions broadcast. Yet, three months and more after they have taken office, almost four months after the election, they do not know enough about the departments to make any changes at all. If they know less now than they knew three months ago, how much less will they know a year from now? The progress of ignorance seems to be rapid. I accept the hon. gentleman's argument that he has not been in the department long enough to find out whether it is overmanned or overpaid. Nevertheless this is not the only respect in which the loud-sounding phrases of the manifesto fell down in realization.

Mr. JACOBS: You cannot forget them.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Lord loveth a cheerful giver;—and the public love a cheerful loser. My right hon. friend seems to take every opportunity—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Don't flatter me.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not have to; it shows for itself. My right hon. friend seems to take every opportunity to show his vinegary disposition. It was not always so; he was usually good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just cold water.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then he comes to the rescue of his friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), just as if he had not said enough. If it had not been for the remarks of the Prime Minister, I leave it to hon. members to say whether they would not have been misled by the statement of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. He implied that it was in the discretion of the Minister of Labour to move the reduction of the salaries of civil servants that had been fixed by the Civil Service Commission, and that that would do no harm. Why, it would practically repeal the Civil Service Act to that extent, because the act provides, in effect, that these salaries shall not be left to the minister to fix, nor shall the appointments be left to him to make, but that both the appointments shall be made and the salaries fixed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: Subject to the approval of Parliament. But Parliament approved that law in the first place and gave the Civil Service Commission that power, and until Parliament repeals that act it must

continue in force, and any action taken by the Minister of Labour or any other minister to move to reduce a salary for a certain office—I am not saying a certain official, because the salary is attached to the office, not to the official—any such action would be equivalent to repealing the Civil Service Act so far as that particular salary was concerned.

Let me point out to the committee a concrete example of what power the Civil Service Commission has,—always subject to Parliament; that of course, goes without saying, for we can repeal the whole act just as well as we can repeal one section by doing as the right hon. gentleman suggests we have power to do. No one questions the power of Parliament to repeal any act, but so long as the Civil Service Act is in force a minister cannot, without contravening the spirit of that legislation, reduce any salary fixed by the commission, and everyone knows that.

Mr. ARTHURS: He could reduce the personnel.

Mr. GRAHAM: He can dismiss an official for cause, but he cannot appoint another in his place. In other words, he can reduce the personnel, but not change it. Le me point out a concrete case. A committee in the Militia Department, composed of certain officials of the department and one member of the Civil Service Commission, proceeded to reclassify that department some months ago under the instructions of the then minister;—this was before my time. That committee brought in a report classifying, I think, 190 officials and fixing their salaries. Eighty-two of those 190 officials appealed to the Civil Service Commission and got their salaries increased, notwithstanding the fact that the minister had approved of the lower classification made by the committee. That shows that the Civil Service Commission is intended, under the act that created it, to fix salaries, even if those salaries are higher than the scale proposed by Parliament.

Mr. BIRD: Does the minister think it wise and in accordance with our parliamentary traditions that the expenditure of public money should be taken from the sphere of effective criticism by this House?

Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly not. Hon. members would have the right to move for the repeal of the Civil Service Act if they wished.

Mr. BIRD: Would the hon. minister approve of that course being taken?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend must be Irish: he answers a question by asking another. That is a matter for discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am pointing out the effect of the act as it stands now.

Mr. BIRD: I should like to point out to the hon. minister the serious situation that arises here. We are engaged in the laborious process of criticising the Estimates, and yet it seems that all our labours are in vain, because when we try to bring our criticisms to bear we find the responsible minister of the Crown takes refuge by saying: These things are fixed before hand by the Civil Service Commission. I think it is a very serious feature of the present situation, and not in accordance with British parliamentary traditions which declare that all public expenditures should be subject to the effective criticism of parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: That may be true.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, I should like very much indeed to expedite as far as possible the business of this committee. But as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and others have chosen to "pick" on me in regard to this civil service question—and, personally, I do not mind that in the least—I am going to read into Hansard what purports to be a complete statement of this question as prepared by my honoured predecessor, Hon. Mr. Robertson. This statement, as I understand, was prepared for the Conservative government in the expectation of being able to show the wonderful benefits accruing to civil servants under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It recites in detail the munificent and wonderful privileges and the sympathetic consideration enjoyed by civil servants through the acts of our predecessors in office. It would appear to be a very opportune time to place this statement on Hansard for the information of hon. members. It was evidently prepared, as will be noted before I finish reading it, after 1st October, 1921, just on the eve of the general election, for the purpose of showing what had been accomplished by adopting the Civil Service Commission method of dealing with the remuneration of civil servants.

Mr. ARTHURS: What is its date?

Mr. MURDOCK: After 1st October, 1921.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And before 6th December.

Mr. MURDOCK: It reads:

The Arthur Young Company was appointed by an Order in Council of August, 1918. Mr. Crerar was a member of the Government at that time, having been sworn in on October 12, 1917, resigning November, 1919.

The employment of Griffenhagen and Associates, Limited, was authorized by P.C. 1238, May 31st, 1920. Their contract was terminated by 60 days' notice, P.C. 296, February 7th, 1921.

The subcommittee of Council to consider proposed legislation *re* Civil Service and to draft a Bill to bring about proposed reforms, consisted of the Hon. A. K. Maclean, convener, Hon. N. W. Rowell, Hon. F. B. Carvell, and the Hon. G. D. Robertson, appointed by P.C. 372, February 18th, 1918.

"The Subcommittee on Reorganization and Efficiency, consisting of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, President of the Privy Council, the Minister of Labour, and the Minister of Immigration, appointed by Order in Council, P.C. 1238, May 31, 1920, was cancelled by P.C. 3649, October 3, 1921, which appointed instead of the foregoing, the Minister of Labour, the Secretary of State, and the Minister of Immigration. Employees who have up to date been blanketed in under the provisions of Order in Council of December 16, 1920, P.C. 2958—with overseas active service, 894 other females, 1,062; other males, 727; total, 2,638. Number of employees in Civil Service, 1913-14, 29,135; 1917-18, 44,378; 1919-20, 50,307; 1920-21, 41,641. The decrease shown by last figure is due mainly to the reductions in war departments. The above figures do not include rural postmasters. There were about 8,000 rural postmasters in 1914, and there are about 10.000 to-day.

The Union Government went to the country in 1917 with a definite policy to reorganize the Civil Service and to eliminate patronage. In implementing their promise they have carried out a reclassification of the Civil Service and a partial reorganization. The reclassification was carried out by, and under the direction of, the Civil Service Commission.

The merit system of promotion is now in full sway in the Civil Service, even in the higher positions. Clerks are selected from the ranks of juniors, seniors and branch heads from those below them, and so on right along the line. New employees are only taken into the service when there is no one suitable for promotion amongst the permanent employees. Patronage has been entirely eliminated. Examinations are practical instead of academic. The new order of things offers inducements and prizes to the highly trained man. Every position is graded and dovetailed into another of greater opportunity, responsibility and salary. Patronage is dead. Favouritism is as nearly eliminated as human nature and the inexorable processes of departmental procedure will permit. To-day entrance to the Civil Service is by way of competition and is ruthlessly just. Industry, integrity, and intelligence are now the only passports to success in the Civil Service, which offers opportunities worthy of the consideration of the best minds among the young men and women of Canada."—(Extract from a pamphlet recently issued by the Civil Service Commission.)

Some examples of merit promotion made recently are—

Mr. CHURCH: What has that letter to do with the item under consideration, Mr. Chairman? The minister is taking up the time of the committee with something that has nothing to do with the matter before us.

Mr. MURDOCK (reading):

Some examples of merit promotion made recently are: postmastership of Winnipeg, filled by the assistant postmaster; director of Printing Bureau, Deputy Minister of Finance; Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance; Assistant Deputy Minister of Interior; postmaster of Toronto.

Coincident with reclassification the Outside Service came under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Previous to this, in the matter of promotions, the trail of patronage was apparent, and the more remunerative appointments were made under the direction of the Patronage Committee. This was particularly true in the Outside Service, where politics entered into every promotion and appointment. The lucrative posts in each locality were jealously guarded, and as no official was transferred from his district or promoted to higher duties in another place, promotion of any kind was almost unknown. The majority of officials in the Outside Service were without hope and many of them in great distress.

The Civil Service Commission was constituted in 1908. Their jurisdiction, however, was confined to the Inside Service and remained thus limited for ten years. During those years, in spite of attempted remedies, the patronage system survived and flourished. The many anomalies and abuses existing were discussed from time to time in Parliament, but so little practical and permanent improvement had resulted that the people were skeptical—

Mr. CHURCH: I rise to a point of order. What item of the Estimates is now being discussed, and is the letter which the minister is reading relative to that item?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has the right to discuss the general policy of his department. The issue has been raised and he is now discussing that policy, particularly with reference to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, may I just draw your attention—

Some hon MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member may not, if that is his intention, criticise the ruling which I have given.

Mr. MANION: I submit that the Chair cannot rule against an hon. member on that point unless he has first made such a criticism. I was just going to express the hope that in connection with all the Estimates we on this side shall be permitted to take that into account as well as the minister. The other day we were dealing with the question of soldiers' civil re-establishment

and it was brought to our attention that we were out of order in discussing matters of general policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sorry that it is necessary to do this; I am doing it only because hon. members seem to want something from me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MURDOCK (reading):

So little practical and permanent improvement had resulted that the people were skeptical and the service itself, than whom none knew better the need for reform, was well nigh losing hope of salvation. However, Sir Robert Borden's manifesto on the eve of the election in December, 1917, placed the matter in a clear light. Next to the determination to "win the war," "Civil Service reform" was the chief plank in the platform of the Union Government, and immediately after the general election—

Mr. CHURCH: I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: If you refer to this green book containing the rules of procedure of the House you will find it provides that speeches in committee must be relevant to the item under consideration. What are we now discussing that makes that letter relevant? I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are discussing the civil government estimates of the Department of Labour, which we started to discuss two or three nights ago, not the Printing Bureau items, which the hon. member for North Toronto got into a discussion of.

(Reading):

Immediately after the general election the entire outside service was placed under the control of the Civil Service Commission. Subsequently on the 24th of May, 1918, a Civil Service Act was sanctioned providing for a reclassification and reorganization of all departments and extending the powers of the Commission to cover all appointments and promotions in the outside service.

In recent years the people have evidenced a growing interest in the administration of the public service. They are demanding more and better service. Now, as never before, the greatest economy is necessitated by the financial burdens resulting from the War.

In the reclassification of such a large army of workers, it was inevitable that there should be some dissatisfaction with the grades awarded, but a right of appeal was given to a Board of Hearing, and this resulted in many individuals being re-graded. Previous to Reclassification, there was no appeal against any seeming injustice or unfairness; influence was the only thing that helped.

The number dealt with throughout the entire Service under the original scheme of classification was 60,000

[Mr. Manion.]

Total number of appeals submitted.. 5,000

These were divided into five classes as follows:—

(*a*) personal appeals claiming wrong classification;
(*b*) class appeals;
(*c*) appeals for increased remuneration;
(*d*) bonus;
(*e*) general.

These personal appeals in Ottawa totalled 2,500. All of these were individually investigated and over one thousand were granted, entailing an increase in salary. The average amount of increase on the appeals granted was $400. The total amount of increase in salary resulting from the hearing of personal appeals was over $400,000. This amount does not include the back-pay which was paid on the successful appeals being made retroactive to April 1919.

A considerable number of changes along the line of promotions have been made among the clerks not appealing, which has resulted in a considerable increase in the salary of these clerks, which would go to increase the above figures.

It can readily be seen that there is still a great number of adjustments to be made which have been delayed by the hearing of personal appeals. The latter are now about completed, when this phase of the work will be taken up.

The appeals from the Outside Service have been treated in the same manner as the appeals in Ottawa, and investigators have been sent from Coast to Coast to personally hear these appeals. The result cannot be given as they are yet incompleted.

It will, therefore, be seen that the Government has taken up seriously the question of proper classification and has offered the proper facilities for every employee of the Government to present his case and have it properly adjusted. This was carried out and is being carried out in the following manner:—

The different units throughout the various branches of the departments elected a representative to present their cases before the Investigators. The Investigator visited each appellant, investigated his work, received his personal statement and then in consultation with the Appellant's representative came to a decision as to the proper classification of the Appellant. In cases where the Investigator and the representative disagreed, all the documents and representations both of the Appellant and the Branch Representative, as well as the departmental representative and deputy head, were sent to the Board of Hearing for final decision. It will therefore be seen that every means was exhausted to give every clerk a full opportunity to present his case.

The whole scheme of reclassification was to place each and every clerk in his proper class in harmony with the work he was performing. This will eventually be accomplished. The result will be that each and every clerk will have a direct channel of promotion open to him. *If he is competent, ambitious and faithful, he is bound to rise through the different grades of the class in which he has been placed.* Under the old scheme this could not be followed, for the reason that a clerk might be doing one class of work to-day and another to-morrow, which did not afford him the opportunity of making himself efficient in any one; therefore, though that inefficiency in the particular class in which he was then found might prevent his subsequent promotion, whereas, in the new, this cannot

occur, and the matter of promotion is entirely up to the clerk.

It must also be remembered that a great many appellants filed appeals simply on principle of taking advantage of every opportunity, and on investigation it was found that many of these had already received a substantial promotion and increase in salary, and taking a chance of getting more. This will account for a considerable number of those not granted.

The chief objection to the reclassification as it originally occurred in 1918, was the apparent low remuneration attached to the many classes. This was not as bad as it looked, for the reason that under the old system a clerk was promoted on seniority and not merit, on length of service and not on duties performed, and the classes under the old system included in each class a large number of grades as established under classification. That is to say that the grading under the old system, $900 to $1,600, would include a large number of classes which now are titled and bear different remunerations. When a clerk is placed in the class to which he properly belongs, his energy and ability can be devoted along that special line, the result being increased efficiency and usefulness. No matter what the service, efficiency will be the one factor which will lead to his promotion, and while the remuneration at the outset of his classification might be considered low, yet the range of possibilities along the lines of promotion are ten to one as compared to the old system. Another feature is, under the old system, a man's duties could change, and he might be assigned very much more important duties than he was then performing, but he would have no claim for increased remuneration or promotion, whereas, under the new classification, the moment new duties are assigned, his classification is affected and he has a claim for a higher grading.

Thus it will be seen that all vestige of patronage, of pull, of favoritism, or any of the old influences that ever entered into the promotion of a clerk are now eliminated, and it is up to the clerk himself as to whether he will make himself efficient along the lines of the duties in which he has been classified.

It will, therefore, be seen at a glance the tremendous undertaking of classifying this large body of Civil Servants and it cannot be denied that errors crept in and are bound to creep in, inconsistencies will naturally arise, but all these will eventually be adjusted, but this tremendous task canot be acomplished in a day. Owing to the demands of the Service for haste and speed this work had to be acomplished in a much less time than should have been consumed, considering the importance of the work, but now that personal appeals have practically been disposed of, these errors and inconsistencies will be rectified.

The hope of the Civil Service is *not in appointments*, but in *promotions*, and this is considered the one strong point of classification as it provides a future for every Civil Servant regardless of who he is, what influences he has, or how many years' service he may have rendered. The amount of money which these changes have entailed cannot as yet be estimated, but the figures given will give you some idea of the large amount required to meet this demand, and while we hear very little from the clerk who receives a substantial promotion and a considerable increase in salary as well as back pay, it is quite natural that we should hear from the unfortunate clerk who did not fare so well, and, therefore, it would appear that the great good that has resulted and the large amount of money that has circulated throughout the Service through re-classification, will not be brought to the surface as the satisfied people say little, but the dissatisfied very much.

If the statements of those whose duty it has been to go through the entire service and meet the rank and file—as has been done during the last year—are to be considered as representing the true state of affairs, then it can safely be said that there is more contentment and real genuine satisfaction throughout the great mass of Civil Service employees to-day than there has ever been before, and while there are a number of dissatisfied clerks, even these realize that to a certain extent their future has been assured in a better way than ever before and that an incentive has been given them for efficiency and proper service.

The service cannot realize the many difficulties that are being met by those having in charge classification, and if they will only be patient until an opportunity is afforded for the proper adjustment of what may appear to be hardships and unfairness, it can be safely said that good results will be obtained. If the service will only recognize that they have the opportunity to place before an unprejudiced tribunal any grievances which they may have or think they have, then their criticisms will be less harsh and the future will have a brighter outlook, and many of their worries will have disappeared.

It is to be hoped that nothing will interfere with the proposed programme which has been begun for the betterment of the service. Those in charge of this tremendous work are now reaching a point where they have their very proper understanding of the needs of the service and are preparing to meet all conditions in a proper and fair way and to see that every clerk, male or female, gets absolute justice. This will take time and require a little more patience on the part of the service.

Hand-in-hand with reorganization goes superannuation, consequently the Public Service Retirement Act of 1920 (or the Calder Act, as it is better known) was passed by Parliament. By it the government assumed responsibility for all employees retired. In every case where it was necessary, either on account of old age, ill-health, inefficiency or lack of employment to deprive a man of his position, some provision was made whereby he would leave the service with a retiring allowance. This amount has been calculated according to his length of service, age and salary.

While these retiring allowances have cost the recipient nothing, at the same time the interests of those who have been contributors to the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act were conserved and the allowances in every case made a little less than in the case of the contributors to the old fund.

When the Act began to be administered and it was found that anomalies were arising and that sufficient provision had not been made for all classes of employees the government passed an amending Bill at the last session of Parliament whereby an endeavour was made to cover all classes of federal service employees. This has been accomplished as practically all employees are eligible under its provisions for retiring allowances with the exception of men who are paid by the hour or what may be termed prevailing rates em-

ployed. (It may be pointed out here that the men who have been placed on prevailing rates during the last two years are consequently prevented from benefiting by the Act.)

Up to October 1, 1921, 468 employees have been retired under the Act. To these has been paid in cash gratuities $195,430.76. The pensions will cost the government while the present annuities live $194,485.60 annually.

In February, 1918, an Order in Council was passed which had the effect of extending a preference to returned soldiers, those who obtain sufficient marks to pass an examination being placed, irrespective of the marks obtained, in order of merit on the list of successful candidates above all other candidates. Further the prescriptions as to age and physical requirements do not apply to any returned soldier if he is able to perform the duties of the office. Returned soldiers are exempted from examination fees. The term "returned soldier" includes all women who served as nurses and so on.

Not only were these preferences accorded by law, but the Civil Service Commission utilized every means to bring to the attention of returned soldiers the opportunities available. Co-operation of the veteran associations was secured throughout the Dominion, and on all special advisory boards for the purpose of adjudicating on applications there is always an official representative present from the Great War Veterans' Association.

Mr. Chairman, that is the document that was prepared and used, as I understand, to justify the position of the predecessors of this Government in connection with the Civil Service regulations, and under these regulations I have felt that I was bound while the law remains as it is and had no option to suggest or make changes in the existing classification of any employees who are being continued in the service.

Mr. CHURCH: Reading long letters will not settle questions of this kind. I do not see how the minister ever expects to pass his estimates—estimates which total upwards of $258,000—by wasting the time of the committee in reading a letter which is not at all relevant to the matter under consideration. What we expect from the minister is constructive legislation such as will improve the conditions of labouring people in this country whether they are engaged on the farm or at work in the large urban centres. If this is to be an example of the kind of administration we are to anticipate from the Minister of Labour—

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. While the Minister of Labour has the floor he can only be deprived of that privilege with his own consent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the Minister of Labour sat down, having concluded what he had to say.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. McKENZIE: This is an interruption to the speech of a minister.

Mr. CHURCH: I am very much obliged to the Solicitor-General (Mr. McKenzie) for his interruption. I would like to remind him, however, that he may not be much longer in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: I regret to say that the Department of Labour is honeycombed with politics. Never was that condition more glaringly apparent than it is to-day. Now, this department has important relations with the industrial activities of the country and the social welfare of the people; it is a department that should be taken completely out of politics.

Mr. MURDOCK: Has the department changed in character at all during the last three months, excepting that I am now administering it?

Mr. STEVENS: That is a big change.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the change to which the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Church) refers.

Mr. CHURCH: The Minister of Labour has made about 375 speeches up to date, and is still talking. He talked all day Monday, all day yesterday, and this afternoon he is still talking—it is evident that the more he talks the less he knows, and the less he knows the more he talks.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend has not yet answered my question. Would he advise me if there has been any change in the character of the Department of Labour since I assumed control? It is too bad that my hon. friend cannot hear anyone but himself.

Mr. CHURCH: Yes. There are a whole lot of things which are changed and which merit criticism in connection with the Department of Labour; in fact, we have not got an up to date Department of Labour at all. No wonder he cannot settle strikes in this country. The hon. minister seems to be brimful of ideas. We have heard him for two or three days in this House, bubbling over with enthusiasm for everything but the poor toiler and worker. I read his speeches during the election campaign in the Toronto district, and I have read his speeches since he was sworn in as a minister of the Crown, and I have yet to see him advance one idea of any value in regard to the Labour Department. The first brilliant idea he expressed was after

he was sworn in as a minister, when he solved the unemployment question in six words. And what were those fatal words? They were simply "Let capital and labour get together." It was announced in the Toronto Globe and the Toronto Star—in fact the Prime Minister announced—that it was a silent government. So the Minister of Labour remained silent for a month. Then he went to the High Park Methodist church and propounded the new policy he proposed for his department—a new policy in the labour situation. I am glad that the rules of this House are framed as they are. They are like the British House of Commons rules, they allow, on the Estimates, a discussion of policies of the departments. They compel those who are criticising the ministers also to be fair and to stick to things relevant. I do not want to be unfair to the Minister of Labour because I do not believe in his policy. The other night we had quite an exhibition of personalities from him. I desire to say to the Minister of Labour that I am not an opponent of his or of Labour. I had seventeen years' experience in a municipal council, and the work that has been done in that period there for the working classes will speak for itself. Better hours and better conditions have been obtained for the workingmen, and they are receiving better wages. With coal and rent as they are to-day, we should not think of any reduction in wages until the hon. minister is able to enact legislation which will check up high prices and the trusts and combines. I think the minister might follow the example set him in the United States. He has a lot of local officers throughout the country—investigators, fair wage officers, editors, sub-editors, a huge staff of filing clerks, publicity agents and his unemployment experts,—and if he would use all those officers in an effort to solve the high cost of living and the unemployment question he would accomplish something. If the hon. minister, instead of travelling all over the country, lecturing and playing politics, would bring before the House some advanced scheme to make Canada a better country for the farmer and the worker in the factory, it would be much better. He says that there are 200,000 people idle, and while I doubt it, I will accept his figure. If the hon. minister would do something for the unfortunate poor people of Canada, the country would appreciate it.

Now a word as to his labour policy. The Minister of Labour visited High Park Methodist church in Toronto and ascended the pulpit. The statement which he made is relevant to the present issue and to these estimates. I think a reference to it is in order. The statement relates to the estimates, to unemployment, fair wages, strikes, industrial wages and supply and demand, and the work of the officers of the department. He said more in the pulpit in that church as a lay-minister in about eight sentences, than he has been able to say in Parliament for two days. He gave a very short sermon in this Methodist church, one of the most honoured churches we have in Toronto, and I will read what this clipping says about that:

> The Minister of Labour entered the pulpit as the choir and congregation were singing, "Work, for the Night is Coming."

It was not "work for the jobs are coming".

> He was garbed in a frock coat and during his address, which was delivered slowly—at times the words were uttered with long pauses between them—the listener gained the impression that, if he should ever have occasion to, Mr. Murdock could turn to the ministry of the Gospel and fit in quite nicely.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We did not catch that.

Mr. CHURCH: He said there were 200,000 men out of work in Canada to-day. Of course there are 200,000 out of work in Canada and why not, the way the department of Labour is run?

> There is something wrong in the conditions under which Canada has been living or is now living. There is a marked necessity for a demonstration of real brotherhood now and in the weeks to come.

He goes on to describe the labour and capital situation.

> The labour problem of to-day is very largely a state of mind.

He has been in several states of mind recently.

> "I am quite sure there are among you those who will not agree with that thought. I insist and intend to show that this is a state of mind. The attitude of the worker towards his tasks, his lot in life, relation to employer, standard of living, are all questions potent for good or ill in Canada. Labour and labouring men approach these questions in a somewhat unbalanced mental attitude or unbalanced viewpoint. Having suffered only too often they have become soured, discouraged, resentful, and in an improper state of mind, so that they cannot argue out the desires and rights of the workers and the desires and rights of the employers."
>
> Mr. Murdock said he had visited a city some time ago where he had seen married ex-service men given doles. Unmarried ex-service men sleeping in buildings with only an army blanket over them and lined up outside waiting for a

bugle to blow in order that they might march inside and get a bowl of soup. All this had distressed the Minister's mind very much.

"It is all wrong," he declared, with sorrow in his voice. "The unfortunate part was that no provincial or municipal assistance could be secured, and so far as the interests represented by me were concerned, I was unable to move until the supervision of municipal and provincial authorities was secured.

"Let the people do something in Canada by real brotherhood.

"Can this unemployment question be dealt with? Yes. If we can only correct the state of mind which we know exists."

Then the employer of labour came in for some warning. There were some employers, the minister said, who are in such a state of mind that they have no right to employ members of the human family.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I understand that, under the rules of this House, when we are in committee on estimates the discussion must pertain closely to the item under discussion.

Mr. CALDWELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: I draw attention to the fact that this long reading of documents wastes the time of 235 members who are here to transact the country's business.

Mr. ARTHURS: A few minutes ago a point of order was taken on exactly similar lines. The minister was then reading from a report of the Civil Service Commission, entirely foreign to his department, except that his department was like all other departments of government.

Mr. MURDOCK: I call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact, that the gentlemen of the Opposition were taking entire exception to certain conditions, which had been handed down to us as heirlooms from our predecessors. All I was undertaking to do was to read what my predecessor prepared as chairman of the committee to deal with the subject. In other words, if that document was an accurate statement of the prerogatives and rights of the Civil Service Commission in October last, it must, of necessity, be a fairly accurate statement of the condition as of March 31, 1922, and that is all I wanted to bring to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CHURCH: That is not a point of order. That is just a sermonette.

The CHAIRMAN: The question was raised a short time ago in the House as to the right of dealing with matters of general policy of the department. The question arose as to the relationship of the Civil Service Commission to the office of the department of the Minister of Labour and the fixing of the salaries of officials of that department. A discussion took place with regard to the relationship existing, and the minister read a statement from his department, which dealt with that particular matter and which was pertinent. I understand the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) is dealing with that matter, perhaps not in the same manner as the Minister of Labour did, but he is making an effort to deal with a particular issue of the expenditures of this department which are included in the civil government Estimates now before this committee, and in that he would be in order unless he were to go too far afield in discussing some speech which was made at some other time.

Mr. CHURCH: I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your ruling. I want to read from this report just one more paragraph. This is taken down verbatim. I may say that the minister's theme was Brotherhood:

Mr. Murdock was quite anxious that the people generally should know his position on such questions.

He was anxious that they should know his position on these real live labour questions and what the policy of the department was as compared with that of his predecessor. I want to read just one more sentence.

I hold this one of those things that has got to be done more now than at any other time in the history of Canada. It is for labour to recognize its responsibility and the fact that the employer cannot, and should not, be expected to furnish all of the harmony necessary to the carrying on of business. The labourer has got to recognize the fact that there was something meant when in this Book of Holy Writ we were all enjoined to do whatsoever our hand found to do and do it with our might. The labourer and those representing labour have got to recognize and daily give a demonstration of this.

I am very much dissatisfied with the condition of labour in this country to-day. We are spending a quarter of a million dollars in this proposed appropriation and in my opinion, we are simply throwing it away in the same haphazard fashion as we did twenty-five years ago. It is the desire of every hon. member to do something to alleviate conditions of employees, workers, artisans and farm labourers in this country, and to do that is what I believe to be practical religion. I am not so unfair as to say that this department is perhaps worse under this Government than it was under any other government. While I am a Conservative, I am an independent Conserva-

tive and I am endeavouring to do something for labour in the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House. I am very much disappointed, as one who has been a member of this House only a few days, to find a minister, like myself a newcomer in this House, who, after he has been speaking on platform after platform for three or four months throughout the country, cannot come forward with a definite policy, when there are 200,000 people out of work in this country. Why cannot the Government utilize the Department of Labour as is being done in the United States to-day? Capital is very highly organized in this country; the trusts and combines are flourishing to-day as they never were before, and if they are allowed to continue to flourish, in six months from now things will be ten times worse than they are at present. In the United States, the Labour Department have their experts throughout the country; they are the eyes of the government; they are going into every city and town in the United States; the Attorney Generals of the different states are at their back and they have had 485 prosecutions of trusts and combines. Thus, the machinery of the Department of Labour in the United States is being used to the advantage of the employee and the artisan. Labour is disorganized in this country. While
5 p.m. it is true we have a Dominion department and provincial departments, while they may have done good work, I do not say that they have done the best they could have done. The unfortunate part of the whole labour problem is that to-day it is made the political football of this political party and that. I plead for better consideration of labour in this House. I represent a city that is the home of trade unionism. Long may trade unionism flourish, because it has done a great deal for Canada. The minister has done something for labour, but he has been fairly well paid for anything that he has done for it. I should like to see the department with a bigger ideal. I do not care what the department spends; I would be the last man to raise my voice against the estimates of this department if I saw in them some means of solving the labour problem of Canada. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) during the late election campaign, went up and down this country sympathizing with the poor people who were complaining of the high cost of living. The policy of the hon. members to my left, the Progressive party, is to bring the producer and consumer together. How are they to get together with coal at $15.50 a ton? How is the labouring man going to live when the cost of living is so high as it is to-day? While the farmer may think that he is not getting proper prices for his produce at the present time, yet if the Labour Department will take this matter up and endeavour to do something to bring down the cost of living, to investigate the housing conditions, and like the Labour Department in the United States, endeavour to regulate the trusts and combines, it would be doing something for the benefit of the working classes. Under the British North America Act there is power enough for the Department of Labour to be up and doing, to do what the minister said he would do if he was returned as a member of this House, let alone a minister, to bring down the high cost of living. After listening to the minister for two or three days, I am sorry I have to say that he will not be any more a success in solving the labour problem of this country than he was in solving the problem of the high cost of living under the late government. I believe some of the members of the Progressive party referred to the high freight rates, the high cost of getting their produce to the consumer. We sympathize with them in that regard. If the minister would think more of labour, be more of a labour man and less of a politician—not be a labour man to-day and a partisan to-morrow—if he would try to think of the employees and workers, in the cities and towns, he would be doing far better than reading lengthy letters in this committee. I am amused to see a letter which the minister wrote the other day to the Liberal organization in the city of Toronto. I will not detain the House by reading it; but if the minister would spend more of his time on labour problems and towards bettering the conditions of the working classes of this country, he would be accomplishing something that would be better for employees and artisans of Canada. I do not wish to offer any opposition whatever to the minister. If he will introduce a big progressive policy along these lines I will give him every assistance and support. But it is useless to attempt to settle strikes by the old methods and red tape and quoting charts on supply and demand. Strikes can only be settled by conciliatory and sympathetic action along practical business lines. In a word, we want practical labour men in the department who have worked for their living and know something

about labour conditions from actual experience, and the minister will have my support in any steps he may take to engage such practical labour men.

Mr. STEVENS: The other night I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Labour what I thought was a very pertinent question, but the adjournment intervened between the question and the possibility of an answer from him. I had expected that he might give the information when the House convened to-day. The question was; how the minister reconciled an increase in the vote of $23,000 odd when there was a reduction in the staff of thirty. In placing this matter clearly and concisely before the House I am taking advantage of the implied suggestion of the Prime Minister, that bona fide suggestions would be welcomed, and, furthermore, that the House itself must take the responsibility for any action in regard to the Estimates. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Labour Department estimates for this year are increased by $23,000. This is the minister's statement, in answer to a question of mine, appearing on page 479 of unrevised Hansard:

The other thirty—

Referring to thirty of the forty-two additional employees.

The other thirty have received notice, which so far as I understand will not be revoked, that they are to leave the service on the 31st of this month.

That is to-day. At another point the minister explained that he was incorporating in the regular permanent staff twelve of the forty-two employees. Now, I want the House to get this point. Last year there was contained in the Estimates a sum of $10,000 for clerical and other assistance, and $10,000 for sundries, out of which would be paid these temporary employees. Inasmuch as the minister has been able to reduce his staff by thirty employees, who leave to-day—this being the end of the fiscal year—there is no necessity for the House to provide in the Estimates for those thirty employees for the coming fiscal year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Sheard:

That in view of the statement of the Minister of Labour, as appearing on page 479 of Hansard, that thirty employees of his department would be dismissed on this day, March 31st, 1922, that item 24 on page 9 of the Estimates be reduced to the same amount as last year, namely, $171,640 for salaries, and $35,000 for contingencies.

[Mr. Church.]

This will give to the minister the same amount of money that he required for last year, including the contingencies, which we have not reduced at all.

I am not taking a course that has not been followed in the past. Last year motions were made to reduce items, and the government of the day took the responsibility of making or not making the reductions, and generally they rejected the motions. It is quite within the authority and power of the Government to reject this motion; but, on the other hand, I do not wish it to shield itself wholly behind the Civil Service Commission. That commission has certain distinct functions to perform, which we all recognize. This House has certain responsibilities, and the Government has certain responsibilities. We are merely asking the Government now to accept this suggestion by which those of us who vote for it are willing at once to aid in the reduction of the Estimates and to take our share of the responsibility for what in some quarters may be regarded as the questionable course of reducing this sum, because sometimes a Government is a little hesitant about taking that responsibility. We offer the Government this opportunity to take advantage of our assistance in the reduction of this item so as to bring it to exactly the same figure as last year in view of the dismissal of thirty employees.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate indeed that the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), formerly a Cabinet Minister, cannot see the real facts. To me it is inconceivable that he cannot appreciate that the allegation contained in his motion is absolutely inaccurate. I presume that he can read and analyze Estimates, and was doing so before I ever thought of becoming a member of this House. May I ask him to turn with me to the page showing the number of permanent employees of the Labour Department for the fiscal year expiring to-day? He will find it is 106. Then, if he will follow slowly to the left he will find the proposal is to provide for 117 permanent employees for the next fiscal year. My firm conviction is that the hon. gentleman surely knows that the thirty employees under discussion are not included, and have never been included, in either the 106 or the 117 employees as specified, but are temporary employees and a part of the staff that I found in the department when I took charge. I have stated that when I took over the

Labour Department, 147 employees were engaged there. Of that number thirty-seven were temporary employees in Ottawa and five were temporary employees located at outside points. None of the thirty-seven in Ottawa or the five at outside points was included in the 106 permanent employees provided for by the late government in the Estimates of the fiscal year expiring to-day. I think I am justified in asuming that no one knows that better than my hon. friend from Vancouver. All this play and parade, therefore, all this imputing to the Minister of Labour something that he never intended to suggest, will not get the hon. gentleman or other hon. gentlemen anywhere. I intimated that a considerable number of temporary employees had been served with notices that there was no provision for them after to-night. A number of these employees were paid out of certain votes not included in the civil government items. I do not know what it may be necessary to do in regard to any or all of these temporary employees, but I have already assured the House that all will be dispensed with whom we can get along without. So far as the 117 are concerned, I have repeatedly stated that we are establishing as permanent only a few of those who were handed to me as temporary and whose services are regarded as essential, according to my predecessor, in carrying out the work of the department.

Now, the adoption of the motion made by the hon. gentleman would personally make no difference to me, but it would herald broadcast to the world and to Canadian labour in particular that the Conservative Opposition in this House are doing all they can to stultify the efforts of my department to do the things that labour believes ought to be done on its behalf. That is all that the opposition to these estimates during the past few days has amounted to. If the motion should carry, it simply means that the department cannot even have the 106 permanent employes paid under the provisions of the law for next year. If the hon. member for Vancouver and his associates are prepared to accept the responsibility for that result, why, let the blame rest where it should. Labour will be interested in finding hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Vancouver coming out in their true colours. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) also has indicated clearly where he stands on questions affecting the rights of labour. They are trying to embarrass the department in every effort it is making to do the things that ought to be done.

Mr. LEWIS: I see here an item for contingencies, $35,000. Does that cover temporary labour in the minister's department?

Mr. MURDOCK: It does cover some of it. It has done so in the past and probably will be utilized for that purpose in the future where necessary.

Mr. STEVENS: Let me ask a question just to clear the atmosphere a little after the somewhat warm castigation that my hon. friend has laid upon me. I understood all that my hon. friend has said before he laboured so hard to impress upon the House that I did not.

Mr. MURDOCK: I knew it.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has transferred twelve to the permanent staff; is that right?

Mr. MURDOCK: It looks like that.

Mr. STEVENS: But is that the fact? That is what I understood my hon. friend to say the other day.

Mr. MURDOCK: What is the difference between 106 and 117?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend stated very clearly that he had transferred twelve. He mentioned also the other night that one had passed out; perhaps he forgets what he did say, but I do not. Thirty are being dismissed, as he has told us so clearly, his reasons being to do away with this miscellaneous group of temporary employees. The twelve employees whom he transferred were paid out of the estimates of last year; therefore if we give the same amount this year as last, $171,000, plus $35,000, we are giving exactly the same amount for a smaller staff. And there is something further that my hon. friend might take into consideration. There are two offices here which can be dispensed with. One is vacant now, involving a salary of $3,900. The other, with a salary of $3,700—Assistant Director of Technical Education—is not needed and, it is understood, was to have been dispensed with. This is a total of about $7,500, so that in asking for this reduction we are asking for nothing unreasonable.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member surely does not indicate that both the Director of Technical Education and the Assistant Director can be dispensed with?

Mr. STEVENS: Unquestionably, on this ground: these two offices were inaugurated in connection with the $10,000,000 vote by way of assistance for technical schools in Canada some years ago. The duty of these officers was to organize technical schools in each province and allocate the respective shares of the $10,000,000 vote to each. There is no necessity for continuing the services of these two highly paid officials once the provincial officials commence to function; a clerk in the deputy minister's office can do all that is required. When the Director of Technical Education vacated the office nearly a year ago, the late government was determined not to refill the position, on the ground that it was no longer necessary. My hon. friend the other day, while he did not think it was required, would not assure the House that he would not give this position to some deserving friend. But what I want to point out is this; there is no need for such an officer, because the provincial governments are functioning so far as technical education is concerned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been trying to get this thing clear in my mind, but I do not know that I have succeeded very well. The motion refers to a statement made on the 28th of March as recorded in Hansard at page 479, and the statement, I take it, is as follows:

> Mr. Murdock: The proposal is to make twelve of these forty-two temporary employees permanent. The other thirty have received notice, which so far as I understand will not be revoked, that they are to leave the service on the 31st of this month.

Now we may take it as clear that thirty men go out to-day, the last day of the financial year. I think it is quite as clear that it will not be necessary to provide any money to pay the salaries of these thirty men who will not be there next year. It is equally as clear in my mind that they were paid last year. Twelve of them will have to be paid again this year, but thirty of them will not. Then why are we asked to vote money this year to pay for thirty men who will not be there? It may be that the whole forty-two were paid last year out of some other vote—contingencies, perhaps. Well, we are voting the full amount of contingencies again this year, so why increase this vote to an amount that will include the salaries of thirty men who are going to leave the service to-day? I cannot understand the situation, and if I have not stated it correctly, I should like to be corrected. To my mind it is an idle and a wrong thing of Parliament to vote money that is not going to be expended. We should know how the money is going to be expended before we vote it. It is clear that only twelve out of the forty-two men employed last year are to be retained as permanent, so why should we vote the money for the thirty who are not going to be retained? As I understand the motion, it is simply to reduce these estimates by a sum that will represent the salaries of the thirty who are to be dismissed, and I think under the circumstances the minister himself might very well have intimated to the committee that the vote would be reduced by that amount. It has been done before in this House. I remember last year when the civil government estimates of the Militia Department were up they provided for forty-one men whom we did not intend to employ that year, and we struck out those forty-one, and reduced the vote by something like $58,000. That is all that this motion asks for. The men are not there, so the salaries are not required, and the money should not be voted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the facts were as stated by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, I for one would not take the slightest exception to this amount being reduced as suggested by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). I think the whole difficulty has arisen from the form in which the estimates have been presented to the House. In this connection let me say that it is not wholly the fault of the present Government that the form is what it is, because the Government in presenting the Estimates to Parliament has simply followed the form in which the Estimates were presented and passed last year, and has presented its figures under corresponding heads. If my hon. friends will look at the Estimates, they will find that what we are now discussing are items contained on pages 107 and 108, details of civil government, which relate to the members of the service whom we wish to have retained as permanent employees. If hon. members will turn to the estimates of the Department of Labour on page 52, they will see there the votes which were passed by Parliament at the last session. Let me direct attention to item No. 268, Administration, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act. Hon. members will see that last year the sum voted under this head was $75,000, and that this year the minister is asking only $45,000. I am informed that in connection with these em-

ployment offices some temporary clerks whose services are being dispensed with were formerly employed and paid out of that particular vote.

Mr. STEVENS: Just at that point, may I ask how much of this $75,000 was expended last year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: While that point is being looked up, I might invite the attention of the committee to another point. If hon. members will look at Item No. 267 on page 52, they will find that the amount voted last year for Fair Wages and Inspection Officers was $20,000, and that this year it is reduced to $5,000; and if one takes the last item of all on that page under Details, "Appropriations not required for 1922-23, $50,000," I speak subject to correction, but I think investigation will show that that $50,000 was in part used for the payment of salaries of temporary clerks who are leaving the service.

Mr. STEVENS: That $50,000 would represent simply the excess of last year over this year, and it is put in there for the purpose of balancing the two columns. It is meaningless outside of that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The members of the committee will see that the total amount asked for by the minister last year was $472,000 and that this year it is $372,000. There is a saving of $100,000. It is reasonable I think to ask the committee, when considering the question of reducing the civil government estimates by the sum of $97,000, to take into account the fact that the minister in presenting his estimates to the House this year shows a reduction of $100,000 in the expenditure for his department on what was asked last year, part of that amount having been used to pay the salaries of temporary employees.

Mr. STEVENS: May I correct my hon. friend? I am not asking for a reduction of $97,000, but of $23,000 in this item No. 24, on page 9 of the civil government estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear that it is not the larger amount, but what I have said would be equally applicable in that case; perhaps the force of my remarks might be increased. When my hon. friend asks that the civil government estimates for the Department of Labour be reduced by $23,000, I think it is fair to ask the committee to take into consideration the fact that the minister shows a reduction in the main estimates for the Department of Labour, as presented to Parliament this year, of $100,000 on the amount asked for last year. I can readily see, that if hon. members wish to embarrass the minister, wish to make it difficult for a new minister requiring first knowledge of his department, and wishing to do justice to the members of his staff, they can probably make out a case from the estimates as brought down which would seem to show that some money asked for was not required, but in view of what I have just said, and in view of the explanation the minister has made that some of the temporary clerks he is dispensing with altogether, were not paid out of corresponding appropriations to those he is referring to at the present time, and that the increase is accounted for by his seeking to disclose publicly to the House that he is making permanent a few clerks to take the place of a larger number of temporary clerks he has dispensed with, I hope my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver, under such circumstances, will not press his motion. If he should, I would ask the Committee to take what I think under the circumstances would be a reasonable attitude in considering the motion and bear in mind all that the minister has said by way of explanation, as well as his saving on the main estimates, and permit him at least the opportunity to get to know the work of his department before beginning to do an injustice to some members of the Civil Service who certainly will be adversely affected if a motion of the kind is passed.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister answer my question as to the amount expended under the item of $75,000 because that is important; that is what this whole argument is based on.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will understand that as the fiscal year expires to-night we could not accurately give him the information now. It might be of information to him, however, if I would state the results at the close of the last fiscal year.

Mr. STEVENS: Pardon me. I have asked my hon. friend for certain information. I am asking it in a conciliatory spirit and, having in mind the expressed wish of the Prime Minister that this motion be withdrawn, if he will tell me, or show me that a very substantial portion of the $75,000 has been expended on this the 31st day of March, or up to the 1st of March, it will go a long way to support the argu-

ment of the Prime Minister. If not I cannot see anything in the argument.

Mr. MURDOCK: In answer to my hon. friend I would say that up to February 28th, 1922, $47,012.51 had been expended under Administration Employment Offices. I still would like to give my hon. friend some of the results that were before him at the close of the last financial year as indicating that he surely must have some knowledge of this situation. At the close of the last fiscal year we found that the civil government salaries $106,762.60 had been paid out, and that out of civil government contingencies $30,627.91 had been paid for temporary employees. For the salaries of Fair Wages Inspection Officers $12,269.84 had been paid; for salaries under the Conciliation and Labour Act $12,721.12; for salaries to Administration Employment Offices $50,953.93. I am sure my hon. friend will agree these are funds entirely different from those we are considering here.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the item referred to by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MURDOCK: Temporary employees. Other items are: salaries joint industrial councils, $326.62; salary director of coal operations, $6,285; salary arrears under reclassification, $8,052.97, or a total for the last fiscal year of $228,139.34. That was as of March 31, one year ago to-day. Again, may I say to my hon. friend that last year the records indicate that the temporary employees in the Labour Department were paid from these sources: contingencies, 56; employment offices, 56; joint councils, 2. This indicates there were 114 temporary employees at one time or another, but there were only about 42 when I took charge of the department.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Do I understand the minister to say that during the past fiscal year at different times there were 114 temporary employees employed in that department?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is correct.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And do I understand the minister to say that the wages of these men were largely paid out of the vote referred to by the Prime Minister?

Mr. MURDOCK: The figures were: employment offices, 56; contingencies, 56; joint councils, 2.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And on the 1st January when the minister took charge there were forty-two temporary employees?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And the minister proposes to do away permanently with thirty out of these forty-two?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, in so far as that may be possible.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And twelve out of the forty-two are to be made permanent? Is that the situation?

Mr. MURDOCK: In order that there will be no misunderstanding, let me say there is no provision being made in these civil government estimates for thirty of the employees I found in the Labour Department when I took office.

Mr. STEVENS: Then their salaries are not needed in the vote?

Mr. MURDOCK: Unless it may be necessary to utilize their services in some one of the branches, and either pay them out of contingencies or some other of the various funds of the department as fixed by statute.

Mr. STEVENS: That does not affect the fact upon which my motion rests. They are provided for in your main estimates of this year. I would say to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the figure of 114 temporary employees given by the minister has no relation whatever, to the extent of forty-two, to the estimates under consideration now. The balance of them, and seventy odd employees, are provided for in item 272 to be found at page 52 of the Estimates. So we must not allow the idea to permeate the minds of hon. gentlemen that the number of temporary employees is being reduced from 114 to 12—that would not be correct at all.

Mr. HALBERT: I hesitate to ask a question for fear of eliciting another speech from the Minister of Labour. We have spent a great deal of time with these estimates and we have not made much progress. I would like to get information on a couple of points from the minister if he can answer me briefly. I understand that under the Civil Service Act the minister has no power to discharge any official but he can abolish an office. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. MURDOCK: My understanding is that I could discharge an employee for cause, but I could not do away with the office.

Mr. STEVENS: Could you not do it under Order in Council?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend corrects me to the extent of saying that I could do so under an Order in Council, but no hon. member would expect me to abolish an office that was necessary and one in which there was work to be done.

Mr. HALBERT: I should think that perhaps you might dispense with unnecessary employees by degrees. For example if there were three clerks in an office it might be possible for you to get along with two. My next question is: To what extent have these estimates been increased by statutory increases to the clerks in the department?

Mr. MURDOCK: The increase of $23,400 in salaries is attributable to the statutory increases provided for in the Civil Service Act, and by the addition to the permanent staff of employees who have heretofore been temporary.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is it not true that during the last fiscal year a number of employees of the department were working with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and were temporary on that account?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am advised that a good many of them were blanketed in during the year, but I had nothing to do with that. It was done before I was there.

Mr. ARTHURS: As a matter of fact, they were so employed.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told a considerable number were.

Mr. ARTHURS: They were there for the express purpose of assisting returned soldiers in the department and were partially paid by your department.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, I am told that none of them were for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): As I understand these estimates, the minister is taking 117 permanent employees to do the work for which he proposes to pay $195,000. The work which that 117 are supposed to do in the coming year was performed in the past year by 106 permanent employees, plus 42 temporary ones, and it cost the department $171,000 odd, plus the amount paid to the 42 temporary ones, taken care of in some other vote. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think my hon. friend is substantially correct.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): In that case this vote, so far from showing an increase, would, in my opinion, show a decrease, because 42 are provided for out of the difference.

Mr. STEVENS: No, 12. My hon. friend is in error. That is very ingenious, but it does not carry. My hon. friend has declared, and never denied, that he has given notice to 30 of the 42 employees, and that, as far as he and the Government are concerned, their salaries cease. He has included in this vote 12 additional ones, or 11, but he says that 12 temporary ones are transferred to the permanent list. The item is increased by $23,000 plus the contingencies. Twelve are paid out of $171,000 plus the contingencies last year.

Mr. MURDOCK: No.

Mr. STEVENS: The salaries of the 117 employees which he is now asking for in the $171,000, plus the $35,000 contingencies. We say to the House this year, "Give his department exactly the same as you gave it last year, and do not give it $23,000 in addition." I agree that these twelve are included in the $195,000, but he has told us, with a spirit of reproach, that he does not intend to clutter up the department with temporary employees like his predecessor. That is a very commendable action. Then it is not under the contingencies, and he can change the vote if he likes. It might have been better had I moved that the total amount be reduced and not specify anything. I specified the item for the purpose of clarity. Last year the Government paid for 117, just the same as they provide for this year, with $171,000, plus the contingency vote of $35,000. We are asked to do the same thing this year.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I would like to ask if the employees last year were not 106 plus 42 temporary, making 148 employees in the service.

Mr. MURDOCK: At the close of the year.

Mr. STEVENS: Paid out of $171,000 plus—

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I did not so understand it. I understood 106 of them were paid out of the $171,640 and the other 42 were paid out of some other vote.

Mr. STEVENS: Out of this $35,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. gentleman from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is entirely mistaken, but it is impossible to explain, and I will certainly have to give up trying to explain. I am forcefully reminded of the old adage "There are none so blind as those who do not wish to see," and I am also reminded of the words of Kipling—

> If you can make one heap of all your winnings,
> And risk it on one turn of pitch and toss,
> And lose, and start again at your beginnings,
> And never breathe a word about your loss.

Poor losers are the cause of all this discussion during the last two or three days.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I had hoped, by my remark, that I would help clear up this matter, but what is the use of trying to clear up this matter, if the minister proceeds to use it as an excuse to lecture his political opponents?

Mr. CARROLL: The motion of the hon. gentleman for Vancouver Centre is in effect for a reduction of some $23,000. He is moving to have the $195,000 odd in these Estimates reduced to some $171,000 odd. I take it that is impossible, unless he is going to force the minister to take away from the permanent staff of the Labour Department the twelve employees whom he has placed there. If the motion read that the whole Estimates be reduced by $23,000 I would see some sense in it. I do not think that motion can be properly dealt with in this Committee. It is something over which this Committee has no control. This increase for the year is mostly made up by statutory increases plus the salary of twelve permanent employees who are taken from the forty-two temporary employees. I do not think the motion of my hon. friend is in order at all, so far as the real gist of the motion is concerned.

Mr. BROWN: I would like to get at the facts of the case, and see where we stand. Perhaps it is not our part to lecture political opponents or political friends, but I think a little less pugnacity on the part of the Minister of Labour would enable us to arrive at an understanding of the situation. I think, perhaps, we understand the situation regarding the permanent employees. There were 106 last year and there are to be 117 this year. I presume the statutory increases provided in the Civil Service Act cover that amount, making the average salary last year $1,619 and the average salary this year $1,667. I suppose that is accounted for by the working out of

that machine which we have created, and for which we do not seem to have provided any brakes. However, that is a matter for discussion later on, but that is the way it has impressed us so far. We have made a machine we do not seem able to control. If there is a brake we have not been able to get our hand on it yet. The question seems to centre around a little question of fact: were those temporary employees last year paid out of that contingency fund of $35,000 or were they not?

Mr. MURDOCK: Part of them were.

Mr. BROWN: If they were paid out of some other vote, I can understand the position taken by the minister that it is necessary to have that amount for contingencies voted this year as well as the amount covering the permanent staff. It is simply a question of fact. If they were paid out of some other fund last year, then we need that amount this year. If the $35,000 contingency fund covered all the temporary employees last year, then I can see that there is something in the motion made by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). Can we get at this question of fact? Speaking for myself—and I think I may speak for those around me—I may say that we came here with a great desire to reduce expenditures. We do not want to handicap unduly a minister in getting acquainted with his department. When I began to look at these estimates, I was almost afraid to confess that I did not know anything about the matter; but since ministers are prepared to confess that, I do not know that we need be ashamed. We do not want to reduce any expenditure that is necessary; we do not want to take the position of "cheap guys," who wish to cut down the salary of a man who is really useful in his department because, after all, the man who is getting the low salary is not, by any means, always the poorest man in a department. Sometimes it pays and pays well to get good men, however much you have to pay them. That is our position. At the same time we want to impress upon this particular minister and upon the Government that it is our desire, if any means can be found of controlling this machine, to control it, so that we may not have this expenditure mounting up year after year without knowing when we are going to reach the maximum for civil government. Can we get at this little question of fact as regards the contingency fund, which may or may not

have provided for those temporary employees? If we can reach an agreement as to that point, we shall understand where we are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. gentleman's question of fact, which is a pertinent one, will I think, be answered by reference to the Auditor General's report. If hon. members will look at the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1921, which is the latest report published, they will find that a number of clerks received salaries paid from funds other than those represented in the appropriation that is being asked for at the present time. The same thing took place during the past year. The Auditor General's report for the past fiscal year, which ends to-day, cannot be presented to Parliament until next year; but it will show then that temporary clerks have been paid out of funds other than the contingency fund referred to here. It will be found that when the minister came into office fifty-six temporary clerks were paid out of the appropriation for employment offices, and as was pointed out this afternoon, the estimate for the employment offices has been reduced this year by several thousands of dollars. I do not think the hon. member for Centre Vancouver is anxious to embarrass us unduly. His purpose has been to make quite plain the difficulties that these Estimates involve and I think all the hon. members will realise that, seeking to follow what has been the custom of other years and to present the Estimates in a similar form, we have not been in a position to make the differences as apparent as we ourselves would like to have them appear. I hope my hon. friend's purpose has been served, and that he will not press his motion to a vote.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) stated clearly—and there is no doubt as to his statement, so far as I can gather during these two or three days' discussion—that the forty-two temporary employees came under this civil list; the fifty-six temporary employees to whom the Prime Minister refers, are provided for in another appropriation altogether on page 52 of the Estimates. My hon. friend is wrong in suggesting to the committee that we are seeking to reduce this vote by virtue of temporary employees being dismissed who were paid under another fund. Nothing of the kind. That point is the crux of the whole business. The forty-two employees, of whom twelve are remaining, were paid last year out of the civil vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we were to discuss this for another week, we would not get very much further ahead, and if my hon. friend intends to press this matter to a vote, I hope he will let us take the vote before six o'clock.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member for Centre Vancouver should know that eighteen of those temporary employees are at present being paid out of the Employment Service appropriation.

Mr. STEVENS: Which is another vote altogether.

Mr. MURDOCK: And two out of the vote for Joint Industrial Councils. That accounts for twenty of the forty-two who are not therefore, being paid out of any contingencies that are now before the committee.

Mr. MANION: Those two votes are in the other section of the Labour estimates.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes they are being paid out of the Employment Service appropriation on page 52.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I think it is desirable that hon. members should appreciate not only the difficulties which the present Government has, but the difficulties which the late government had, in the classification of the Estimates, and I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment or two while I read a part of a debate which took place last session, and which will illustrate that the difficulties we on this side of the House are having at the present time in explaining our Estimates are precisely of the nature and character of those with which the late Government was faced when asking Parliament to pass its Estimates, and this as a consequence of its own legislation in giving certain powers to the Civil Service Commission and being governed in the reorganization of the Civil Service under those powers. I have in my hand Hansard of March 15th, 1921, when the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) was putting through his estimates. Hon. members who were in

the House last session will agree that no more conciliatory minister could be found than the then Minister of Agriculture, and the following is an illustration of the difficulties which he met with in endeavouring to explain the organization of his department. At page 935 of Hansard the following appears:

Mr. Cannon. Am I to understand the minister to mean that the Civil Service Commission has the right to fix the wages that shall be received by the civil servants in the employ of the Government, without the head of the department having anything to say about the matter?

Mr. Tolmie: The salaries and the increases are fixed by the classification.

Mr. Cannon: Does the minister refer to the classification that was made by those American experts imported into Canada, or to some other classification?

Mr. Tolmie: The classification brought into force about a year ago.

Mr. Cannon: By whom?

Mr. Tolmie: By the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Cannon: Last week the Minister of Trade and Commerce explained during a debate in this House that experts brought into the country by the Government and who were absolute strangers to the Civil Service had made certain changes in the classification of the civil servants. Am I to understand that the changes which appear in the item I refer to were made by the experts or by the Civil Service Commission itself?

Mr. Tolmie: I understand that these salaries were fixed at the time the classification was made, but what part the American experts played in the classification I could not say off-hand.

Mr. Cannon: What I want to know is who made the classification? The Civil Service Commission, the Minister, or the outside experts?

Mr. Tolmie: It was certainly not the minister, but the Civil Service Commission. Whether they had the assistance of these imported experts or not, I could not say.

Mr. Cannon: The minister states he is not responsible for the classification of these employees?

Mr. Tolmie: The minister had nothing to do with the fixing of these salaries.

Mr. Cannon: But before the classification was made was not the minister consulted by the Civil Service Commission or by the experts, because, after all, the people who can give proper information in regard to the employees of a department are the head, the deputy head, and the branch heads? Were they consulted, and if so, did they make reports written or verbal?

Mr. Tolmie: The classifiers had a staff of experts of their own, and also consulted the deputy head before the classification was approved.

Mr. Cannon: Am I to understand that the deputy head of the Department of Agriculture is responsible for the classification of these particular employees? If so, I would like the minister, who is the head of the deputy head, to tell us the reasons for these varying increases.

Mr. Tolmie: The evidence of the deputy minister was taken by the commission, who came to their own decision.

Mr. Cannon: I should like to know from the minister, now that his deputy is here and can give him the required information, why the junior translator is getting a bigger increase than the translator himself?

Mr. Tolmie: Although the evidence of the deputy minister was taken, the final decision was in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. Therefore, I do not hold the deputy minister responsible for these increases that appear here. As I have explained before, there is the old classification and the new. This particular class of junior translator begins at a salary of $1,200 under the old system, with annual increases of about $50 a year up to about $1,600. Under the new classification the minimum salary of translator is fixed at $1,440, with annual increases of $60 up to the maximum.

I think Mr. Chairman, it will be apparent to hon. members that the late government experienced the same difficulty in accounting for their estimates as presented to Parliament as we on this side of the House are experiencing to-night. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has explained that in presenting his estimates he accepted the statement made to him by his deputy minister as to what was the proper classification of the different clerks in his department, and the appropriate increases they were to receive, and that the estimates as presented contained nothing in the way of new appointments other than the making permanent of a certain number of temporary clerks.

I took advantage of the recess to discuss with the minister, with his deputy and others of the staff who had to do with the preparation of the estimates, the figures as they are presented. I find that the position is exactly as stated by the minister: that some of the temporary clerks have been made permanent. But there is this feature which has not been brought out, and which should be explained. If a deputy minister thinks that certain of his clerks ought to be promoted under the methods employed, the Civil Service Commission require that Parliament in the first instance vote the money for the position to which the advancement is to be made. After the money has been voted, the deputy minister has to go to the commission and ask its members to make the promotion. The commission may or may not carry out the wish of the deputy in that regard. The consequence of this method of procedure is that, in bringing down his estimates, the minister is obliged to ask Parliament to vote the money needed for the new position and also to vote the salary of the clerk in his

existing position in case he should not be transferred to the new one. In these estimates, six positions are cited which represent positions into which certain of the clerks may be promoted. Whether the Civil Service Commission will grant the promotions after they have been asked to do so, no one can say; until Parliament has voted the money and the promotion has actually been made, it cannot be a matter of certainty. The deputy minister states that these positions are provided for in the estimates in accordance with the requirements of the Civil Service Commission and the classification.

My hon. friend has a motion before the committee to reduce the estimates by a certain sum. I would like to make it clear that the acceptance of the motion will mean that the services of certain clerks in the department will have to be dispensed with, because there may not be an amount sufficient to pay the salaries of all the clerks whose positions are being provided for. The new fiscal year begins to-morrow; what we are asking Parliament to vote now is an amount necessary to meet these salaries during the coming year. I think the minister will find it possible to dispense with some of the clerks in his department; he intends to do so, in any event, when he gets an opportunity to effect reorganization. But the adoption of the motion may involve considerable embarrassment to some of the members of the service; it might make it necessary to dispense with the services of certain clerks a little more summarily, perhaps, than would otherwise be the case. I would appeal to the members of the committee to consider the Civil Service in this matter, and not to take a step which will involve no embarrassment to the Government but which may bring hardship on certain members of the Civil Service.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend the minister, and, in a more moderate manner, the Prime Minister, read a lecture this afternoon to me and to others here instead of seeking, as the Prime Minister now has done, to give us an intelligent understanding of this matter. If the minister finds himself in a dilemma, it is his own fault. I asked him a very civil and pertinent question on Tuesday last; I got no answer to it. I asked the question a second time. I am not blaming him or even rebuking him for not answering my inquiry, but he got off on other topics. To-day I broached the matter again, and my answer was a lecture which, I may say, did not impress me very strongly. If a minister replies to questions by delivering curtain lectures, he is not likely to get very much consideration at the hands of those who are seeking the information. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour both sought to give the impression that I had no serious intention in pressing for the information I was requesting. Now, let me point out to the committee a few facts. The Prime Minister this afternoon very skilfully led the committee away from the point under discussion to another vote,—and I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, had I been in that position you would have promptly called me to order—a vote on page 52, resolutions 268 and 272, dealing with the Labour Department proper. He conveyed to the committee information which was refused by the Minister of Labour,—who, indeed, gave us exactly the opposite impression—that the temporary employees involved in this discussion came under vote 272. Now, the minister gave us the impression very distinctly—and I shall not read long stories from last year's Hansard or this to support my argument—that he was reducing the large floating temporary staff, and he took upon himself great credit for doing so. I am in the judgment of the committee whether or not I reasonably interpreted the minister's attitude. He took credit to himself for that, and in his remarks he referred to this vote now before us. I came to the conclusion, as I think other members did, that he was reducing the staff which was included in the vote we were discussing; otherwise, why should he bring it in at all? If he wanted to take credit for reducing the staff by over thirty employees who came under another vote which we were not discussing, why did he bring the matter up? I submit I was perfectly correct in taking the minister's answer as it was given, although I am free to say that it was neither clear nor free from ambiguity. But I will meet the Prime Minister exactly on his own ground. He takes us over the votes 268 and 272, and I assume I shall be in order, Mr. Chairman, in referring to them; the Prime Minister transgressed the rules sufficiently to take us there.

I submit these facts to the committee in justification of the motion which I have presented: In votes 268 and 272 and the vote now before us we have three sums —I will give last year's figures first— $171,000 in vote 24; $75,000 in vote 268; $15,000 in vote 272, a total vote of $261,000. I asked the Prime Minister how much of vote 268 had been used, and after a great

deal of pressure we secured the information that up to the first of this month, $48,000 out of the $75,000 had been spent. I will add $12,000 more for this year, making $60,000—and it will not amount to $60,000, I may tell hon. gentlemen. In other words that reduces the amount for last year to $246,000 in respect of the three votes—and the Prime Minister is weaving these supernumeraries into the three votes. The amounts for 1922-23 are as follows: $195,000 for vote 24; $45,000 for vote 268; $15,000 for vote 272, a total of $255,000. In other words, we have $246,000 last year as against $255,000 proposed this year. The minister has given us his solemn statement that to-night thirty employees cease to be employed by the department. He is asking for about $9,000 more for thirty employees less in these three votes,—and I care not how the Prime Minister juggles from one vote to another; the thirty employees are incorporated in these three votes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Would my hon. friend tell us what figures he is adding, how he gets $246,000?

Mr. STEVENS: I went over that pretty well, but I shall not follow the example of the minister and refuse to give the information again. In 1921-22 the civil government vote corresponding with vote 24 this year was $171,000, in round figures; vote No. 268 was $75,000, and vote No. 271, $15,000. The Prime Minister tells us that those are the votes in which these employees are somewhere involved. The total is $261,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Where do you get $246,000?

Mr. STEVENS: I will give it to my hon. friend at once.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You said $246,000 just now.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to finish the sentence I was about to utter. I asked the Prime Minister this afternoon how much of that $75,000 vote had been expended, and after a little pressure we got the answer, namely, $48,000; that applies to vote No. 268, and I say that I allow for this month, and it is an excessive allowance, an additianal $12,000, making $60,000 on that vote, or a total of $246,000. Now this is the point and the crux of the whole matter. That vote of $246,000 paid for the whole of these employees, both the ones included in the vote immediately under consideration and the supernumerary group. Let us go a step further. The minister advises us that he is dropping thirty employees; I am clear about that.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend has said so many times this afternoon what the Minister of Labour intended to do that perhaps I had better read the minister's language, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read it.

Mr. MURDOCK: It is on page 479 of Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: On page 479 of Hansard a question was asked the minister and he replied as follows:

> Mr. Murdock: The proposal is to make twelve of these forty-two temporary employees permanent. The other thirty have received notice, which so far as I understand will not be revoked, that they are to leave the service on the 31st of this month.

Now have I misstated the minister's language?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS: Then let me go back to my argument. For the sum of $246,000 a certain staff was maintained last year. This year there are thirty employees less whose services are to terminate to-night, the 31st of the month, yet the Government are asking $255,000 this year. I submit that there is no need to ask for $255,000 to provide for the services of thirty less employees when $246,000 proved sufficient for last year.

But that is not all. In the vote now before us the minister himself tells us that the position of Director of Technical Education, opposite which is the sum of $3,900 has been vacant for many months, I think nearly a year. He does not think it will be filled, but he is not certain. Then he states on page 479 of Hansard in regard to another individual, "I have no assurance that we shall fill this position." That was a position carrying a salary of $1,980 so here again there is an additional $5,800 for two positions which according to the minister's own statement there is no need to fill. So I submit to the House that in view of a reduction in the staff of thirty, and two other positions with salaries attaching to them amounting to $5,800 that the minister says he does not think will be filled, we are warranted in reducing this vote by $23,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does my hon. friend take into consideration in that

computation he made by way of a comparison any statutory increases for this year? He is eliminating them altogether.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend can take what consolation he likes out of that interjection, but it is utterly void of reason and logic.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is chock full of truth though.

Mr. STEVENS: Then I also say this: Last year, when these estimates were before the House, the then minister reduced them by $40,000. Why? I am not saying there was any particular merit in that, but the point is this: Exactly the same conditions apply this year as applied last year. During the war, and subsequently, there had been built up in this as in other departments extra staffs to deal with questions that were perhaps pertinent at the time but which to a large extent have now disappeared. Last year $40,000 of a reduction was made in these estimates, and I am informed that this year there should be a corresponding reduction in the requirements for this department. Indeed, Sir, when the Prime Minister himself spoke and carried us away from the vote under consideration to page 52 of the Estimates, he pointed out that the department had reduced the estimates on page 52. Now does not that reduction indicate that the activities of the department, and its main activities are covered by these main estimates, have been reduced by a corresponding amount? Otherwise, why the reduction in the estimates? If, therefore, there has been a reduction in the main estimates on page 52, does it not stand to reason that the head office expenses ought to be reduced accordingly? Is not that common sense?

The Prime Minister also made the statement that there were six duplications in these estimates. Let us pause for a moment to consider that. Why did not the minister tell us there were these duplications? He had his two deputies in front of him, and he told us that he required all of this. He said he might be able to weed some out, but the Prime Minister coolly tells us tonight that there are six duplications: that is, there are six clerks provided for here, and in order to meet some possible demand of the Civil Service Commission for possible elevation of officers to new positions, six new positions are provided. Does that sort of thing permeate the whole of these Estimates?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: In every department?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a most extraordinary situation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is.

Mr. STEVENS: What I suggest to my hon. friend is this: We have here a list of the votes in resolutions such as this: "Privy Council, $66,000." That is the resolution. Then details are given for our convenience, and the minister has a great many more details for his convenience, but the vote is a vote for a certain sum, and therefore I say to the committee we can very well afford to reduce the sum and then let the department work out these difficulties of duplications that have been mentioned. It is manifestly absurd for the minister to come before Parliament and ask us to vote sums on which we have no information at all. Let me put it this way to my hon. friends. If what the Prime Minister states is now the case, let us take these six duplications and segregate them so that they are not applicable to both votes. My hon. friend knows this perfectly well; supposing he elevates one of these clerks to a higher salaried position, he is immediately at liberty, by authority of Parliament, to refill the vacated position; he knows perfectly well that he is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend, I am sure, does not want to create a wrong impression. As I explained to him, that is part of the method of procedure adopted by the Civil Service Commission. They fill the new position. When they have done so, they take account of the fact that this money has been voted, not for the purpose of creating two positions, but for the purpose of enabling a clerk to be transferred at the appropriate time from one to the other. The minister cannot fill the position; his deputy asks the Civil Service Commission to give him a clerk to fill a particular position. The Civil Service Commission then takes account of the fact that when the Estimates were before Parliament one appropriation was put in to meet the possibility of this new appointment; that however, cancels the other—it does not create two new positions. This is simply a method of procedure which the Civil Service Commission has adopted to carry out what is necessary in effecting promotions.

Mr. STEVENS: I think perhaps it would be more correct to say that it was a method

discovered this afternoon, or this evening, by my hon. friend to explain this rather involved dilemma in which he finds himself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. STEVENS: The bare facts are there. A certain sum of money was required last year for a given service. This simple fact I place before the committee—and let me say to them that the same thing applies to other departments—the service is reduced by the number of thirty employees, and I say that we should not be asked to vote a larger sum by $23,000, than was required last year, for the payment of that reduced service. Now let me say this to the Prime Minister—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend this question: Suppose the Civil Service Commission should refuse to promote a certain clerk? If his salary is done away with what is going to be done with that clerk? From what source is he going to get his salary? The only way in which the payment can be provided in the meantime is for the estimate to be voted.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend can vote his appropriation for the clerk if he desires. We are not objecting to that; we are objecting to this increase when there is a reduction of service. Just exactly how my hon. friend is to work it out is his business and not ours. Now let me draw the attention of the committee to another fact. I may be transgressing the rules but the Prime Minister has set an example in this regard. The Government claim—a statement was handed to the press in which they made the claim—a reduction of $138,000,000 in the general estimates of the country. The claim is made—we will not debate for the moment whether rightly or wrongly—that this is an economy effected in expenditure throughout the country. But if you take the Civil List you will find that in practically every department, with the exception, I think, of the Department of Railways, there is an increase at Ottawa. Now I bring this fact to the attention of the Government and I say: Personally I will co-operate with you in bringing about a reduction in the cost of administration in Ottawa because of the decreased service throughout the country. Now, if that is not logical I do not know what it is. Take any department; take the Department of Public Works, if you like. If there is a cessation of public works activities throughout the country surely there ought to be a corresponding reduction in the overhead cost of administration. Let me point this out to the committee: The very expedient employed by the late government, and condemned by the Minister of Labour this afternoon, is the method by which this can be brought about. And what is that? You will note that a year ago a reduction of $40,000 was made in the Labour Department. How? By dismissing or dispensing with the services of a number of temporary employees. We have been told by the Minister of Labour, by the Prime Minister and other speakers for the Government, that you cannot reduce the staff because they are permanent employees. The Minister of Labour says he cannot reduce the estimates because the salaries are for permanent employees. He is making twelve new permanent employees out of temporary employees this year. My hon. friend shakes his head. I do not know how on earth we are going to pin the Minister of Labour down to anything. He has told us time and time again that he is adding twelve temporary employees to the permanent staff. The committee knows perfectly well that what I am stating is perfectly true. Now what I am pointing out is this: The expedient of temporary employees is for exactly the situation that is facing us to-day. What is that? A reduction of the cost of administration throughout the country resulting from a cessation of activities due to the war and causes subsequent to the war. We can never get down from the war peak in the matter of expenditure unless we dismiss some one. Whom should we dismiss? Why the temporary employees certainly, and that is what the Minister of Labour of last year did. He reduced the estimates by $40,000; he laid off certain temporary employees. The present Minister has forty-two temporary employees and this number, when temporary employees in other branches are included, is increased to 114. How can he reduce his estimates, how can he reduce his overhead, how can he reduce the cost of administration in Ottawa? Simply by dispensing with the services of some of these temporary employees instead of making them more permanent than they were. And so I say this to the Government: All through the main Estimates for the Civil Service in Ottawa there is a tendency towards a general increase; and I am not going to allow the Minister of Labour to get away with his curtain lecture to me this

afternoon, or the suggestion that I was aiming a blow at the working people in the Civil Service. I am doing nothing of the kind. I say to the Government that where they have efficient civil servants pay them a salary commensurate with their services every time; but it does not follow that the country must maintain a large staff beyond the needs and the requirements of the service. If the conditions to-day, as they were last year, are coming gradually back to normal, and we are getting away from the exigencies of war, then let us gradually bring the service down to a peace standard. Therefore what we say to the Prime Minister, and to every member of the Government, is that they will find us willing to join with them in a study of these Estimates for the one purpose of bringing about a reduction in the overhead charge, viz., the cost of administration in Ottawa.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret if I have not been able to make the hon. member from Vancouver realize my viewpoint and my understanding in regard to some of these things. I have tried several times to make it clear that, although in the estimates in certain cases perhaps there are two salaries, it is only intended to use one. Let me give a concrete case to illustrate my meaning, that of Mr. F. E. Harrison, Wage Investigator, Calgary. This gentleman has been for some time classified as a wage investigator at a salary of $2,340 a year. It has been contended—and here is the argument—that he should be named as a senior wage investigator beginning at $2,520 per year, a classification established by the Civil Service Commission. The vote in this particular case is to provide for the promotion of Mr. Harrison. In addition to his regular position he was formerly assistant to Mr. W. H. Armstrong, Director of Coal Operations, and was paid a salary of $600 per annum from War Appropriations for his extra services. While the position of Director of Coal Operations has been abolished, many of the duties pertaining to this position have descended to Mr. Harrison who performs them at a loss of $600 in salary. The department feels that Mr. Harrison should not suffer any loss, but as the limitations of the classification of his position and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission prevented the department from giving him the required increase in salary it was deemed advisable to create the new position of Senior Wage Investigator carrying a higher salary in order that he might be permitted to receive the compensation to which the department feels he is entitled.

This is not an increase in the staff, but it proposes to establish two classifications with pay, only one of which will be used, under any circumstances, but if this $2,520 salary for Mr. Harrison's classification, as senior wage investigator, does not pass, we surely want to leave him with his present salary of $2,340, and classified as a wage investigator; otherwise we would have to come back to you and ask you to reconsider it. There is a number of exactly similar duplications in this proposal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: By whom was Harrison appointed? That is important.

Mr. MURDOCK: The Hon. Mr. Crothers, the late Minister of Labour, now deceased.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is it not possible, if both votes pass, for the senior wage investigator and the other investigator, as proposed, for the Minister of Labour to appoint another man?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told that the lower position would be at once abolished by the commission, when the senior wage investigator had ben appointed.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is something I cannot answer.

Mr. ARTHURS: Have you any wage investigator other than this man?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why should the position be abolished?

Mr. MURDOCK: I can only give my hon. friend my word that the position will not be filled, and, furthermore, I will acquiesce in your view. If hon. gentlemen say that no more money should be paid for permanent salaries this year than last year, to-morrow morning I will proceed to put into effect the desire of this House, but not one temporary salary has been paid out of the vote of last year, or could be paid out of the vote of this year, and, therefore, any stress that has been placed on the forty-two temporary employees has no bearing upon this specific civil government vote.

Mr. HOCKEN: As I understand the minister, a larger salary has been put in

providing for the promotion of this investigator. He is not sure that this man is going to be promoted. If the position for which he is providing this salary is filled by the Civil Service Commission, we will have two employees on the pay-roll. Here is a wage investigator, as I understand it, at $2,300 a year. Then $2,500 is put in in the expectation that he will be promoted. If the Civil Service Commission say that he is not a suitable man, and they select somebody else, you will have two men on salary. Is that right? You do not lay off the wage investigator; you retain him in the position he occupies now, and you add another entire salary.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told we would at once drop the wage investigator.

Mr. HOCKEN: You put in the man who now holds that position?

Mr. MURDOCK: We would not accept any other man for promotion in place of this man, for whom a new official classification has been made.

Mr. HOCKEN: Do I understand that in the promotion of this man, and the creation of a new office, the department has power to refuse the man selected by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MURDOCK: The department would have the right to refuse to appoint any one. I desire the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) to understand that this man is regarded as being specially entitled to some extra consideration on account of the special mining situation in District 18, and the fact that he has proven to be a valuable officer in British Columbia and Alberta. While war appropriations were being dealt with he was getting $600 more, but that cannot be paid any longer, and, therefore, the only way to give him a fair measure of justice is to make a slightly increased classification, giving him a couple of hundred dollars more than other investigators.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not objecting to his getting an increase or promotion, but I am stating that the Civil Service Commission is the body that will decide whether he is to be promoted or not. Am I right?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is hardly right, because they would not appoint without an application from us, and if they appointed anyone except this man, I am told the Labour Department would not accept the appointment, and would not regard some other man as being specially entitled to $200 extra, and, therefore, the position would not be filled.

Mr. HOCKEN: Then I do not understand the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who does?

Mr. HOCKEN: I thought the procedure was that the department notified the Civil Service Commission that there was a certain office to be filled. The commission then advertised for applications for the particular office, and held an examination, or an inquiry, into the man's capacity and filled the office. I do not object to this man being promoted, or getting more salary, but if the Civil Service Commission say "You having asked for a new officer, we do not think the man who was the former wage investigator is competent for it, and we will appoint someone else." Then I understand the appointment by the Civil Service Commission would stand. If they appointed someone else, then the department has not only the wage investigator on its payrolls, but also the new appointee. I do not see how you are going to get over that, unless the Department of Labour directs the course of the Civil Service Commission. If the minister tells me that he can control the commission that will explain the matter. I was under the impression that that commission was not controlled by the department. If it is controlled by the department, then patronage has not been abolished, and if it is not controlled, we are in danger of having two men to fill one job.

Mr. EULER: It came out pretty clearly last year, before the committee dealing with the Spinney Bill, that the deputy head of the department could make a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission, which was almost always accepted by the commission. I was a member of that committee and I think that was pretty clearly established.

Mr. CALDWELL: Was that not with regard to promotions only?

Mr. EULER: Not necessarily. This would refer to a promotion, I understand. It was clearly understood in that investigation that the opinion, or the suggestion, of the deputy head would be accepted. I do not know that they are absolutely bound by that opinion, but it was established before that committee, certainly to my satisfaction that the commission accepted the recommendation of the deputy head. There-

fore, if the Minister of Labour or his deputy made his recommendation to the commission that this particular man be appointed, I think there is very little doubt that the commission would accept that recommendation—at least they stated so at the investigation.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I wish to ask a question, and I am not asking it in a controversial way. It arose from a statement made by the Prime Minister, which struck me as being of considerable importance, and I should like to get a clear understanding of it. If I mistake not, it was said that, not only in this department, but in others, the necessity arose at times practically to duplicate positions in the Estimates in order to provide for possible or probable promotion from one position to another, and in order to allow for that, a salary was provided for each position, with the understanding that only one salary would be used.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the case in some of the departments.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In that case, is it necessary to provide for both salaries? Would it not be sufficient, in cases like that, to provide for a salary to cover the higher position of the two, because the greater always contains the less, and in case the promotion was not made, the salary appropriated for the higher position would still pay the salary of the lower position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is quite right. I am informed that, in some departments, what he has suggested is done, but in others, the other course has been adopted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the way I have understood the act to be worked out; but does that not all go to show that this motion should pass? The motion is made on the ground that there is not so much to provide for this year as last; that is to say, that the Labour Department, in the scale of its operations, would be smaller rather than larger, on account of the assurance of the minister that the number of employees would be less, as undoubtedly they should be less? The number has been growing progressively less for some time. Objection is taken on this ground—this is given as an illustration of the objection—that it is necessary to name in the Estimates two positions to cover the event of the man who fills what is now only the one position, the lower, not being chosen by the commission to fill the higher. The minister says: "Well, if he is not chosen, we shall not accept the other choice." I think he is right in saying that the department has power to refuse the choice of the commission. In that case only one salary is going to be required, and if the higher one is provided for, undoubtedly that is all that is necessary. Supposing there is simply a general cut ordered by this committee. Then it is certainly within the power of the department to allocate that cut so that just the six duplications will absorb a good part of it. Consequently, there is no argument in the case of duplication against the cut being made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my right hon. friend is quite correct so far as he goes. The sum which the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has proposed is an arbitrary and rather a large amount. Without opportunity for adjusting all these estimates very carefully, it is difficult to say just what amount could be saved. If my hon. friend from Vancouver would consider reducing his amount somewhat, possibly the hardship of which I have just spoken might be avoided; but to take the sum which he has suggested and deliberately pass it in this committee, I am afraid, would create hardship upon some members of the Civil Service.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I should like to ask the minister whether with reference to two positions provided for in the estimates, a substantial saving might not be made. On page 107, the third position is that of Director of Technical Education. As I understand the matter, the legislation under which this office was created was passed in 1919, and Dr. Gill was appointed Director of Technical Education either in the latter part of 1919 or in the early months of 1920. In carrying out the provisions of the act, it was found that it was necessary for the Director of Technical Education to visit the different provinces for the purpose of making the necessary arrangements for the proper working of the act, and that required that the director should be absent from Ottawa a great part of his time. That was found to interfere with the carrying on of the office at Ottawa; and in order to carry on the negotiations with the provinces, later on an Assistant Director of Technical Education was appointed. We have a Director of Technical Education, and for the last year the appropriation was $4,275. This year the appropriation is $3,900. The arrange-

ments, as I understand the matter, have all been completed with the provinces, and on the first of September of last year, Dr. Gill resigned. Mr. Crawford was appointed Assistant Director of Technical Education, and from the first of September of last year until the 29th of December, when the late government went out, Mr. Crawford was carrying on, performing the duties of Director of Technical Education. It was the intention of the late government that no appointment would be made to fill the vacancy; that Mr. Crawford should be promoted to be Director of Technical Education. It was found that the reason for the appointment of the assistant had passed.

9 p.m.

All arrangements had been completed between the department at Ottawa and the provinces, and the Director of Technical Education was again in a position to carry on his work here. The late government was in office from the first of September until the 29th of December, and no appointment was made to fill the vacancy. Why? Simply because it was the policy of the government to do away with the assistant and to let the director again carry on at Ottawa. There is really no work outside of Ottawa, and it was the policy of the ex-Minister of Labour and of the late government that the Director of Technical Education should be a fountain of information only; that he should be in Ottawa for the purpose of giving to the provinces information that they might write for, so that these two offices are clearly not necessary, unless the present minister has changed the policy of his predecessor in office and has some other policy for the administration of this act. If he has, I am sure he will tell the House what that policy is. If he has no other policy, surely it is unnecessary to provide a salary of $3,900 for the Director of Technical Education and a salary of $3,705 for the assistant director. I do not know whether any appointment has been made since the 20th of December last or not; but I know that prior to that time no appointment had been made, and that the late government had no intention to make any appointment. There you have a clear saving of $3,705. With another item here, the two would make a saving of more than $5,000. I should like to know from the minister, in connection with the second item on page 108, "Confidential Messenger," who the confidential messenger was last year.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am advised that Mr. Lacelle was confidential messenger last year and is this year, as proposed.

[Mr. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): When was Mr. Lacelle appointed?

Mr. MURDOCK: In 1906, I am told.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Was a Mr. Rump not confidential messenger last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am advised that he was promoted to a clerkship, and that he earned his promotion by passing the specified examination. He has been there since I have been in office.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): If I were to claim that when Mr. Rump was placed in another department no appointment to the office of confidential mesenger was made, that would not be according to what the minister understands to be the fact?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told that Mr. Lacelle has been a messenger since 1906, and that he was made confidential messenger some two or three years ago.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Did Mr. Lacelle occupy the position which in the estimates $1,200 was provided for last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: The estimates as I have them before me so indicate.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): That is your answer?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes sir; and he did occupy the position to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Will the minister kindly explain the position of the department with reference to the appointment of a Director and Assistant Director of Technical Education?

Mr. MURDOCK: Gladly. The position of Director of Technical Education was vacant when I assumed office. I understand that Dr. Gill, who ocupied the position, went to British Columbia at a substantially increased salary some time early in September last. My predecessor in office very kindly left me a memorandum in regard to Dr. Gill, and the hon. member for Lanark has explained fully to the House the recommendation and suggestion made to me at the time I took office. The position has not been filled yet, although numerous applications have come to me, and I have not thought of filling it at the moment. We have in the department an Assistant Director of Technical Education. With my knowledge of his abilities and of the work to be performed, I do not care at the present time to promote him to the director-

ship. I do not see the necessity of having two officers at present, but I do not know whether that condition will continue. It is only proper to say, though, that this year there are $1,000,000 to be handled under the direction of either the Director or the Assistant Director of Technical Education. I am told that each year agreements have to be made between the federal government's representative and the educational authorities of the provinces with regard to the expenditure of this fund, and that it requires a very capable officer to see that the appropriation is judiciously expended. That is as I understand the situation with regard to the Directorship of Technical Education. I think the hon. member will agree that it would not be advisable for me to strike out the position of director and leave in the position of assistant director—in other words, an assistant to a position which does not exist. Therefore, at present the two positions are left in, although one is vacant.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): If it is intended to promote the Assistant Director of Technical Education to the position of Director, surely the position of Assistant at $3,705 should be struck out of the estimates; or if it is the intention to continue the assistant, then the position of director at $3,900 should be struck out. It is not intended to continue the two positions?

Mr. MURDOCK: Would it be consistent to strike out the Director of Technical Education and leave in the Assistant Director? If my hon. friend, as a business man and member of this House, will advise that course, I will agree with him at once.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): No. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he follow what I stated to have been the policy of the late government—promote Mr. Crawford.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not prepared to do that, Sir, at present.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): But that would not be any reason why both appropriations should be kept in the estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why not strike out the appropriation and leave the position there?

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister made a very reasonable suggestion, and I want to bring it to the attention of the committee as early as possible. I would suggest that my resolution which now reads:

That in view of the statement of the Minister of Labour as appearing on page 479 of Hansard that thirty employees of the department would be dismissed on this day, March 31, 1922, item 24 on page 9 of the Estimates be reduced to the same amount as last year, namely, $171,640 for salaries and $35,000 for contingencies.

Instead of that I would move to substitute therefore:

That item 24 on page 9 of the Estimates be reduced by the sum of $15,000.

This, I have calculated somewhat carefully, will pretty well cover these points upon which we are agreed there will be required no vote. If the Prime Minister is agreeable to that, I would amend my motion accordingly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the House will agree, I think we shall save time by accepting the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for an opportunity to address the committee briefly. I am delighted with the zeal for economy shown by my hon. friends to my right. They have made a great deal of progress during the past year in the right direction, and I hope that that progress will continue. It did seem to me that my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Stewart) was on pretty good ground with respect to this Directorship of Technical Education. I expressed my opinion yesterday on that question, and I need only make this further observation now, that the position of Assistant Director of Technical Education might very well be dispensed with. If the minister does not wish to promote the present occupant of that position to the senior position, he might leave him in an active capacity in the other, at any rate, until he had made up his mind whether or not he wished to make that promotion. In fact, I am pretty well convinced that there is no need for either, and I think that the deputy minister or the minister himself, might very well be able to make the necessary arrangements with the provincial authorities covering the expenditure of this money, which in my judgment should never have been voted to the provinces for this purpose. But let that pass.

There is one other aspect of these estimates that I wish to briefly bring to the attention of the minister, and I do it not in any spirit of captious criticism, but with a real desire to assist him. I observe there are several items in the estimates for statistical clerks. Altogether we are providing about $27,000 for twenty-two stat-

istical clerks in the Department of Labour. We have a Bureau of Statistics, a branch of the Government service which in my judgment is very efficiently manned and operated. Would it not be possible for the Department of Labour to have its statistical work done, in large measure at least, in the Bureau of Statistics? The offices of the Labour Department are only a few blocks from those of the Bureau of Statistics; the bureau has all the machinery and equipment necessary to carry on the work. Are we to understand that the Department of Labour are building up within their own confines another statistical bureau? I mention this because I know how easy it is to duplicate services in government departments in this city. Another question I would ask is whether the Department of Labour is being equipped with the machines that go with statistical research work and which are already installed in the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. MURDOCK: At present we are merely continuing the plan which, as I understand, has been in effect for very many years. These statistics collected in the Department of Labour are in connection with employment questions, the cost of living, and other matters coming within the purview of the department. I may tell my hon. friend, however, that for the past couple of weeks two or three ministers who think there is unnecessary duplication of statistical work have had it in mind to confer with the deputies of the respective departments and their chief officers with a view to finding out where those duplications can be eliminated, and how the collection of statistics can best be made uniform and placed under the supervision of one department only. I could place before you correspondence indicating that that matter is now under advisement and awaiting the time when we shall be able to get together for that purpose.

Mr. CRERAR: I am delighted to hear that statement from the minister. I am very certain that if the committee of the Cabinet prosecute their inquiries diligently, as I am sure they will, very considerable saving can be effected. I may not be fully conversant with the circumstances, but there appears to be no good reason why this information gathered from different parts of the country for statistical purposes cannot be turned over to and compiled by the Statistical Bureau, with a consequent saving of thousands of dollars to the other departments.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I make no criticism at all of the vote; in fact, I am disposed to think it is necessary. But it is only right that the committee should know that the concentration of statistics has been the work mainly of the last two years. The statistics formerly were prepared in every department—Railway Department, Trade and Commerce, and all the rest, and the result was not duplication, but triplication and quadruplication and all the other "cations." They have, however, been concentrated in the Trade and Commerce Department, under a very efficient officer, Mr. Coats, who stated in a recent address that, in his belief, we now had the best statistical service of any country in the world. That has been the work of late years. I do not rise particularly to emphasize that feature of the late administration, but possibly I can be justified in doing so in view of the taunt that has just been flung at us that our enthusiasm for economy is of recent birth.

Mr. BROWN: Another thing that the Government might well consider is the question of what statistics are really valuable, and what are not. As an illustration of statistics that are not very valuable I recall the case of a man in our community who used to bucksaw wood and who could tell you at the close of the day exactly how many sticks he had cut. He marked it down and kept a faithful record; in other words, he accumulated statistics. We had a very ponderous volume put into our hands since we came here, the Canadian Atlas, a magnificent volume, splendidly printed on paper of excellent quality. I turned over the pages the other day and I came across this heading: "Tons of freight per head of population." Now, that information is entombed in this ponderous volume. It reminds me of going into a museum and finding the mummies of cats and hawks and other vermin that were taken from the pyramids of Egypt. The Government might very well consider whether it is wise or necessary to publish statistics that are not of permanent value. One of the things that makes us speak as we do in regard to the reduction of expenditure is that the wheat crop of Manitoba is said not to be able to pay the taxes of this year.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in this discussion, but as its range seems to have stretched from Dan to Beersheba and has proceeded, whether relevant to the item under consideration or not, I wish to suggest that

when the Government are co-ordinating, so to speak, the statistical branches of the various departments they consider seriously the advisability of eliminating at least fifty per cent of the civil servants employed in the inside service at Ottawa. I am an old civil servant; I had about four years' experience in the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa, and during that time I was forced to the conclusion that the service at Ottawa is overmanned, and, to great extent, overpaid. The people of my constituency are up in arms against the conditions prevailing in Ottawa with regard to the Civil Service. The late government gave us what was termed Civil Service improvement or Civil Service reform. A few days ago I went over to the department in which I used to be employed, and I found that where there were two employees in 1914, in many of the branches to-day there are fifteen or sixteen, drawing pay from the public treasury. The farmers and the labouring men of Hants object to the public funds being dissipated in this manner. This afternoon we spent a great deal of time in the consideration of a matter involving $4,000 or $5,000; and we spent about $25,000 or $30,000 of the public moneys in useless discussion, largely owing to the fact that the ministry have inherited from the Government which was driven from power on the sixth of December a legacy for which the people owe them nothing but christian forgiveness—to say the least. My only object in rising this afternoon is to ask the Administration, when they take into consideration the co-ordination of the statistical branches, to give serious attention also to the reformation of the inside Civil Service—without going to the United States for assistance and without accepting the legacy which was handed down to us by the late administration.

Mr. NEILL: I have much pleasure in endorsing the remarks of the last two speakers, although my experience has been from a different point of view. While it is highly desirable that we should save the money that is spent in handling and tabulating these returns when they are brought in, the people who excite my sympathies are the wretched people in the country who have to make them out. There are a large number of retailers in Canada —I forget the exact number—and it was a plank in my platform that I should endeavour to eliminate these useless returns. They are a perfect pest to the body of retailers throughout Canada. A merchant in a big way in Vancouver told me they had to employ an extra clerk to make out the returns; this was more particularly during the war. Every time they sold a sack of potatoes all these different returns had to be made out, and not only did they have to keep an extra clerk for that work, but a very capable clerk, a statistician, indeed, to cope with it. I know one case where a storekeeper got one of these wretched returns and sat down and wrote on it, "I will go to gaol before I will attempt to fill out this return." He simply could not do it and was not going to lie about it. This going-to goal part of the business is no fantasy, because nearly all these returns have a notice at the bottom that if the return is not sent in by such and such a date you are liable to so many days in gaol. The company I am associated with have had a number of returns to make out, and while we fibbed a little we generally got them out a month or so late, and mailed the things in. One in particular I had mailed, but it did not appear to have reached the department, because I got a registered letter to say that on account of its not being sent in I was liable to, I forgot how many months in gaol, and they rather indicated they expected me to go to gaol by registered letter forthwith. I had no way of proving that I had sent the return in, although I knew perfectly well I had sent it in. The company I am connected with also sells coal, and we have a monthly coal return to fill in. It is made out in such a way that no known system of book-keeping can be used in making out the return. We fake the thing as a matter of fact. Every sale is supposed to be tabulated in this miserable return, and we simply have to fill it out more or less by guess. And if that were not enough, about every three months, or to be quite safe, every six months, they change the whole system of making out the returns so they cannot be of any possible use to them for purposes of comparison. Hon. gentlemen are inclined to laugh, but it is a matter of deadly earnestness to a great many people. I am often at a loss to know and often wonder whether it will be myself or my book-keeper who will go to gaol eventually. Certainly one of us will. If the Government will eliminate some of these returns they will certainly earn the gratitude of the very large body of retailers throughout Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Stevens) agreed to: yeas 120, nays 0.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Before the resolution as amended is agreed to I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Department of Labour to be represented at the Genoa Conference by a labour representative of this Dominion.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend is referring to the Conference in April, we shall be represented by Colonel Carnegie. I think the conference my hon. friend refers to is at Rome, not Genoa. The governing body of the International Labour Office meets at Rome in April.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am speaking of the Economic Conference at Genoa.

Mr. MURDOCK: We have nothing to do with it.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I think Canada is represented at the Genoa Conference by Sir Charles Gordon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And Professor Montpetit.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Is it the intention of the department or of the Government that labour shall be represented at that conference?

Mr. MURDOCK: We have had no invitation to be represented at that conference.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The conference is for the consideration of economic and financial questions which are vital to the interests of Canada, questions in which labour as well as capital has a very deep interest. I should like to ask the minister if, in his opinion, in the consideration of these matters the interests of labour would be well taken care of by Sir Charles Gordon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I might answer my hon. friend. An invitation was extended to the Government of Canada to be represented at the Genoa Conference. It was intimated that one or two delegates might be appointed, but the Government has chosen, as my hon. friend has mentioned, Sir Charles Gordon and Professor Montpetit. As my hon. friend is probably aware, Professor Montpetit is professor of economics in the University of Montreal and is well versed in labour and other problems. I am sure that in the hands of these two gentlemen the interests of labour, so far as they are matters for special concern, will be represented at this conference. It was not especially requisite that any particular group or class should be represented.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I do not wish at all that my question should indicate that I have any fault to find with the selection made by the Government. If I were to express my own view I should say that in the selection of Sir Charles Gordon no happier or better choice could have been made for Canada. I simply desired to know whether in this conference, as in past international conferences, it was the intention that the Department of Labour, or labour, should be specially represented by a labour representative.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I point out to my hon. friend that this conference is very similar in character to the conference at Washington. The late government when asked to appoint delegates to Washington selected Sir Robert Borden to represent this country; it was not thought advisable to appoint a special labour representative to that conference. The same reasons that governed the late administration in their appointment have also actuated the present Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I tell my hon. friend furthermore that I do not know of a better economist in Canada than Professor Montpetit and he is not more of a capitalist than myself. Besides I do not see why a labour man should be appointed at this conference any more than a farmer or a person engaged in any other trade or occupation in Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am entirely satisfied; I simply wished to get the position the Government took. There is another question I would like to ask the Minister of Labour before this matter is finally disposed of and that is: Is it the present policy of the minister to promote, or to attempt to promote, further good relations between employers and employees, particularly in the building trades? I find that in January last the minister is reported to have said that employers and employees in the building industry "must and shall get together." Now if my hon. friend is correctly reported I think it is possibly due to the committee that we should know what the policy of the Labour Department is, particularly in view of the fact that after that statement was reported by the press to have been made by the minister, the Fourth Annual Conference of the Association of Building and Construction Industries, held in the city of Hamilton from January 17th to 20th, passed this resolution:

Resolved, that in our industry we have found Joint Industrial Councils tend only to cause dissension rather than cure it, and therefore such councils should not be continued.

I would like to have the minister state to the committee whether in view of the fact that earlier in the month of January he is reported to have stated—if he was incorrectly reported of course that disposes of the matter—that the employers and the employees must and shall get together, the department has any policy for dealing with the situation in view of the resolution passed in Hamilton.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am glad to advise my hon. friend, although I am sure he is already aware of the fact, that the Labour Department has no authority to compel pleasant, proper and consistent relations in the building trades as between employer and employee. I can however, inform the hon. member that anything that can be done in a suggestive way will be done, any assistance that can be rendered will be rendered, in order to bring about, to create and to maintain proper relations between employer and employees in the building trades. That is being done from time to time. Occasionally we have suggestions as to how we can assist in that respect, and in every case we undertake to do whatever it appears possible to do to bring about, establish, and maintain the relations which should exist between employers and employees. But again I repeat my hon. friend is as familiar as I am, if not more so with the knowledge as to how far, under the existing federal regulations, the Labour Department can go in a matter of that kind.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): It was only in view of the language used by the minister himself "must and shall" that I asked for information as to what the policy of the department was. Now I have one more question to ask and then I am through. In the Toronto Globe of November 24, 1921, the minister is reported to have expressed himself as follows:

I have been longing for two years to appear before a proper tribunal in order to get the facts as to the manner in which the rights of the people of this Dominion have been sacrificed and intentionally so. But no opportunity will come until after December 6th. When I am member for South Toronto I am going to continue in Parliament this battle for a showdown. Among those who may be questioned will be the Conservative nominee for West York, who will then be a private gentleman.

I shall ask what protection the Canadian people have at present against combines, trusts and mergers. I'll answer here and now, none whatever.

I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether with the staff and organization of the Department of Labour, he has undertaken to carry out and wage this battle which, at Mimico on 24th November last, he promised to wage, and if not whether he intends to carry out the promise? If so when and how?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member's question has nothing whatever to do with the Department of Labour but I will answer by saying that no action has been taken or will be taken through or by the Department of Labour to do the things to which my hon. friend refers; and I here and now suggest that I was rather optimistic in regard to certain things at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree with the Minister of Labour that there is no power of compulsion in the department to compel the employers and the employees in the building trades to get together; but if there is no power of compulsion, would it not comport more with the dignity of this country if the minister did not use the language of compulsion? When a minister of the Crown uses the language of compulsion, saying what people "must and shall" do, that signifies that the power of compulsion is behind the language; and when the power of compulsion fails it does not comport very well with the dignity of the country or with the dignity of the office which the minister holds.

The next point I want to make is this: The minister through the campaign painted a lurid picture of what he described as trusts and combines which he designated as the enemies of the people. They were described as foes to be fought, as the oppressors of the real people of the country —the common people of the nation. Does he really think that the man whom he joyfully painted as acting in that role—and he was joined in vigorous language day after day and night after night by the leader of the Progressive party in denunciation of Dominion Textiles and all that pertained to them—does he think that the head and front, the founder, the centre, the heart, and everything practically, of Dominion Textiles is the right representative of Canada at an economic conference? If I believed what the minister expressed before the election, and if I believed what the leader of the Progressive party expressed over and over again, and Sir Charles Gordon were appointed to represent this country at an economic conference—a man who was declared to be the common

enemy of the people of Canada—I would feel like getting up in Parliament and saying so. Why is it there is silence on the part of the minister and the Government after Sir Charles Gordon is selected? Why is there silence on the part of the Progressive leader in Parliament after Sir Charles Gordon is selected? Does not all this seem very strange? Certain things, of course, were brought into the arena of vituperation, but none so much as Dominion Textiles. That organization was held up as the child and creation of the late Government, and those who controlled it were represented as the dictators of the Government policy, pressing their heels on the neck of the common people, without sentiments of real patriotism for the nation as a whole, and selfish aggrandisers interested only in the accumulation of wealth. Is such a man as Sir Charles Gordon a fit representative of the Dominion, and of labour, along with the rest of the Dominion, at any conference at all? How could hon. gentlemen have been sincere, and then sit silent when such a selection was made?

Mr. MURDOCK: Two or three hon. gentlemen have referred to Sir Charles Gordon, and to what I said in the campaign. I never mentioned Sir Charles Gordon's name throughout the election, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to produce proof to the contrary. Furthermore, I never gave consideration—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did the hon. gentleman mention the Dominion Textile Company and one of the presidents of it?

Mr. MURDOCK: One at a time, please. I never thought about Sir Charles Gordon during the campaign. I never dealt, specifically or otherwise, with the Dominion Textiles, but rather with certain other concerns.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Will the hon. minister allow me a question? Did he impale the Dominion Textile Company in the city of Toronto?

Mr. MURDOCK: I referred in Toronto, and at other places, to certain combines in textiles, cement and various things affecting the interests of the common people of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Dominion Textiles.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think it. I do not think I ever used the words "Dominion Textiles."

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to know if we are discussing the Department of Labour or holding a post mortem?

Mr. HOEY: The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has made frequent and characteristic attacks, has misled the members of this House and has referred to the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar).

Hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I do not think those expressions are quite parliamentary.

Mr. HOEY: If they were parliamentary, those are the expressions I would use.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. HOEY: I want to say—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I think the hon. gentleman must withdraw that expression, and use some other.

Mr. HOEY: If it is your pleasure and ruling, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to withdraw, although I have the misfortune to come from a country where men do not usually withdraw their statements once made. I say, in answer to the charge made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the hon. leader of the Progressive party has already on the floor of this House, in the debate on the Address, protested against the appointment of Sir Charles Gordon to the Economic Conference at Genoa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad the hon. gentleman rose and made the statement. If he said so, I did not hear him. I am very glad he made the statement. He was consistent in doing it. I am not disputing it at all.

Mr. ARTHURS: During the debate yesterday a question arose regarding the mining situation in Nova Scotia, and the minister is reported to have spoken as follows:

> I presumed to send to Nova Scotia a very capable officer of the department in order that he might go on the ground in the mining towns of Cape Breton and ascertain what the actual conditions were.

Further on he said—

> I am sorry to say that I must have been too presumptuous in sending a federal employee to that district and in that capacity, because when he got to Halifax he was given to understand, in substance, that he had better mind his own business and get back to Ottawa.

What officer of the department was sent; for what purpose was he sent and from whom did he receive the order to come back to Ottawa? The minister must know this.

Mr. MURDOCK: In reply to the question of the hon. gentleman from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs), I may say that Mr. T. A. Stevenson was the officer of the Labour Department who went East to investigate the entire situation and report to the minister. After being in Halifax a short time—I could not say the time without the file—he was given to understand by an official of the provincial government, as I understand the report, that the provincial government of Nova Scotia was amply sufficient unto itself to deal with the situation in that locality, and that there was not any real necessity for a representative of our department to go further than Halifax to look into the situation.

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. gentleman has stated that some officer of the provincial government of Nova Scotia gave this order to come back to Ottawa. Has this officer sent by his department made a report to the Minister of Labour, and if so is that report available to this House?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. T. A. Stevenson made a report as I recall now. I am speaking from recollection subject to correction. He made a report of each mining town investigated during his stay there, forwarding daily reports, and if they were all collected into one continuous report, I imagine we would find a concrete reference to every mining town he visited, or every situation which he investigated while down there.

Mr. ARTHURS: That does not answer the last question. Is that report available to the House? Further, who was the officer of the Nova Scotia government who asked this man to come back to Ottawa. I would also ask the hon. gentleman as a favour to lay the report on the Table, so that it would be available to every member of the House, and we could see the conditions that this officer found.

Mr. MURDOCK: Anything in the Labour Department is available to the hon. gentleman and to this House. I will undertake to bring it to the hon. gentleman and to give to it such publicity as he desires.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is all we want. The minister did not answer my other question as to who was the officer of the Nova Scotia government who asked this man to come back to Ottawa.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would have to look at the report in order to give the information which my hon. friend wants, and which, I judge, he can get from the report when he receives it.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): There are two matters I should like to clear up on the record with reference to these estimates, and I am sure the minister would be glad to have them cleared up. On page 108, there is an item, "one supplies clerk", for which, last year, there was an appropriation of $1,600, and for which there is no appropriation this year. I understand that, last year, no appointment was made to this office and no salary paid. Can the minister confirm that? From the estimate as it appears now, it would seem to be a reduction in staff and a saving.

Mr. MURDOCK: It has been found possible to discontinue entirely that position for this fiscal year.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I make the statement that no appointment was made last year and no salary paid, and that consequently no officer can be disposed of. This year the Government is not dispensing with the services of an officer or with a salary, but is simply carrying out the policy of the ex-minister in the late government.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will note that last year there was a salary of $1,600 provided for in the estimates for one supplies clerk. I am told now that, by the usual methods of Civil Service promotion and advancement, that gentleman has gone up to the classification of senior supplies clerk at a salary of $1,680, or an increase of $80 a year.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Last year no appointment was made and no salary paid. That is all I desire to clear up.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told that my hon. friend is perfectly right, and I am thankful for the information because I was not aware of it.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I simply wish to clear up what appears from the estimates to be dispensing with the services of an officer and the saving of a salary of $1,600. My hon. friend does not wish to create that impression when it is not so. Does the same thing not apply to

the next item, "one audit clerk", for which, in the estimates of last year, a salary of $1,300 was provided, and for which there is no appropriation this year? I understand no appointment was made to the office and no salary paid. If that is so, that is all I desire to clear up.

Mr. MURDOCK: If the hon. member will look further up the list, he will find an item, "senior audit clerk", at a salary of $1,500. That is where that classification has gone to and where it is specified in the current estimates.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Last year both these offices were not filled and both salaries were not paid.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told, the same individual in each case.

Item as amended agreed to.

Civil Government—Militia and Defence—Salaries and contingencies—$615,577.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that this resolution was called on Monday or Tuesday last and was allowed to stand over owing to my absence. I may say that I have taken the opportunity of going through the various items with some care, and I think I can say that I have some familiarity with the particular items concerned. There does not appear to be very much reduction from the estimates of last year as they were amended by the committee on that occasion, but I think the reason for that is justifiable. The work consequent upon the conclusion of the war is still being performed to a large extent by three branches of the Department of Militia, notably, the Central Registry Office, the Records Office and the Pay and Allowance Branch. The work these three branches are doing is practically all after-war work, necessitating the employment of a considerable staff. I thought, perhaps, there might be a little greater reduction at the present time than these estimates show, but still I cannot express much surprise at the statement now made. Perhaps I might state that, in addition to the staff which is shown upon page 74 of the Estimates, there is a large temporary staff in that department; 400 of the temporary staff are, I understand, to be let out to-day. When I had the honour of being made Minister of Militia and Defence the temporary staff alone numbered 5,280, and last April, while the estimates were before the House, I remember I was able to say that the staff had been reduced to 1,200 or thereabouts, and that it would be gradually reduced and finally wiped out within the next year or two. I think myself that a reduction of 400 this year is a fairly good showing. That temporary staff, however, is not paid out of the Militia Department vote at all, but out of the Demobilization or War Claims Vote, as it is now called, which will be found in the Estimates, amounting to some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. It is purely a war vote. These clerks are doing war work and have always been paid out of the demobilization fund. Their services will expire automatically, I should think, within a year or at most two years, when these temporary officials will of course be all out of the service. I would hardly like to say that the minister has saved the country $600,000 as I saw stated in one newspaper, by reason of dispensing with four hundred clerks on the first of this month. Certainly that amount will not be paid to them this year, but no one expected it would be. Automatically they go out because there is no work for them to do. The Demobilization or War Claims vote will also vanish entirely within a year or two. But on page 74 of the Estimates we find the permanent staff as it is to-day of the Militia Department. Having gone over that as carefully as I can, I do not think any reasonable objection can be taken to it, and so far as I am concerned, the vote having stood over for my presence in the House, I do not think I have any further criticism to offer on that head.

10 p.m.

Mr. MANION: I notice a Director of Separation Allowances and Assigned Pay. Of course, I know that officer was used very much during the war, but I am wondering as to the necessity of such an officer at the present time.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): Although the war is over that officer's work is going on at the rate of two hundred cases a month.

Mr. MANION: Are they disputed cases?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is also in charge, I believe, of the loan branch in connection with the Finance Department, and is a pretty busy man.

Mr. MANION: The minister apparently did not hear my question. I asked if the officer's work was in regard to disputed cases of assigned pay and separation allowances.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will give the number of claims investigated, approved and paid

by him during the war. War service gratuities, 1,647; separation allowances, 246; pay and allowances, 764; refunds of transportation, 120. Approximately only 10 per cent of the claims received were approved, 90 per cent being rejected, but all had to be investigated. The number of pay and allowance cheques redeemed up to the 28th March, 1922, was 16,656, while the letters received numbered about 60,000, or an average of 4,000 per month. All these letters, of course, had to be answered. He is a very busy man with a comparatively small staff.

Mr. SALES: Is such an officer as custodian of surveying equipment at a salary of $1,680 really necessary?

Mr. GRAHAM: Until some time ago that gentleman was a senior clerk. He has been given that title by the new classification, and his work is the same as before, although he is engaged in the Survey branch.

Mr. BROWN: I have had occasion to look over the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1921, and under the head of civil government, Department of Militia and Defence, I find the total allotted to be $221,955.14. Does that cover the items that we are considering here, which were increased to $586,000 odd last year, and for which $585,000 is now being asked? Did the expenditure for that department increase that amount in one year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The statement would of course be for two years ago—

Mr. BROWN: I realize that.

Mr. GRAHAM:—before 270 employees were added.

Mr. BROWN: Then does the number of employees added to the staff account for that very large increase over two years ago?

Mr. GRAHAM: The classification of the department, although recommended, was delayed for quite a length of time, and when it came into effect it was to some extent retroactive, which made the expenses all the larger.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I notice that the purchasing department has been increased to this extent: there are three junior purchasing agents instead of one; two purchasing agents as there were before; and they have dropped one assisting purchasing agent, making five agents altogether instead of three. Is this due to reclassification? That is, are they the same men under different names? If so, are the former positions which they held still provided for by duplicated statements, or have they been abolished?

Mr. GRAHAM: The positions which they held before have been abolished. The department did not recommend that these new titles be given, but on appeal the officials were given them by the Civil Service classification. It is the same men, and the former offices disappear.

Mr. BROWN: I have not had my question answered yet, and I think it is something that the country would like to know. I asked whether I have correctly interpreted the Auditor General's report in assuming that the cost of this department has increased from $221,000 two years ago to something over half a million both for last year and the present year.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman is literally true on account of the postponement of reclassification from an earlier date up to that time, and the increase two years ago was really made almost entirely owing to the reclassification.

Mr. BROWN: That means over $300,000 in that one year.

Mr. GRAHAM: The work that these permanent clerks now do was performed at the time he mentions by temporary clerks who were paid out of the demobilization vote.

Mr. GOULD: Reference was made by the hon. ex-Minister of Militia and Defence to the services of some 400 temporary clerks being dispensed with to-day. Are the salaries of members of the permanent staff in the Records Office paid out of the war appropriations fund, or out of the moneys that are being voted to-night?

Mr. GRAHAM: The permanent staff is paid out of this vote. A large portion of the temporary staff, as has been explained by the ex-minister, was paid in former years out of the demobilization vote. This year—and personally I regret the necessity for doing it—four hundred members of the temporary staff are being retired, effective the first of April. I hope that with the amalgamation bill put through we shall eventually be able to carry on the work of the four branches, each of which

has now a large temporary staff, with the permanent staff only.

Mr. GOULD: About three years ago contracts were entered into with those who now constitute a part of the permanent staff to cover their employment for a period of three years. I understand that at the end of next month those contracts will expire, and that they apply to quite a number on the permanent staff in Ottawa. If these contracts are not to be renewed—and from personal conversation with some of the men affected, I judge they do not anticipate their renewal—the decrease in the permanent staff should be apparent in the amount we are asked to vote to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be in connection with the military staff, not the civil staff.

Mr. MacLAREN: In the preparation of these estimates, has the system of duplication of salary votes been followed, as in the case of the Labour Department, where provision is desired for promotions?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Agriculture—Salaries and contingencies, $775,717.50.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Prime Minister stated a few evenings ago that the secretaries employed by ministers of the late government would be placed in such a position that they would receive, as nearly as possible, their ordinary salaries, less secretarial allowance. My late secretary, Mr. Lynton, was first engaged in the Department of Customs; later he was taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) when he assumed the office of Minister of Agriculture. He served him for two years and was then taken over by me. I am anxious to know what the disposition of the minister is with regard to Mr. Lynton, or what he proposes to do in that connection?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): We are endeavouring to locate him, but we have at present no vacancy which is worth as much as the position he held previously, and so far we have not succeeded. That, however, is our aim.

Mr. CRERAR: I notice a very considerable increase in the amount for salaries from $567,000 last year to $640,000 this year, contingencies standing at the same amount. The total amount voted for salaries in the Department of Agriculture has grown from $399,000 in 1913 to $640,000 this year—a very substantial increase. Perhaps the minister could give us some explanation of the increase of $80,000 over the amount voted last year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The increase of $71,680 is due to three causes. A certain number of temporary clerks have been promoted to the permanent staff and get larger salaries, in accordance with the new salary range. In addition to that, there are some nineteen new positions, accounting for something like half the total increase. There is a reduction, however, under the head of clerical and other assistance from $45,000 to $35,000. My hon. friend may think the salaries very high, but if we have a number of these positions vacant to-day, as we have, it is because the salaries are not sufficiently high to attract applicants to fill the vacancies. The position of Dominion Cerealist, for instance, will be vacant in June. The positions of Dominion Agrostologist and of Plant Pathologist have not been filled yet. Taking them altogether, I do not think that the key men in the department are overpaid. As a matter of fact, we have some difficulty in retaining them at their present salaries.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask why $10,000 additional is necessary for travelling expenses. I was under the impression that the cost of travelling was coming down to a certain extent.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are a number of assemblies and conventions held, some every year, and others at longer intervals, at which the department is represented. The Agricultural Institute meets at Rome this year, and we shall have representatives there. Then there are always a certain number of conferences in connection with live stock and other matters at which we are represented. Some of the travelling expenses that were formerly charged up to the branch vote will this year be charged to this item specifically set aside for travelling expenses. The main increase is due to these overseas conventions being held this year.

Mr. EVANS: A number of new positions are being filled this year, such as Dominion Bacteriologist, Chief of Feed Division, Specialist in Ornamental Horticulture, two Assistant Entomologists, and so forth. It seems to me that agriculture is top heavy at the present time with pro-

fessional men. It is too expensive altogether. Was there a call for these new appointments this year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not had a Dominion Bacteriologist in the department hitherto, but if my hon. friend has been reading the newspapers and is acquainted with the legislation passed last session, the Dairy Produce Act, he will know that a great deal of attention is now being paid to the question of bacteria in milk and dairy products generally. Then there is the question of soil bacteria. It has been found as we go along in our agricultural research work that bacteriology plays a far more important part in agriculture than we ever dreamt of some years ago. This man will have to deal more particularly with dairy products and soil bacteriology.

With regard to the Chief of the Feed Division, it is proposed to subject our various feeds to an analysis to guard against any dilution or disease in the seed. It includes bran and shorts, and all kinds of stock feeds.

The specialist in ornamental horticulture will be used at the Dominion Experimental Farm. That farm is a rendezvous for visitors from all over the Dominion, and it was thought that a little more attention might be paid to ornamentation of the lawns, shrubberies, and that kind of thing.

The Assistant Chemist is required because the chemist's work is growing and he is unable to take care of it himself. Many samples of soil are sent in from time to time, and in order that we may intelligently apply artificial manures, it is necessary to analyze different soils to ascertain what manures are best adapted to them.

With regard to the Assistant Entomologist, I am sure we must all have heard at various times of the tremendous loss to our forests as a result of the spruce budworm and other insect pests. The department sends out scouts from the Entomological Branch for the purpose of locating these insects and directing the activities of the lumbermen to the affected parts of their limits, so that they can cut down their trees and use them before they are destroyed by these bark beetles and other insects. As a matter of fact, we are going to be short even with these new men.

Mr. GOULD: I am not in any mood to criticise the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, because since my appearance in this House I have been quite convinced that of all departments of the Government the Department of Agriculture has been used the most niggardly in the matter of expenditure. I have made a point of that throughout the country. The minister has mentioned the work done by our Entomological branch and in that connection an incident comes to my mind which happened some years ago at a time when the cut worm was very bad in the West. I mentioned it simply to urge that the Entomological branch has been perhaps in a more or less starving condition so that research work could not be carried out thoroughly, with the result that we who were engaged in agriculture and suffering much loss annually through the depredations of insects would sometimes have to challenge the advice that was given out by the branch. On this occasion, I was driving my team up and down the field, and as the horses were warm I stopped them and walked into an adjoining field of wheat. I had been reading Bulletin No. 32, I think it was, of the Entomological branch, dealing with the cut worm, and according to the advice given in that bulletin all these cut worms should at that time in the morning have been under the surface. It was about eleven in the forenoon and the sun was shining very strong when I walked into my field of wheat and saw, I should judge, a million cut worms in a given space, some going north, some south, some east, some west. I said, "My, according to information in a certain pamphlet you fellows should all be under the ground. What are you doing here?" I wrote to Mr. Criddle about it, and we exchanged several letters, and in the end—I am not saying this boastfully at all—he informed me that my contention was right, that the instructions given in this pamphlet were wrong, and he asked me to continue my research work.

My point is this. The professional man whose money is secure, being voted by this Government, is in a much more favourable position for carrying on research work than the practical man who is concerned with making his living, and consequently I ask that adequate provision be made both in the estimates and in the staff of the Entomological branch so that those who are making their living by agriculture may receive real assistance through entomological research work, which the individual on the farm has not the time to carry on. As I said before I believe that many of the branches of the Department of Agriculture have been starved in the past for the want of funds, and I make this special

plea particularly on behalf of agriculture and of the producers of Canada. I read in the records of last year that the loss to agriculture from insect pests amounts to no less a sum than $120,000,000. A few days ago I put a question with reference to the methods employed by the Government in dealing with insect pests. I asked, for instance, about chlorine gas. I was informed that chlorine gas was considered too expensive to employ in the destruction of insects. That may be true; but the expense of chlorine gas does not prevent its use in the destruction of human lives. If we entertain a proper conception of the value of the agricultural industry surely we shall not hesitate to employ chlorine gas, or any other remedy, which will enable us to prevent the wholesale losses that result from these insects. Let me point out that the vacant lands held by this Dominion in our western country form veritable breeding grounds for the grasshoppers, cutworms, and many other insects injurious to agriculture, of which I have been complaining. These vacant lands are also breeding grounds for gophers and other pests—menaces to the growth of wheat and other products of the soil, and in view of this fact the Dominion Government must assume the obligation to combat these pests which live upon the Dominion Government's land. We settlers can take care of our cultivated areas and we do so; but when we have taken the necessary precautions in the shape of spreading poisoned bait we see when we come out the next morning hordes of grasshoppers emerging from the vacant Dominion lands, spreading in all directions, and all our work, onerous as it is, has to be done all over again, to say nothing of the additional expense incurred. I earnestly urge the Government to appropriate sufficient money to wage a determined fight against these insects and other pests which commit such depredations in the west.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand that Mr. Duncan Marshall is in the employ of the Department of Agriculture. Which of these positions does this official fill?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He does not belong to the inside service.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Reference has been made to a position which was shortly to become vacant. Am I correct in understanding that this position has been vacated by Dr. Saunders, who was identified with the research and experimental work which resulted in the origination of the variety of wheat known as Marquis wheat?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend refers, I think, to Dr. Charles Saunders. He and his father were closely identified with the experiments which resulted in the discovery to which my hon. friend refers—both of them worked together.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I am informed that this position has become vacant owing to the resignation of Dr. Saunders on acount of ill health?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Is this position being filled; also is any provision being made for Dr. Saunders, or has he made any application for assistance of any kind?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may say in reply to the hon. member for Moosejaw that the position will not be vacant until the first of July next. Dr. Saunders has been on sick leave most of the winter, although until quite recently he has been working an hour or two a day—some of the time at any rate—and against the doctor's orders. We are fearful that we shall not be able to replace him at the same salary. Hon. members will find an item in the Estimates making provision for increases of salary. That I think will overcome the difficulty which was the subject of discussion this afternoon and as to which we apparently got all tangled up. On page 89 of the Estimates a vote of $4,000 is asked for "New positions and promotions." In the event of an increase of salary being needed, after receiving the necessary authority from the Civil Service Commission, we shall thus have an appropriation out of which some provision may be made. We shall have to provide for the vacancy mentioned and possibly one or two others; for example the Plant Pathologist who is now investigating the depredations of rust. All of us from the West know the loss that has been sustained from this cause. I suppose that in that country from fifty to one hundred millions of dollars has been lost from the result of the invasion of rust, and the trouble is becoming more prevalent all the time. Aparently there are only one or two men on this continent who are capable of holding the position referred to. Unfortunately, if I wanted to augment the salary attached to this office by $5,000 I do not know how I should do it—I would not know how to go about it. That is a serious handicap which the members of the Government are

labouring under at the present time, and I do hope that before Parliament prorogues we will be given the necessary authority to meet the existing situation. We have not only the positions of Cerealist and Plant Pathologist to fill, but one or two others; and I am afraid that if the present classification is to prevail the salaries attached to these offices will be found to be wholly inadequate. Hon. members must understand that there is a very large limitation of ministerial authority in connection with these appointments. I am not making any complaint, we are working under the system as best we can; but the point is that when responsibility rests—as it must rest—upon a minister, he should be given the necessary authority to meet such a peculiar situation.

I do not think I answered my hon. friend's query as to how we are dealing with Dr. Saunders. We are making provision for his going on the retiring list under the provisions of the Calder Act. This act, however, expires on the first of July next and unless we provide for an extension it will not be very long available for our purposes. I do not know whether any further provision will be made for Dr. Saunders than the present law permits. I do not hesitate to say that he has been a very greatly underpaid man during the last number of years. That, perhaps, is due to the fault of nobody in particular. It so happened that when the war broke out he happened to be at the top of what is called his salary range. I do not know whether my hon. friends are familiar with that term but they probably understand what it means. In the case of a position which has been classified there is a certain minimum and a certain maximum fixed, and the stages between are called steps. Dr. Saunders happened to be at the top of his class when the fiat went forth that there should not be any more increases in salary, and therefore got no further remuneration except the bonus which he enjoyed in common with all others. I hope that some method may be worked out during the present session whereby this injustice will be rectified, and I feel confident of receiving the assistance of my hon. friend from Moosejaw in arriving at a right conclusion.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it true that another Professor Saunders—in this case in Nova Scotia—has resigned from the Department of Agriculture? The official to whom I refer has been engaged in demonstrating the efficacy of poisons for the potato bugs and other insects.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that what my hon. friend states is the case. The officer was an entomologist.

Mr. CALDWELL: Why did he resign?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have understood he resigned because of the inadequacy of his salary. I feel that Professor Saunder's resignation is a distinct loss to the Dominion, especially to the eastern section of Canada where we grow large quantities of potatoes and encounter serious difficulties with varieties of insects that destroy the crop, to say nothing of rust and other plant diseases which affect potatoes. I repeat that it is a distinct loss to the potato growers of eastern Canada that we should lose the services of Professor Saunders.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend's remarks further illustrate the difficulty to which I was referring. I am informed that Professor Saunders resigned because he received a better offer from elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL: From the United States?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, these offers invariably come from the United States. We experience very active competition from that source in regard to qualified scientists. Under the provision as to salary we were not able to meet the competition and we had to let him go.

Mr. CALDWELL: What salary was he getting?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know. That comes under the outside staff. We have not that information here.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does your plant pathologist come under this head?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, he is under civil government, but we have plant pathologists who will come under the vote for outside staff in connection with the different farms, the information regarding which will be given while we are considering the general estimates of the department. I understand that we have lost pathologists there also for the reasons that I have indicated. We will go into that more extensively when we have the general estimates up.

Mr. CALDWELL: I hope so.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): What are the duties of the chief car inspector?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This gentleman's duties are to inspect the fumigation and cleansing of the stock cars under the provisions of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. He has charge of the inspectors, who look after fumigation and general cleansing of the stock cars.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Have you inspectors all over the country?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, located at strategic points all over Canada.

Mr. GOULD: We have provision made for the Dominion Apiarist, who is an adviser in the keeping of bees. It is not my intention to object to this item, but I wanted to draw the attention of the minister to a circumstance which exists in my own district, the Moose mountain country. Several farmers in that part of the country, owing to the shelter provided by the Moose mountains, attempted to go into the business of keeping bees, and with more or less success. These men have all communicated with me, and asked what assistance might be given them in the way of advice, or what advice the department had to give them, which would be applicable to their particular district. They feel that they should not do all the pioneer work, and I would suggest that perhaps this expenditure might be increased to help out conditions existing in the West. The hon. gentleman is well acquainted with the fact that it is difficult for the people in the West to raise bees. We have small fruits and none of the larger fruits, and the production of honey in that western country would be a wonderful thing, particularly as a weapon to defend ourselves against the encroachments of our British Columbia friends who want to charge us 90 cents extra duty on apples. I think these men who have done much of this bee-keeping work around that country should get a little assistance in the way of advice at least from the department based on information they have received from experiments carried on in a community where conditions are the same as exist in the West. I would ask the minister if any provision is to be made to give advice to farmers as to how it is best to keep bees so that they may produce honey for home consumption.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is exactly the object of his appointment. The apiarist is assistant to the Dominion Apiarist. The Dominion Apiarist has charge of the bee work of twenty-two experimental farms, and his assistant is at liberty to travel through the length and breadth of the land for the purposes mentioned by my hon. friend. This is a work which is neglected. The little tiny bee looks small to the farmer, but the time has come when we must look into small things in connection with agriculture, if we are going to make the best of everything that we can avail ourselves of.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the duty of the fertilizer inspector? This is a new appointment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The principal work is to take charge of the experiments in connection with the application of the fertilizers, so that he may be able to report back to the people just what the results are from the use of the fertilizers. I expect to bring down a consolidation of the present Fertilizer Act, with extensive amendments this year. It is for the purpose of superintendence, and, in addition to that, the carrying out of the act, to see that the fertilizers are of a particular strength in certain important constituent parts. Perhaps that would be the duty of the chemist. This appointment is principally for the purpose of conducting experiments with fertilizers. The officer will first analyze the soil to see what it is deficient in, then apply the fertilizer and report back to those interested.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am as much interested in fertilizer—because we use it in growing potatoes—as my hon. friends from the West are in wheat. Potato-growing is the chief industry in New Brunswick. I do not see how you can expect to get an inspector for $1,900. The chief canning inspector gets a salary of $2,660. It looks to me as though the fertilizer expert would command a larger salary than the canning inspector. I am as much in favour of economy as anybody in Canada, because nobody realizes the necessity more than I do, but I think it is false economy to try to employ a specialist at the price of a common day labourer, because you will not get him at that price.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think you are quite right in that respect. We find it pretty difficult to keep up with our work just now, and with reference to the item I read a few moments ago "New positions and promotions," we expect to promote one of the officials, and put him into a higher grade. He will begin at the bottom salary, and get automatic increases for two or three years, whatever the various steps may be, and this $4,000 will take care of that. I do not know exactly why it was put in at such a low rate. It is a

new position entirely, and the salary range has not been fixed, we just simply put it in at that figure until such time as we could put it through the Civil Service Commission, with the salary raised and all that sort of thing. It is rather complex and difficult to understand. I have been trying to grasp it for the last three months and I am in my A B C's yet, but I think I understand a little more about it than I did when I began. It is one of the most complicated pieces of machinery I ever saw.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not finding fault with the salary. I do not think you will be able to get a competent man for that salary.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: And I think my friends from the West hardly realize the importance of it to us in the East. We use a ton of fertilizer to the acre to produce a crop of potatoes, we pay as high as $100 a ton for the fertilizer, and it sometimes proves very unsatisfactory. I think you will understand the necessity of having a good man as a fertilizer expert. I know a hundred farmers in one locality absolutely refused to pay for the fertilizer two years ago, because it not only did not produce a crop, but it destroyed the soil. They were to pay $100 a ton for it, and they used a ton an acre. Some of the men ploughed it in, and sowed grain in the soil. Others left a few potato plants in the ground and did not get any results. The fertilizer company entered action against one man as a test case to collect the price of the fertilizer and seventy odd farmers combined to fight the case, and put up the money. Yet the fertilizer company has not brought the case to trial, although it is two years old. A sum amounting to $70,000 is involved in the matter between the farmers and the fertilizer company. I hope when the ministers new fertilizer bill comes down, it will cover the case more fully than the old act did. Last year I brought up an amendment to the Fertilizer Act, in an endeavour to remedy this condition. It received its first and second readings; it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture by the then Prime Minister; it was unanimously endorsed by that committee; but notwithstanding that fact and the fact that the committee reported it back to the House at least a month before Parliament prorogued, the government failed to bring my bill up for third reading. I do not know whether the reason was because the representatives of the fertilizer company, who came and fought the bill before the Agriculture Committee, stayed around a week longer lobbying in the House. I noticed that the next day after the Agriculture Committee had reported the bill back, they were going around with long faces. I think the barber must have charged them half a dollar to shave them that morning, their faces were so long. Their faces shortened gradually during that week, and they finally went away with broad smiles. My bill was not brought up for third reading, which is merely a matter of form and takes a very short time in the House, and accordingly it lapsed. When the ministers new fertilizer bill comes down, I hope it will cover the subject very fully. I also hope he will be able to get an expert, through whom the farmers will be able to get some redress in a case like that I have spoken of.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will promise my hon. friend that the Agriculture Committee will have full opportunity to deal with this bill when it comes down, because it is my intention to refer the bill directly to the committee. I am disposed to think this salary will not get the party desired. I had an explanation from Dr. Grisdale before he was waylaid in Ottawa the other night and was so maltreated that he was not able to get around for some time. There was some special reason why he thought at that time he could get a man for the salary; but inasmuch as there is an appropriation to provide for a probable increase, I think we shall be able to meet the situation. We do not want any third-rate man; there is no place in the department or anywhere else for poor men. If you are going to get a good man and if you wish to retain him, you must pay a good salary I forget why this salary was put at $1,920 but there is some provision for the higher rate, if we get the consent of the Civil Service Commission, and I think we shall.

Mr. MILLAR: Perhaps it might be appropriate just now to go back to the first part of the session when we had a number of speeches in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Many congratulations were offered. I am going to congratulate the leader of this Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) on securing such a man as the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). Perhaps

it is appropriate that I should do so because we lived within a few miles of each other over thirty years ago, and I have known him ever since. I think I may say that, amongst the men that were available at that time to fill this position, I know of no man who commands the respect and confidence of the people of Saskatchewan amongst all classes, not only Liberals, but Progressives and Conservatives, to the same degree as the present Minister of Agriculture.

I was going to ask a simple question. I was quite interested in the remarks about rust. I thought it was significant that the minister connected his remarks about filling the position of plant pathologist and the salary required to get the proper man, with the fact that there were only two or three on the continent who could successfully cope with the question of rust. From the minister's knowledge, what chance does he think there is of successfully coping with the rust question? The losses are enormous, and I was rather of the opinion that, so far, there was no one who could successfully cope with this great evil. I thought, perhaps, from the minister's remarks to-night he had some inkling that they were making some headway and had some chance of finding a remedy.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before answering my hon. friend's question, I should like to express my appreciation of his very kind remarks with respect to myself. I can remember the time, not so long ago, when my hon. friend was the first secretary of the Territorial Grain Growers' Association, including Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I was the president for the first five years of its existence. I can appreciate my hon. friend's very kind remarks in connection with our relations in those days. I do not exactly know how it has come about that this aisle is between us at the present time, but we shall look forward to the time when, perhaps, the distance between us will be lessened.

Mr. MILLAR: The minister is on the wrong side.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Referring more particularly to the question of rust investigations, I may say that progress has been somewhat slow. I can recall now, over fifty years ago, my first experience of rust in Ontario, more particularly with respect to winter wheat. It was looked upon as a very mysterious visitation; it was thought to be associated with climatic conditions. Certain days were then spoken of as "rusty" days. Intermittent blinks of sunshine and rain, calm, warm, murky nights and mornings, we knew, were conducive to the development of this parasitic spore. Of later years we came to the conclusion that we knew very little about it, and now our research men are investigating in all directions to find some remedy for it. They seem to think the remedy is along the line of plant resistance, of breeding a wheat plant of sufficient resistance to fight off the attack itself. Just as Dr. Saunders, by plant breeding, discovered a wheat known as "Marquis," somewhat similar to, but very much earlier than the old "Red Fife," so it is thought there may be discovered a wheat plant that will be able to resist the ravages of this rust fungus. I saw in the local papers the other day some American research workers had discovered a smut-resisting wheat, and I am sure some of my hon. friends must have noticed it. Smut has sometimes been referred to as a twin brother or sister of rust, although there is no relation between the two, but it is one of our enemies in the West more particularly. It is thought, if these researches are taken up exhaustively, we shall be able to discover a rust-resisting wheat and other rust-resisting cereal plants. Just the same as animals are resistant to disease, as has been well established, so plants are also resistant, some more so than others, to diseases of this nature. I may say to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, that the progress in that direction has not been very rapid. We have made the discovery, that in the West these invasions usually start down about the Gulf of Mexico in the spring of the year. In another two or three weeks, you will have the wheat planted; in fact, it will be green there now. If they have a severe attack of rust down in Oklahoma and around the gulf, about the beginning or middle of May, and later on in Kansas, it is almost certain that western Canada will have an attack sooner or later. Sometimes, it occurs so late in the season that it does not do very much harm. If it starts sufficiently early down in the south, it has to travel, and travel against the prevailing winds; it comes up through the Dakotas and Minnesota, into part of Saskatchewan, but mainly into Alberta. By the time it gets that far west or northwest the grain is ripe and safe from its ravages. How it travelled had always been a mystery, but experiments made with balloons showed that at an altitude of three or four miles the rust spores travel

in the cross currents going in an opposite direction to the currents at a lower level. Those spores have been found fertile even at that altitude. That will explain in a measure how rust travels so rapidly in a northwesterly direction against the prevailing wind. We know that it does travel, and that it is more or less epidemic. Once it gets started it develops very fast even though the climatic conditions may not be very favourable to it: but if the climatic conditions in the south are favourable, it gets to the northern latitude before the harvest is over. Experiments so far have not led to any particular conclusions; we are feeling our way and are getting sufficient foundation material to know in what direction to act, but it will take some years to reach this stage. Up until quite recently we knew very little about this pest. This much, however, has been established, that the barberry bush is the intermediary or host-plant that makes it possible for this fungus growth to develop. Without the barberry it is questionable if it could find another host-plant to serve its purpose. Therefore, wherever we find the barberry bush we would be well advised to look upon it as a noxious weed and destroy it. As a matter of fact some of the western provinces are now treating the barberry bush as a noxious weed.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the Department of Agriculture carrying on any work with the object of combating the ravages of the spruce bud moth of eastern Canada? All over the maritime provinces and Quebec the situation is becoming very serious.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am almost ashamed to admit that the only way in which we are taking care of that extensive work is by the addition of this one lone entomologist we spoke of a moment ago. That is one of the many requirements that we have to attend to; there is no question about that. When my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Fielding) gets his revenues in a more buoyant condition I will apply to him and may get an appropriation for a good many more entomologists. The ravages of this spruce bud worm are tremendous, and are measured not in tens of millions of dollars but in hundreds of millions. I was given the information by a gentleman recently, but the figures are so alarming that I hesitate to quote them. This matter comes under the Department of the Interior, but there is a certain amount of interchange of work, and on request from that department we do a certain amount of scouting for the purpose of discovering where the invasions of this pest are most threatening so the lumbermen may cut the timber before it is quite destroyed. We are not doing much, but we have to cut our coat according to the cloth. I do not think that is a good policy in this case, and I would certainly like to get more cloth somehow or other. The next war, it is said, must be against insect life. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) I do not think is unduly alarmed at all, for he comes from a district which by dear experience knows the ravages made by insect pests.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are the provinces taking up this work themselves?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the Department of Agriculture co-operating with them?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. minister speaks of the loss in dollars, but it cannot be computed in dollars at all. I think we hardly realize what it means to eastern Canada if the spruce bud moth continues its ravages. Unless it can be checked there will be no pulp to make paper and no lumber to build houses. The spruce forests of eastern Canada are different from those of the West, where I have also spent a considerable time. The spruce is a perpetual growth, the trees varying from the size of one's arm up to the largest sizes, all being intermingled, and as the large trees are cut the young growth develop and give a crop of lumber every ten years upon the same ground. But in New Bruswick—and I know that province best—it is estimated that 50 per cent of the standing spruce, both large and small, has been killed already by the spruce bud moth, which means that for generations to come this land will be barren, it being generally unfit for agriculture, and simply a lumber preserve. Our spruce forests are what the province of New Brunswick derives its revenue from almost absolutely, and I think the Dominion Government will be well advised to take some steps to explore the possibility of combating this menace. It looks to me to be a big problem. I have seen the air full of these moths fluttering around the tops of our spruce trees, and as a result of their ravages you will notice the buds turn red as if they had been scorched, and the tree dies in one or two years. It is not merely a matter of dollars and cents; the preservation of the future supply of our

lumber for building, for pulp and paper, and for other uses is involved.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The maritime provinces and Quebec are taking steps to preserve their forests, and a fairly extensive reforestation plan is being carried out in Quebec now. This is such an interesting subject that I may be excused, Mr. Chairman, if I refer to the Main Estimates —and this will also relieve the anxiety of my hon. friend from Assiniboia—where it will be found that provision is made for dealing with other insect pests. At page 22 we have an appropriation for the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect Pests Act. In the present temper of the country I might be subject to some criticism if this vote was not for such an urgent purpose, as it will be noted that last year the vote was $190,000, as against $235,000 this year, or an increase of $45,000. But that will be found rather small, too, when we come to apply it to the enormous task we are discussing, the fight against these new insect pests, because, Mr. Chairman, the last four or five years have been so dry not only in the West but also in the East, that a lot of new insect enemies have been developed that we never heard of before. In other words, if you change the climate you change the insect pests. The result is we have to meet the situation with a new vote for that branch which will come up later on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, if the pleasant exchange of compliments between the minister and the governmental supporters on this side is finished—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —I would suggest that it is a good time to adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carry the Estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to assist my friends as much as possible, but there are several members very much interested in this item who did not think it would come up so soon, and I would therefore ask that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. FIELDING: Is the item to carry or to stand?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let it stand.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.12.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Monday, April 3, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S BEREAVEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Before resuming my duties in this Chair, I feel bound to express my deep appreciation of, and thanks for, the kind sympathy which you have so generously extended to me in my recent bereavement.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Canadian delegate to the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, held at Washington, November 12, 1921, to February 6, 1922, including the treaties and resolutions.

I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding:

That 2,000 copies in English and 1,000 in French of the report of the Canadian delegate to the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, held at Washington, November 12, 1921, to February 6, 1922, including treaties and resolutions, laid upon the Table of the House on the 3rd of April, 1922, be printed forthwith; and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS COMMITTEE

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved:

That the name of Mr. Pelletier be substituted for that of Mr. Savard on the Special Committee on Pensions, Soldiers' Insurance, and Civil Re-Establishment.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. J. F. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain) moved:

That the name of Mr. Shaw be substituted for that of Mr. Hudson on the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the leader of the Government to an article appearing in the press this morning to the effect that work on the Esquimalt dry dock has been ordered stopped. In that connection I would like to read a wire from

the Associated Boards of Trade of British Columbia, dated Victoria, March 31. It reads

Whereas it has been brought to our notice that the Federal Government has ordered the suspension of work on the building of the Government dry dock at Esquimalt; also we understand that the work on the floating dry dock at the Wallace shipyards, North Vancouver, has been discontinued by order of the Government; and exceedingly regretting that the Government has seen fit to stop both of these important works especially seeing that at Esquimalt they have already expended approximately one and one half millions of dollars; therefore be it resolved that this meeting of the Associated Boards of Trade of British Columbia in session at Victoria request the Government to immediately reconsider their decision in order that these important and necessary works for the development of the ports of Victoria and Vancouver be proceeded with as rapidly as possible.

This telegram clearly indicates that the matter is one of great importance not only to the ports mentioned, but also to the great shipping interests of the Pacific coast. I should be very glad indeed, therefore, to receive from the leader of the Government some statement as to what the Government intends to do in this connection.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I saw in this morning's paper the despatch to which my hon. friend has referred. I also noticed a communication which was reported to be a telegram from myself to the secretary of some organization in Victoria with regard to this matter. I should like to make it plain that I have not sent any communications at all; possibly the message referred to was sent by one of my colleagues and the press has got the Kings mixed. But the substance of this telegram attributed to me, indicated that the matter was receiving the attention of the Government. We have thought it advisable to have a report on the situation as it affects the dry docks of Victoria and Vancouver before proceeding further with the work. The matter is under consideration.

NOVA SCOTIA MINERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to put a question to the Government with regard to the positon of the present or apprehended strike in Nova Scotia. In this morning's press there is an announcement which purports to come from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). The substance of it is in five or six lines, which I will read:

I have not reconstituted the Gillen Board, and I shall not do so unless the "strike on the job" policy is abandoned and repudiated. If that policy is repudiated I shall be very glad to do anything in my power to bring about a settlement of the trouble.

Contrast that with the statement of the Government as embodied in the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), which may be compressed also into a very few words. After suggesting that the Gillen Board should be reconstituted, and being asked by myself whether that intention on the part of the Government was to be carried out wholly irrespective of the order issued by Mr. McLachlan or conditional on that order being revoked, he said:

I made no condition about Mr. McLachlan at all, in fact I had not given that phase of the question much thought, but I think if we have legal power—and the Minister of Labour holds that we have—to revive the commission—I do not like the term "revive"; I think the commission is still alive—they should be asked to resume the inquiry, go to Cape Breton and acquaint themselves sympathetically with conditions on the ground. I have every hope that if that is done you will have a satisfactory conclusion of the difficulty.

That attitude I think was pretty generally accepted by the House as meaning that action on the part of the Department of Labour was not to abide the day of repentance on the part of McLachlan. May I ask, does the statement purporting to come from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) or the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) of Thursday last represent the position of the Government to-day, or does neither?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With regard to my right hon. friend's first query respecting the statement of my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), I understand that statement has reference to a telegram the minister received from Mr. Baxter, the president of the miners, asking whether the board would be reconvened under certain conditions, and the reply of the minister had reference to the request as he received it from Mr. Baxter.

The position which the Government has taken was exactly as stated the other evening. The Government is quite prepared to reconvene the board, and the Minister of Labour has already in the last couple of days been in communication with Mr. Gillen the president of the board, obtaining his consent to act on the board the minute it is reconvened. The Government had expected to receive an intimation from either

one of the interested parties or from one of the members of the board asking for its reconvening. We thought that that request would be forthcoming. If it is much longer delayed, the Government will proceed with the establishment of the board without waiting for the request, but we thought it might facilitate the working of the board later on if one of the parties was sufficiently interested to request that it be reconvened.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Anyway, I understand that the reconvening of the board is wholly irrespective of the repudiation of Mr. McLachlan's stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We think the reconvening of the board should in the public interest be unconditionally.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unconditionally?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, certainly.

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) the House proceeded to Government orders, and went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved:

Resolved, That a sum not exceeding $79,109,751.00 being one-fourth of the amount of each of the several items not yet voted as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1923, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of Parliament, be granted to His Majesty for the year ending March 31, 1923.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I have had the opportunity since this matter was last discussed of further considering the plight in which we find ourselves and of what ought to be done in the circumstances, and I am confirmed in my opinion previously expressed, that the practice in the past was the only practice which could have been adopted, and that the change that was foreshadowed by last year's opposition was not seriously proposed—it was merely advanced for the purpose of delaying, obstructing and embarrassing the government. Under those circumstances, I have no desire to follow such a course of action. I think, however, we ought to follow as nearly as possible the practice in the past, which was to vote simply one-sixth, and not one-fourth, as this resolution proposes. The only reason for taking an interim vote in advance of the consideration of the Estimates in detail is that of necessity. The Estimates ought to be considered as individual estimates without any doubt, and the usual conditions under which an interim supply vote is granted—I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will agree with me—are: First, that the Opposition are not in the slightest degree prejudiced in considering the Estimates or in objecting to any individual item; and, second—with which condition also I think the Minister of Finance will agree, that this interim supply cannot be made use of for the purpose of undertaking any new work which has not yet been passed upon by the House.

Now, as to the amount. The only excuse for a vote of this kind is necessity. The usual vote has been one-sixth. That will carry the Government down to the 15th of June, and between now and the 15th of June all these Estimates ought to have been properly and regularly considered in detail, and I have no doubt they will have been. Therefore, I am perfectly willing to consent so far as I am concerned and so far as this Opposition is concerned to the usual interim vote of one-sixth.

Mr. FIELDING: The mental processes by which my hon. friend has reached his conclusion do not disturb me very much. I am more interested in getting the vote through. I regret my hon. friend did not mention sooner that he preferred one-sixth, because at the first stage of the discussion I stated that, while it might be a convenience to have one-fourth voted, if he preferred one-sixth I would be happy to change the motion accordingly, but if we are to change the motion now, it will have to be postponed so that new calculations can be made. We will have to adjourn the committee and have the clerks make the new calculation.

As to the conditions laid down I quite agree with my hon. friend that no action of this kind prejudices the right of the Opposition or of any member of this House to the fullest and freest discussion of every item in the Estimates. As to the second point mentioned, that this interim supply cannot be made applicable to works not yet authorized, of course, at the most, it could only be applied to things expressed in the Estimates; anything not authorized and passed by the House of Commons cannot be undertaken. However, I do not anticipate any difficulty in that direction. The main purpose of the vote is to meet the requirements of the Civil Service. If on reflection my hon. friend would prefer to make it

one-sixth, I have no objection, although it is taking two bites of a cherry—this House will be in session for several months, under the best conditions. But I have no objection to making it one-sixth. It will delay the proceedings a little while, that is all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very sorry this misunderstanding has occurred. I had intended to make myself clear on the previous occasion, that I would consent to one-sixth. So far as making the change in the figure is concerned, the calculation could be made in a few moments by the clerk. It is merely a matter of dividing the vote by six instead of by four. Or, the figure could be inserted afterwards, and the motion read simply one-sixth without stating the figure.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend and I will agree that we will make the motion one-sixth, and leave the clerks to work it out. I move now to amend the motion by making it one-sixth instead of one-fourth, and the clerks will fill in the precise amount at a later stage. That will also be necessary with regard to the bill which I shall have occasion to move in a few moments.

I do not know whether there has been any collusion between my hon. friend and the clerks at the table, but I find they have already the motion prepared for one-sixth, with the amount filled in accordingly. The figure will be $53,901,669.17.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time, and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1923, the sum of $53,901,669.17 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 26, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1923.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House do now revert to the Orders of the Day.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 20, respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—Mr. Charters.

Bill No. 21, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 22, respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill No. 23, respecting Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 24, the Quebec Railway Iight and Power Company.—Mr. Mitchell.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

COST OF FLAGS

Mr. DUFF:

What was the total cost for the year 1921, of all flags used on every public building in all parts of Canada?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Health—William Head Quarantine Station, $24.59; Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, $25.50; St. John Quarantine Station, $12; Marine Hospital, Lunenburg, N.S., $5.34; total, $67.43. Department of Militia and Defence—The cost of flags issued during 1921 was $2,027.30. Department of Public Works—The cost of flags issued during 1921 was $3,660.49.

MISS NORA GRAHAM

Mr. HANSON:

1. Is Miss Nora Graham, of Windsor, Hants county, Nova Scotia, employed at the House of Commons or by any department of the Civil Service at Ottawa?
2. If so, in what capacity and by whom was she recommended?
3. What salary does she receive and by whom is it paid?
4. Has she passed a Civil Service examination and the qualifications required by the Civil Service Commission for a government position?
5. If so, when and for what position?
6. Was she in receipt of pay from the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment or any other department of the Federal Government previous to March 1, 1922?
7. If so, where and in what capacity?
8. Was free transportation furnished to her from Nova Scotia to Montreal or Ottawa by the Department of Railways and Canals or the management of the Canadian National Railways, or by any one in a public capacity?

9. If so, by whom, at whose request and upon what grounds?
10. Is her appointment temporary or permanent?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes, on the members' stenographers staff of the House of Commons.
2. As a stenographer, and was recommended by Mr. L. H. Martell, M.P.
3. Four dollars per day, which is paid by the House of Commons.
4. No record.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. No record.
7. Answered by No. 6.
8. No.
9. Answered by No. 8.
10. Temporary.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION—TUGS

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. How many tug-boats were used in the Montreal harbour, under the control of the Board of Harbour Commissioners from 1917 until the closing of navigation in 1921, and what were the names of the said boats?
2. What coal supply was carried by each of the said boats?
3. What quantity of coal was used by each of these boats?
4. What officers were in charge of these tugs during the above-mentioned period?
5. Who was in charge of the coal supplied to the said boats?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The Montreal Harbour Commission has furnished the following information:

Questions 1, 2, 3:

NAMES OF TUGS—COAL SUPPLY AND COAL USED

Number of Tugs used during year, names mentioned below:—		1917 9	1918 9	1919 8	1920 3	1921 2
Name of Tug	Coal Supply Carried	Quantity of Coal used				
		1917	1918	1919	1920	1921
	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons	Tons
Tug "Sir Hugh Allan"	56	1,004	1,424	965	1,112	1,329
Tug "John Young"	30	715	689	765	Not in co	mmission.
Tug "Alphonse Racine"	25	226	476	Sold in 1919		
Tug "Robert Mackay"	25	872	840	759	836	972
Tug "Aberdeen"	25	992	539	848	570	9*
Tug "St. Peter"	8	681	654	612	On ways	98†
Tug "Beaver"	7	352	136	315	Not in co	mmission.
Tug "Passepartout"	2½	76	72	97	"	"
Tug "David Seath"	25	613	610	583	"	"
Total Tons each year		5,461	5,440	4,944	2,518	2,408

*Heating in Spring. †Temporary Service.

Question 4:

STATEMENT SHOWING NAMES OF OFFICERS IN CHARGE OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS TUGS, DURING SEASON OF NAVIGATION 1917 TO 1921 INCLUSIVE

Name of Tug	Year Capacity	Day Shift	Name of Officers Night Shift	Changes during Season
"Sir Hugh Allan"	1917 Captain	F. X. Laviolette		
	1st Eng	L. Crouteau		
	2nd "	F. Mailhot		
	1918 Captain	F. X. Laviolette		
	1st Eng	L. Croteau		
	2nd "	F. Mailhot		2nd Eng. C. Jacques.
	1919 Captain	F. X. Laviolette		
	1st Eng	L. Croteau		
	2nd "	C. Jacques		
	1920 Captain	F. X. Laviolette		
	1st Eng	L. Croteau		
	2nd "	C. Jacques		
	1921 Captain	F. X. Laviolette		
	1st Eng	L. Croteau		
	2nd "	C. Jacques		

STATEMENT SHOWING NAMES OF OFFICERS IN CHARGE OF HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS TUGS, DURING SEASON OF NAVIGATION 1917 TO 1921 INCLUSIVE—*Concluded*

Name of Tug	Year Capacity	Day Shift	Name of Officers Night Shift	Changes during Season
"John Young"	1917 Captain	J. Lacouture	J. Valois	
	Engr	H. Matte	R. Cossetti	
	1918 Captain	J. Lacouture	J. Forcier	
	Engr	H. Matte	R. Cosetti	
	1919 Captain	J. Lacouture		
	Engr	H. Matte		
"Alphonse Racine"	1917 Captain	P. Chatard		
	Engr	J. McArthur		
	1918 Captain	P. Chatard		
	Engr	J. McArthur		
"Robert Mackay"	1917 Captain	E. Labelle		
	Engr	L. Toupin		
	1918 Captain	E. Labelle		
	Engr	L. Toupin		Engr. W. S. Parker.
	1919 Captain	E. Labelle		
	Engr	W. Parker		
	1920 Captain	E. Labelle	N. Chevrier	Captain P. Chatard.
	Engr	J. B. Marchand	A. Perron	Engr. W. Parker.
	1921 Captain	J. Lacouture	N. Chevrier	
	Engr	W. Parker	A. Perron	
"Aberdeen"	1917 Captain	P. Croteau		
	Engr	J. B. Marchand		
	1918 Captain	P. Croteau	J. Forcier	
	Engr	J. B. Marchand	R. Cossetti	
	1919 Captain	P. Chatard	J. Forcier	Captain P. Croteau..
	Engr	J. B. Marchand	R. Cossetti	
	1920 Captain	J. Lacouture		
	Engr	P. Lange		
"St. Peter"	1917 Captain	N. Chevrier	Z. Perrault	
	Engr	A. Perron	W. Cretien	
	1918 Captain	N. Chevrier	Z. Perreault	
	Engr	A. Perron	A. Clement	
	1919 Captain	N. Chevrier	Z. Perreault	
	Engr	A. Perron	A. Clement	
"Beaver"	1917 Captain	H. Cadieux		
	Engr	T. Mongrain		Captain P. McLean.
	1918 Captain	H. Cadieux		
	Engr	T. Mongrain		
	1919 Captain	H. Cadieux		
	Engr	H. Vezina		
"Passepartout"	1917 Captain	M. Cournoyer		
	Engr	A. Seguin		
	1918 Captain	M. Cournoyer		
	Engr	A. Seguin		Engr. A. Carpentier.
	1919 Captain	P. McLean		Captain M. Cournoyer.
	Engr	J. B. Hebert		
"David Seath"	1917 Captain	J. Forcier	J. Valois	
	Engr	J. Lamothe	R. Cossetti	
	1918 Captain	P. Chatard		Captain H. Cadieux.
	Engr	J. McArthur		Engr. F. Mathieu.
	1919 Captain	M. Cournoyer		Captain P. Chatard.
	Engr	P. Lange		

5. Captain J. Smith, in charge of coal barge, under direction of Mr. George Gendron, mechanical superintendent.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Who purchased the paint used by the Montreal Harbour Commission during the years 1917 to 1921 inclusive?
2. What are the names of the persons who received the said paint?
3. What are the names of the foremen who distributed this material?
4. From whom was the said paint purchased and what was the total amount paid for same?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

The Montreal Harbour Commission has furnished the following information:—

1. Purchasing agent, L. H. A. Archambault, under approval of Board of Harbour Commissioners.

2.

STATEMENT No. 1—A.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL

Names of the persons who received the paint purchased and used by the Harbour Commissioners during the years 1917 to 1921 inclusive

Year	Department	Name of Storekeepers and Assistants	
1917	Machine Shop and Harbour Yard	G. B. Hearle,	General Storekeeper.
	Machine Shop	W. D. Aird,	Assistant Storeman.
	Harbour Yard	R. Meunier,	" "
	"	F. Scott,	" "
	Traffic Dept	A. Gagnon,	" "
	Elevators and Sheds	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.
	" "	W. C. Clifton,	Assistant Storeman.
	Electrical Dept	T. Bourgoyne,	" "
1918	Machine Shop and Harbour Yard	G. B. Hearle,	General Storekeeper.
	Machine Shop	W. D. Aird,	Assistant Storeman.
	Harbour Yard	A. Cassavant,	" "
	"	F. Scott,	" "
	Traffic Department	A. Gagnon,	" "
	Elevators and Sheds	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.
	"	W. C. Clifton,	Assistant Storeman.
	Electrical Dept	T. Bourgoyne,	" "
1919	Machine Shop and Harbour Yard	G. B. Hearle,	General Storekeeper.
	Machine Shop	W. D. Aird,	Assistant Storeman.
	Harbour Yard	A. Cassavant,	" "
	"	F. Scott,	" "
	Traffic Dept	A. Gagnon,	" "
	Elevators and Sheds	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.
	" "	W. C. Clifton,	Assistant Storeman.
	Electrical Dept	T. Bourgoyne,	" "
1920	Machine Shop and Harbour Yard	G. B. Hearle,	General Storekeeper.
	Machine Shop	W. D. Aird,	Assistant Storeman.
	Harbour Yard	A. Cassavant,	" "
	"	F. Scott,	" "
	Traffic Dept	A. Gagnon,	" "
	Elevators and Sheds	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.
	"	W. C. Clifton,	Assistant Storeman.
	Electrical Dept	T. Bourgoyne,	" "
	Warehouse Construction	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.
1921	Machine Shop	G. B. Hearle,	Storekeeper.
	"	P. J. Cullen,	Assistant Storekeeper.
	Harbour Yard and Traffic	J. Emblem,	Storekeeper.
	" " "	F. Scott,	Assistant Storeman.
	Elevators and Sheds	J. L. E. Drapeau,	Storekeeper.
	" "	W. C. Clifton,	Assistant Storeman.
	Electrical Dept	W. D. Aird,	Storekeeper.
	"	T. Bourgoyne,	Assistant Storeman.
	Warehouse Construction	A. Beauregard,	Storekeeper.

The above storekeepers act under direction from Mr. Geo. Smart, Comptroller, who is responsible for safety of all stores.

3. All paints taken into stock by above storekeepers and distributed by them on requisitions authorized by superintendents and foremen.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

4.

STATEMENT No. 2A

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL

Statement showing names of firms from whom Paint was purchased for use by the Harbour Commissioners during the years 1917 to 1921 inclusive and the total amount paid to each firm for same

Year 1917	Where delivered						
	Shop	Yard	Sheds	Elec.Dpt	Traffic	Sundry	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Brandram-Henderson Co	214 60						214 60
Canada Paint Co	1,032 20	155 17	44 25		19 10	15 65	1,266 37
Gravel, Ludger	23 76						23 76
Jamieson & Co., R.C	217 86	109 79			46 75	3 25	377 65
Lemesurier, C			240 00				240 00
McArthur Irwin Co						2 64	2 64
Martin-Senour Co	295 57						295 57
Patterson Mafg. Co					5 64		5 64
Ramsay & Sons, Co., A	518 70	111 48		7 67	148 05	72 70	858 60
Sherwin-Williams Co	1,161 60	56 83	4,406 53		6 65	38 00	5,669 61
Walker Hardware Co., J		9 20	17 80			1 80	28 80
Wall Bros			44 00				44 00
Total value, 1917	$ 3,464,29	$ 442 47	4,752 58	$ 7 67	$ 226 19	$ 134 04	$ 9,027 24

Year 1918	Where Delivered							
	Elev. 2	Shop	Yard	Sheds	Elec.Dpt.	Traffic	Sundry	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Barrett Co						6 50		6 50
Beveridge Paper Co				383 10				383 10
Canada Paint Co		142 96				10 10		153 06
Canuck Supply Co						6 00		6 00
Jamieson & Co., J. W		309 25	36 25			16 50		362 00
Jamieson & Co., R.C		108 96	85 70		10 05	91 35		296 06
McArthur Irwin Co		123 49		38 17				161 66
Martin-Senour Co		157 29	21 00					178 29
Merchants Awning Co							1 75	
Ramsey & Sons Co., A		855 52	123 35		45 43	74 76		1,099 06
Sherwin Williams Co		62 01		7,383 05		11 35		7,456 41
Thompson B. & S. H	1,753 50			1,487 50				3,241 00
Total value 1918	$ 1,753 50	1,759,48	266 30	9,291 82	55 48	216 56	1 75	13,344 89

Year 1919	Where Delivered						
	Shop	Yard	Sheds	Elec. Dpt.	Traffic	Sundry	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Barrett Co					6 50		506
Canada Paint Co	261 31	67 52			15 50		344 33
Brandram-Henderson Co	334 64			75		3 00	338 39
Jamieson & Co., J. W	1,268 14	42 63	464 64				1,775 41
Jamieson & Co., R. C	245 20	105 20		1 45	20 50		372 35
Ramsey & Sons, Co., A	470 13	242 87		71 35	147 65	52 42	984 42
Sharpe Ltd., C. A	111 60						111 60
Sherwin Williams Co	338 14	32 70	892 75		24 70		1,288 29
Thompson B. & S. H					34 50		34 50
Walker Hardware Co., J			672 75				672 75
Wall Bros			24 00			53 40	77 40
	173 40						173 40
Total Value 1919	3,202 56	490 92	2,054 14	73 55	249 35	108 82	6,179 34

Year 1920	Where Delivered							
	W. House	Shop	Yard	Sheds	Elec. Dpt.	Traffic	Sundry	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Barrett Co						4 50		4 50
Brandram-Henderson		99 34						993 4
Buckley Co				3,401 81				3,401 81
Canada Paint Co		236 39	104 20		18 50			359 09
Eclipse Paint Co				280 00				280 00
Jamieson Co., R. C		60 43	137 74		23 30	147 14	60	369 21
Ramsey & Sons Co., A		92 46	192 50	7,373 01	28 40	28 10		7,714 47
Sherwin Williams Co							41 15	41 15
Sterling Products Co				227 50				227 50
Walker Hardware Co., J				5 20				5 20
Webster & Sons	111 15							111 15
Total value 1920	111 15	488 62	434 44	11,287 52	70 20	179 74	41 75	12,613 42

STATEMENT No. 2A—*Concluded.*

Year 1921	Where Delivered							
	W. House	Shop	Yard	Sheds	Elec. Dpt.	Traffic	Sundry	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Barrett Co.			6 71					6 71
Brandram-Henderson	172 74	12 49	4 82	99 94	16 24		2 78	
Canada Paint Co.	1 29	78 14	87 93	30 39	49 97			247 72
Canada Asbestos Co.				30 47				30 47
Dom. Paint Co.	25 75							25 75
Jameison Co., J. W.	27 34	294 33						321 67
Jamieson & Co., R. C.		71 82	183 97	20 60	63 16			339 55
Ramsay & Son, A.		64 52	2 63	2,580 43			12 38	2,659 96
Reed & Co., Geo. W.	7 50			52 90				60 40
Sharpe Ltd., C. A.		139 44	48 56					188 00
Sherwin-Williams	252 21	131 97	129 78	33 15				547 11
Standard Paint Co.					17 77			17 77
Thompson, B. & S. H.	561 55							561 55
Walker Hardware Co., J.				24 50			6 65	31 15
Total value 1921	1,048 38	792 71	464 40	2,872 38	147 14		21 81	5,346 82

RECAPITULATION

Name of Firm	Year					Total value 1917 to 1921
	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Barrett Co.		6 50	6 50	4 50	671	24 21
Brandram-Henderson	214 60		338 39	99 34	309 01	961 34
Berevidge Paper Co.		383 10				383 10
Buckley Co.				3,401 81		3,401 81
Canada Paint Co.	1,266 37	153 06	344 33	359 09	247 72	2,370 57
Can. Asbestos Co.					30 47	30 47
Canuck Supply Co.		6 00				6 00
Dom. Paint Co.					25 75	25 75
Eclipse Paint Co.				280 00		280 00
Gravel, Ludger	23 76					23 76
Jamieson & Co., J. W.		362 00	1,775 41		321 67	2,459 00
Jamieson & Co., R. C.	377 65	296 06	372 35	369 21	339 55	1,754 82
Lemesurier, C.	240 00					240 00
McArthur Irwin Co.	2 64	161 66				164 30
Martin Semour Co.	295 57	178 29				473 86
Merchants Awning Co.		1 75				1 75
Patterson Manfg. Co.	5 64					5 64
Ramsay & Son, A.	858 60	1,099 06	984 42	7,714 47	2,659 96	13,316 51
Reed & Co., Geo. W.					60 40	60 40
Sharpe Ltd., C. A.			111 60		188 00	299 60
Sherwin Williams	5,669 61	7,456 51	1,288 29	41 15	547 11	15,002 57
Standard Paint Co.					17 77	17 77
Sterling Products			34 50	227 50		262 00
Thompson & Co., B. & S. H.		2,341 00	672 75		561 55	4,475 30
Walker Hardware Co., J.	28 80		77 40	5 20	31 15	142 55
Wall Bros.	44 00		173 40			217 40
Webster & Sons				111 15		111 15
Grand Total Value	9,027 24	13,334 89	6,179 34	12,613 42	5,346 82	46,511 71

BRIQUETTING PLANT

Mr. GOULD:

1. What was the initial estimated cost to the Dominion Government for the construction of the Briquetting plant at Bienfait, Saskatchewan?
2. Who made the estimate?
3. Was there any collapse of buildings during the construction?
4. What is the total cost of the plant to the Government to date?
5. Is the plant now closed?
6. If so, why?
7. What salary was paid to the superintendent, Mr. Roche?
8. Was there an explosion in the said plant?
9. If so, when?
10. What was the immediate monetary loss as a result of this explosion?
11. Was the explosion due to neglect on the part of the operators?
12. If not, what was the cause?
13. Was a Government inquiry made into this explosion?
14. When will the product of the said plant be available commercially?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. The total estimated cost was $400,000 of which the Dominion Government was to bear one-half and the Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan one-quarter each.

2. The Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

3. No. (A small concrete roof of one bin did fall but this was replaced by the contractor at his expense).

4. The total cost of the plant to date is $570,871.15 of which sum $210,831.32 was spent on buildings and the balance of $360,039.83 on equipment.

5. Yes, as far as actual operations are concerned.

6. On account of exhaustion of funds voted by the Governments interested.

7. Three hundred dollars ($300) per month.

8. The Board has no record of any explosion of consequence.

9. Answered by No. 8.

10. None.

11. 12. 13. Answered by No. 8.

14. The Lignite Utilization Board hopes, subject to the successful operation of the carbonizers after changes now being made are completed, to have briquettes available commercially in from 6 to 8 months.

NOVA SCOTIA MINERS

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. What steps, if any, are being taken to secure for the Nova Scotia miners a fair day's pay for a fair day's work?

2. In view of the high cost of living, has the Government used its influence with the operators of industrial companies to prevent any curtailment of production?

3. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to prevent the British Empire Steel Corporataion in the minister's own words, from undertaking to dictate Government policy?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. The differences between the coal operators and the coal miners of Nova Scotia were referred to a Board of Conciliation and Investigation established by the Minister of Labour under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and the findings of the board were made public early in February.

2. Advantage is taken of every suitable opportunity to urge on employers of labour the advisability of maintaining production to the largest possible limit, and where there has been a reduction in output, to make the utmost effort to return to normal production.

3. If any action is necessary such action will be taken and information given to the public in due course.

SOREL SHIPYARDS

Mr. HANSON:

1. Have any persons been dismissed from the Sorel shipyards since the 29th day of December, 1921?

2. If so, what are the names of the said persons, and what were the respective causes for dismissal?

3. Have any persons been taken on the staff at the Sorel shipyards since the 29th day of December, 1921?

4. If so, what are the names of the said persons and the reasons for their employment?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. There have been no actual dismissals of employees at the Sorel shipyard since the 29th December, 1921. The services of a number of employees were discontinued temporarily since that date.

2. The names of the persons whose services have been so discontinued are as per list attached.

3. A number of persons have been taken on as employees at the Sorel shipyard since the 29th December, 1921.

4. The names of those who have been so taken on are as per list attached. The reasons for the discontinuance of the services of some and the employment of others are stated by the superintendent of the shipyard as follows:—"Due to the scarcity of work in Sorel and the great number of unemployed persons, and by reason of the fact that the Sorel shipyard could not employ more men than a limited number for the work we had, and also in view of giving relief to the suffering families, every fortnight a certain number of men were suspended and a new gang of men given employment. In order to obtain the relieving result, I took my information from the secretary of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the clergymen of Sorel and St. Joseph de Sorel and the General Hospital of Sorel, who were in a good position of knowing the families in distress."

(The list of names accompanying this answer has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House).

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE—INSURANCE

Mr. MARLER:

1. What amount of insurance is carried on the ships owned by the Canadian Government, known as the Canadian Merchant Marine?

2. When was this insurance placed?

3. What are the names of the companies carrying such insurance and the amount in each?

4. Who were the brokers through whom this insurance was placed?

5. What was the amount of the premiums?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $41,310,720.00.

2. January 1, 1922.

3. Thirty English companies of good repute, and four American companies as under:

Globe & Rutgers Fire Ins. Co.; Franklin Fire Ins. Co., Philadelphia; Springfield Fire & Marine Ins. Co.; Aetna Ins. Co.

4. Willis, Faber & Co. of Canada, Ltd., Montreal.

5. In sterling, £303,096.16.10. In dollars, $144,111.63.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE—OUTSTANDING CLAIMS

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. Are there any claims outstanding against two Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships constructed at Prince Rupert? If so, what is the total amount of said claims?

2. Has the Attorney General of British Columbia, Mr. Manson, requested settlement on behalf of the creditors?

3. If so, is he acting for the Government of the province of British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No claims are outstanding against the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine constructed at Prince Rupert. There are, however, claims by outside creditors outstanding against the Prince Rupert Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, the contractors for the construction of the vessels. The Department of Marine is not definitely advised as to the exact amount of these claims. They are represented as amounting to between $430,000.00 and $450,000.00.

2. The Attorney General of British Columbia has requested settlement on behalf of the community and in the hope that satisfactory arrangements for continuing the enterprise at Prince Rupert might be made possible.

3. No.

FUEL FOR LIGHT BOATS

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What was the cost of the fuel used by the light boats l'Ile Blanche, Princess Shoal and l'Ile Rouge, during the last season of navigation?

2. How many cords of wood were bought for each of the said boats?

3. What price was paid per cord for said wood?

4. When did they commence using coal on the said boats?

5. How many tons of coal were purchased for the said boats, and what price was paid per ton?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. $2,005.

2. 1 cord of kindling wood for Red Island lightship.

3. $10.00.

4. In 1918.

5. 210 tons at $9.50.

[Mr. Graham.]

GRAND TRUNK COAL

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What quantity of coal was imported into Canada during the calendar year 1921, for and on account of the Grand Trunk railway?

2. What was the value of said importations?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 1,823,000 net tons.

2. Cost at the mines, $4,725,000; delivered in Canada, with duty and charges, $11,250,000. Of this total, $963,000 was for duty.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

What method is used by the Government in establishing the amount of bonus to be paid to a civil servant?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

The distribution of the sum granted as a bonus to civil servants is governed by an Order in Council of April 21, 1921, which divides the service into groups and sets forth the amount to be paid to each person.

CANADA-MEXICO TRADE

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the Government in its possession any recent reports of the trade possibilities between Canada and Mexico?

2. Has Canada any Trade Commissioners in Mexico?

3. If so, how many and where are they located?

4. If not, does the Government contemplate the early appointment of experienced Trade Commissioners there?

5. Have any steps been taken to promote trade between Canada and Mexico?

6. Have any steps been taken to inaugurate steamship service from Canada to Mexico, both on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. The Government has this matter under consideration.

5. Yes.

6. This is also under consideration.

MR. ALEX CAMERON

Mr. HALBERT:

1. Was Mr. Alex Cameron, of Beaverton, Ontario, employed on the Trent Valley Canal system?

2. If so, on what date was he first employed, what were his duties and salary?

3. Is he still employed on the said works?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Yes.

2. First employed August 26, 1913, as Foreman, at $4 per day, which wage was reduced to $3.50 per day, August, 1914.

3. No.

MACKENZIE-MANN SUBSIDY

Mr. IRVINE:

What is the date on which the Dominion Government paid the first cash subsidy in connection with the Mackenzie-Mann interests?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The date on which the first cash subsidy was paid to the Canadian Northern Railway by the Dominion Government was September 7, 1900.

Mr. IRVINE:

What was the total amount received by the Mackenzie-Mann interests from the Government up to the time when they surrendered control?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The total amount of cash subsidies paid the Canadian Northern Railway by the Government was $31,870,016.56.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—DEFICITS

Mr. IRVINE:

What is the total amount of deficits paid to date, by the Government, for the operation of the Canadian Government Railways?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Total amount of deficits paid by Government for operation of Canadian Government Railways to December 31, 1921, $46,097,072.56.

LIVE STOCK BRANCH—CALGARY

Mr. IRVINE:

1. What is the cost of the Dominion Livestock Branch office at Calgary, apart from free freight outlays?

2. What is the free freight outlay out of Calgary under the carload lot?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Salaries, office rent, etc., for the fiscal year 1921-22, $6,061.70.

2. From April 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922, the sum of $12,516.80 was paid by the Federal Department of Agriculture in connection with shipments under its free policy out of Calgary.

INCOME TAX, MONTREAL OFFICE

Mr. DEMERS:

How many persons are employed in the income tax office at Montreal, and what are their names?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: The number is 209. If the honourable gentleman will move for a return the names will be promptly brought down.

RIORDON COMPANY TAXES

Mr. HALBERT:

1. Was a note accepted from the Riordon Pulp and Paper Company in payment for income tax?

2. If so, on what date was this note accepted?

3. What was the amount of said note?

4. Has any payment been made on the said note?

5. If so, what amount?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. A note was received from Riordon Company, Limited, on account of income tax.

2. Note was dated 30th April, 1921.

3. The amount of said note was $51,103.09.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

Mr. MICHAUD:

What amount has been received each year from customs and excise collections, during the last fifteen years, in the several ports and sub-ports in the county of Madawaska, New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

CUSTOMS REVENUE FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1906-7 TO 1921-22, INCLUSIVE, FOR THE FOLLOWING PLACES IN THE COUNTY OF MADAWASKA, N.B.

Fiscal Year	Grand Falls	Edmundston	St. Leonards	Green River	Clair	Connors	St. Hilaire
1906-07	521 68	2,303 49	681 27	104 60	13,936 70	.....	.....
1907-08	833 43	5,121 79	1,435 32	612 95	18,850 54	.....	.....
1908-09	6,805 93	16,429 92	1,084 01	320 07	21,519 01	.....	.....
1909-10	3,167 10	29,714 97	793 11	254 03	22,241 07	.....	.....
1910-11	11,561 92	26,288 15	3,979 48	376 78	22,675 43	.....	.....
1911-12	3,004 84	25,206 37	7,120 55	750 20	18,268 50	.....	.....
1912-13	5,080 65	27,607 66	12,972 37	1,891 26	13,465 02	.....	3 76
1913-14	6,908 53	38,974 15	35,455 68	4,628 42	14,948 54	.....	30 92
1914-15	5,937 89	25,841 28	34,301 47	694 67	10,813 03	.....	180 52
1915-16	4,204 97	24,124 72	22,417 74	340 00	5,729 95	4 45	578 38
1916-17	4,075 49	32,426 99	16,523 08	496 87	2,159 37	.....	1,123 51
1917-18	2,790 97	71,990 71	11,388 08	525 40	2,436 81	320 92	168 26
1918-19	3,561 78	88,295 93	3,927 83	225 21	1,157 36	980 67	578 57
1919-20	3,171 59	25,283 19	3,259 75	289 66	1,828 40	3,166 15	101 27
1920-21	1,843 53	57,754 12	3,494 19	415 65	1,139 72	811 53	336 06
1921-22 (11 months)	3,839 84	97,993 48	8,887 67	181 46	6,140 31	1,080 24	276 15

Excise collections are included in the amounts shown for 1921-22, as the Customs Service and Excise Service have been amalgamated since 1st April, 1921.

It is not possible to give the information as requested regarding excise collections prior to April 1, 1921, for the reason that the Inland Revenue records did not show amounts collected for smaller places but included them in the total collections for the division in which the county of Madawaska is situated.

EDMUNDSTON POST OFFICE

Mr. MICHAUD:

How much revenue was received from the Post Office at Edmundston, New Brunswick, during the past fifteen years?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1906	$ 1,677 88
1907	1,340 29
1908	2,192 80
1909	2,287 77
1910	2,393 07
1911	2,370 72
1912	2,475 12
1913	2,689 30
1914	2,638 28
1915	2,702 68
1916	3,578 01
1917	3,871 57
1918	6,007 41
1919	7,483 36
1920	9,273 56
1921	11,389 94
Total	$64,371 76

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

Mr. SPEAKMAN:

1. How many returned soldiers have been established on farms in each province by the Soldier Settlement Board?

2. What number of said settlers, if any, in each province, through failure, have had their land, stock and equipment resold?

3. What loss, if any, has been sustained by the Crown, in each province, in such cases of resale?

4. (a) How many officials and employees are employed by the said Soldier Settlement Board, and (b) what is the total expenditure for salaries and expenses of said Board.

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. As at January 31, 1922:

British Columbia	3,252
Alberta	8,674
Saskatchewan	7,722
Manitoba	4,439
Ontario	1,595
Quebec	415
New Brunswick	583
Nova Scotia	402
Prince Edward Island	334
	27,416

[Mr. Bureau.]

2. As at January 31, 1922:

—	Land, Stock and Equipment Completely Sold	Land Sold—Stock and Equipment Not Sold	Stock and Equipment Sold—Land Not Sold	Neither Land nor Stock and Equipment Sold
British Columbia	127	5	193	60
Alberta	124	5	426	143
Saskatchewan	69	15	184	124
Manitoba	59	6	273	83
Ontario	57	8	76	34
Quebec	49	3	57	13
New Brunswick	35	7	7	21
Nova Scotia	16	4	4	19
Prince Edward Island	31	5	4	6
	567	58	1,224	503
Total	2,352			

3. In 419 cases in which complete returns have been received from district offices the following gains and losses are shown:

	Gain	Loss
British Columbia	$ 7,660 57	.....
Alberta	24,848 07	.....
Saskatchewan	22,585 14	.....
Manitoba	1,047 33	.....
Ontario	5,999 83	.....
Quebec	.....	$9,737 46
New Brunswick	6,514 88	.....
Nova Scotia	2,632 81	.....
Prince Edward Island	10,188 63	.....
	$81,477 26	$9,737 46

Net Gain, $71,739.80.

4. (a) Number of officials and employees as at December 31 in each fiscal year: 1917-18, 2; 1918-19, 216; 1919-20, 1,500; 1920-21, 1,046; 1921-22, 761. Peak of staff, June, 1920, 1,579.

(b) Total expenditures for salaries and expenses:

Salaries—

1917-18	$ 1,720 40
1918-19	102,291 72
1919-20	1,269,459 84
1920-21	1,929,035 97
1921 to Feb. 28, 1922	1,261,548 09

Expenses of Board—

1917-18	$ 1,514 91
1918-19	105,261 22
1919-20	1,303,964 05
1920-21	1,290,646 39
1921 to Feb. 28, 1922	597,826 84

SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. What parcels of land did the Indians of the Kee-See-Koose Indian reserve, in the Province of Saskatchewan, surrender to the Department

of Indian Affairs, in or about the years of 1909 and 1910, and what is the legal description of each of such parcels?

2. What parcels, if any, have since been disposed of by the Department (a) by auction, and (b) otherwise?

3. What is the legal description of each of such parcels so disposed of, name of the purchaser and the amount of the purchase price?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Portions of Tps. 32 and 33, Rge. 32, W. 1st, in the Keeseekoose Indian Reserve, were surrendered for sale on the 15th day of May, 1909.

2. (a) By auction sale held on the 1st of December, 1910, the following parcels were disposed of. The name of the purchaser and the amount of the purchase price are also given.

Description of Land	Purchaser — Tp. 32, Rge. 32, W. 1 M.	Purchase Price
		$ cts.
N.E. ¼ sec. 22	Alloway and Champion	1,123 75
N.W. ¼ sec. 22	J. T. Hewitt	960 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 22	Alloway and Champion	160 00
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 23	" "	1,031 25
Fr. N.W. ¼ Sec. 23	" "	1,125 00
Fr. N.W. ¼ Sec. 24	" "	168 00
N.E. ¼ Sec. 27	Crescent Reality Co	1,240 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 27	" "	960 00
S.E. ¼ Sec. 27	Alexander Wills	960 00
S.W. ¼ Sec. 27	" "	960 00
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 28	Crescent Reality Co	228 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 28	Alexander Wills	228 00
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 33	Alloway and Champion	408 50
N.E. ¼ Sec. 34	" "	1,040 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 34	" "	1,120 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 34	Alexander Wills	846 00
S.W. ¼ Sec. 34	" "	960 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 35	Alloway and Champion	800 00
Tp. 33, Rge. 32, W. 1 M.		
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 1	Alloway and Champion	792 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 1	" "	1,120 00
Fr. S. ½ Sec. 1	" "	582 00
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 2	Crescent Reality Co	1,425 00
Fr. N.W. ¼ Sec. 2	" "	1,415 50
Fr. S.E. 6 Sec. 2	J. T. Hewitt	1,540 50
S.W. ¼ Sec. 2	"	1,520 00
N.E. ¼ Sec. 3	M. F. Steinberg	2,200 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 3	Jno. M. Madison	2,240 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 3	Alloway and Champion	1,335 75
S.W. ¼ Sec. 3	" "	1,422 20
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 4	J. W. Robson	351 50
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 4	"	370 00
Fr. N.E. ¼ Sec. 9	J. R. Dixon	851 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 9	"	740 00
N.E. ¼ Sec. 10	F. L. Schreiner	2,760 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 10	Jno. M. Madison	3,200 00
S.E. ¼ Sec. 10	M. F. Steinberg	2,128 00
S.W. ¼ Sec. 10	Jno. M. Madison	2,640 00
N.E. ¼ Sec. 11	A. B. Allard	1,480 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 11	J. H. Heffernan	1,960 00
S.E. ¼ Sec. 11	S. C. Simms	1,522 50
S.W. ¼ Sec. 11	S. C. Simms	1,920 00
N.E. ¼ Sec. 12	G. L. Jennings	1,760 00
N.W. ¼ Sec. 12	Emma Perry (Mrs. A. B. Perry)	1,896 00
S.E. ¼ Sec. 12	G. L. Jennings	1,960 00
S.W. ¼ Sec. 12	W. H. Rutledge	1,880 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 13	G. L. Jennings	864 50
Fr. S.W. ¼ Sec. 13	Emma Perry (Mrs. A. B. Perry)	779 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 14	C. M. Rear	640 00
Fr. S.W. ¼ Sec. 14	C. M. Rear	870 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 15	J. R. Dixon	1,392 00
Fr. S.W. ¼ Sec. 15	J. R. Dixon	1,462 00
Fr. S.E. ¼ Sec. 16	Ole P. Harstad	405 00

(b) Applications were submitted to the department in June, 1911, to purchase the Fr. S. E. ¼ of Sec. 21, Tp. 32, Rge. 32, W. 1 M., and the Fr. S. E. ¼ of Sec. 33, Tp. 32, Rge. 32. The former was purchased by J. R. Dixon for $54 and the latter by Theo. A. Sparks for $228.

3. Answered by No. 2.

COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. STANSELL:

1. Has the position of Commissioner of Agriculture been filled?

2. If so, by whom, and what is his remuneration?

3. Who was the last commissioner under the Agricultural Instruction Act, what was his remuneration and when did he resign?

4. Who has been doing this work during the years 1920 and 1921?

5. What are the qualifications necessary for the position required under the Civil Service classification list, and how are the qualifications therein designated and described?

6. Was the present appointment made by the Civil Service Commission? If not, how was it made and by what authority?

7. Was the position advertised? If not, why?

8. Is the new appointee a technically trained man, and of what technical institution of agriculture is he a graduate?

9. Was promotion within the department considered when the appointment was made?

10. Were returned soldiers with required technical training and with practical experience given an opportunity to apply for the position?

11. Was the present incumbent a defeated candidate in support of the party of the present Government during the last election?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Mr. W. J. Black. He resigned 29th November, 1918. He was then receiving a salary of $4,000 per annum.

4. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

5. Commissioner of Agricultural Instruction.

Qualifications: Graduate in agriculture from a college of recognized standing; experience as Supervisor of Agricultural Instruction or in work of equivalent character and standard; a high degree of organizing ability; knowledge of pathological methods; familiarity with the agricultural conditions and problems of the Dominion; tact, good address, and ability in public speaking.

6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. Answered by No. 1.

ELEVATOR OVERAGES

Mr. LUCAS:

1. What was the total amount of overages received by the Government from terminal elevators during the year 1921?

2. What was the total value of the same and what became of the proceeds?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. During the crop year 1920-21, the total amount of overages to be delivered to the Government was 98,455 bushels, and 671,078 pounds of mixed grain.

2. $130,524.06. Accounts have been rendered for this amount, but no payments have yet been made.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—INSURANCE

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What is the amount of annual premium payable on the $112,590,338 insurance carried on the property of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, referred to in the answer to question number twenty on March 29, 1922?

2. What is the amount of annual premium payable on the insurance carried on the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $506,656.52.

2. $362,098.65.

BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of beef, fresh, cured, canned and frozen, was imported into Canada, and from what countries during each of the years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the value of the beef so imported during each of the said years?

3. What amount of duty was collected on these imports during each of the said years?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION OF "BEEF, FRESH AND PICKLED, AND CANNED MEATS" SHOWING THE QUANTITY, VALUE AND DUTY COLLECTED, BY COUNTRIES, FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1920 AND 1921, AND 1922 TO DATE.

	1920			1921			1922, to date		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty
		$	$ cts.		$	$ cts.		$	$ cts.
BEEF, FRESH, CHILLED OR FROZEN:—									
Australia							704	34	21 12
New Zealand				91,431	9,417	1,828 62			
United States	1,811,609	230,240	54,348 27	1,541,431	290,125	46,242 93	70,671	19,619	2,120 13
Total	1,811,609	230,340	54,348 27	1,632,862	299,542	48,071 55	71,375	19,653	2,141 25
BEEF, PICKLED, IN BARRELS:									
United Kingdom							400	50	6 00
Newfoundland	920	206	18 40	1,230	222	24 60	420	53	8 40
Belgium				99	15	1 98			
United States	467,014	70,650	9,340 28	1,257,389	138,071	25,147 78	642,921	46,555	12,858 42
Total	467,934	70,856	9,358 68	1,258,718	138,308	25,174 36	643,741	46,658	12,872 82
CANNED MEATS:—									
United Kingdom	240,819	91,824	23,121 98	1,130,112	304,180	82,631 26	768,446	181,624	45,128 38
Australia	14,928	4,655	1,197 67	18,099	2,862	729 42	1,116	433	108 25
Br. Sts. Settlements	18	19	5 22						
Hong Kong	67,436	42,534	11,696 85	12,086	6,828	1,876 45	1,954	601	165 28
Newfoundland	42	25	6 87	1,152	214	58 85	2,001	551	151 52
New Zealand	8,064	1,681	294 17	162,578	22,976	4,142 56	262,214	37,565	7,203 09
Argentina				196,862	56,415	14,291 25	573,588	102,212	25,553 00
China	1,344	673	185 07				15	22	6 05
Denmark				1,375	750	206 25			
France	132	52	13 00	11,062	14,233	3,801 85	68,184	29,346	7,419 17
Holland				10	8	2 20			
Japan	13,935	3,217	835 35	2,638	959	245 25	132	31	8 03
Miquelon and St. Pierre				110	36	9 90			
United States	585,280	162,972	44,817 81	450,719	134,857	37,085 67	450,810	110,874	30,490 35
Uruguay	85,873	24,075	6,620 52	39,282	13,493	3,710 57	85,500	19,987	5,496 42
Total	1,017,871	331,727	88,794 51	2,026,085	557,811	148,791 48	2,213,960	483,246	121,729 54

NOTE:—"CANNED BEEF" and "CANNED MUTTON" are not shown separately in the Classification of Imports, but are included in the statement of "CANNED MEATS".

MUTTON AND LAMB IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of mutton and lamb, fresh, cured and canned, was imported into Canada, and from what countries, during each of the years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the value of the mutton and lamb so imported during each of the said years?

3. What amount was collected as duty on the imports referred to during each of the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION OF "MUTTON AND LAMB, FRESH, CHILLED OR FROZEN," SHOWING THE QUANTITY, VALUE AND DUTY COLLECTED, BY COUNTRIES, FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1920 AND 1921, AND 1922 TO DATE

Mutton and Lamb, Fresh Chilled, or Frozen,	1920			1921		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty
		$	$		$	$
Australia				68,080	9,183	2,042 40
New Zealand	2,477,799	313,592	49,585 98	4,868,884	700,176	112,026 77
United States	2,365,105	490,182	70,953 15	2,910,737	562,806	87,322 11
Total	4,842,904	803,774	120,539 13	7,847,701	1,272,165	201,391 28

Mutton and Lamb, Fresh, Chilled, or Frozen	1922, to Date		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty
		$	$
Australia	104,313	7,804	3,129 39
New Zealand	605,364	94,894	12,343 73
United States	7,618,387	417,971	78,551 61
Total	8,328,064	520,669	94,024 73

NOTE.—"Canned Mutton" is not shown separately in the classification of imports, but is included in the statement "Canned Meats."

PORK IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of pork or pork products, such as bacon, hams, fresh, salted or otherwise cured, have been imported into Canada and from what countries, during each of the years ending the 31st March 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the value of the pork and pork products so imported during each of the said years?

3. What amount was collected as duty on the said pork imports during the said years?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION OF "PORK AND PORK PRODUCTS" SHOWING THE QUANTITY, VALUE AND DUTY COLLECTED, BY COUNTRIES, FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1920 AND 1921, AND 1922, TO DATE

	1920			1921			1922, to Date		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty
PORK: FRESH, CHILLED OR FROZEN—		$	$		$	$		$	$
United Kingdom							3,585	611	72 30
Australia	12,097	2,190	362 91						
New Zealand							1,360	199	27 20
United States	46,293,256	14,405,277	1,388,797 68	22,402,444	3,862,311	672,073 32	28,467,150	4,419,634	854,014 50
Total	46,305,353	14,407,467	1,389,160 59	22,402,444	3,862,311	672,073 32	28,472,095	4,420,444	854,114 00
BACON AND HAMS: SHOULDERS AND SIDES, CURED									
United Kingdom	20	12	0 30	303	111	6 06	1,400	525	23 70
British India							2	2	0 04
Hong Kong	4,337	1,527	86 74	5,145	2,462	102 90	20	6	0 40
Newfoundland	58	17	1 16						
New Zealand				66	21	1 32			
China				550	110	11 00			
United States	4,973,539	1,384,409	99,470 78	6,817,359	1,545,380	136,347 18	6,849,036	1,233,802	136,980 72
Total	4,977,954	1,385,965	99,558 98	6,823,423	1,548,084	136,468 46	6,850,458	1,234,335	137,004 86
PORK: BARRELED IN BRINE									
United Kingdom							400	75	6 00
Newfoundland	3,225	824	64 50	2,930	754	58 60	1,945	360	38 90
United States	9,131,568	2,089,028	182,631 36	10,846,702	1,734,370	216,934 04	8,142,820	808,976	162,856 40
Total	9,134,793	2,089,852	182,695 86	10,849,632	1,735,124	216,992 64	8,145,165	809,411	162,901 30
PORK: DRY SALTED—									
Hong Kong	4,693	2,320	93 86	768	330	15 36			
United States	4,171,647	1,061,487	83,432 94	2,061,447	438,345	41,228 94	1,113,801	152,283	22,276 02
Total	4,176,340	1,063,807	83,526 80	2,062,215	438,675	41,244 30	1,113,801	152,283	22,276 02

APPLE IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of green apples, in boxes or barrels, have been imported into Canada, and from what countries, during each of the years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the value of the apples so imported during each of the said years?
3. What amount was collected as duty on the apples so imported?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Statement of the total imports entered for consumption of "green apples" showing quantity, value and duty collected for the fiscal years 1920, 1921 and 1922, to date:

Fiscal Year 1922

Country	Quantity Brls.	Value	Duty
United States.	145,088	$1,053,744	$130,579 20

Fiscal Year 1921

United States.	273,319	$1,528,606	$245,987 10

Eleven Months Fiscal Year, 1922

United States.	105,828	$ 648,293	$ 95,245 20

EGG IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of eggs have been imported into Canada, and from what countries, during each of the years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the value of the eggs so imported during each of the said years?
3. What amount of duty was collected as duty on the eggs so imported?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION OF "EGGS", SHOWING THE QUANTITY, VALUE AND DUTY COLLECTED, BY COUNTRIES, FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1920, 1921 AND 1922, TO DATE

Country	1920			1921		
	Doz.	Value	Duty	Doz.	Value	Duty
		$	$		$	$
United Kingdom	3	30	0 06	1	15	0 02
Australia	1,800	806	54 00	8,915	5,851	267 45
Hong Kong	65,616	18,069	1,968 48	71,959	22,215	2,158 77
Newfoundland	2	1	0 06	3	2	0 09
New Zealand	5,158	2,470	154 74	11,250	6,844	225 00
China	3,422	1,077	102 66	46,134	15,637	1,384 02
Japan	1,200	505	36 00	2,257	821	67 71
United States	5,900,279	2,814,484	177,008 37	5,201,417	2,292,912	156,042 51
Total	5,977,480	2,837,442	179,324 37	5,341,936	2,344,297	160,145 57

Country	1922, to Date		
	Doz.	Value	Duty
		$	$
United Kingdom	6	39	12
Australia	30,434	13,917	913 02
Hong Kong	78,428	20,923	2,352 84
Newfoundland	.....	.....	.....
New Zealand	.....	.....	.....
China	149,783	42,205	4,493 49
Japan	.....	.....	.....
United States	9,223,475	3,122,929	276,704 25
Total	9,482,126	3,200,013	284,463 72

BUTTER IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of butter was imported into Canada, and from what countries, during each of the years ending March 31st, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the value of the butter so imported during each of the said years?

3. What amount of duty was collected during each of the said years on the butter so imported?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION OF "BUTTER" SHOWING THE QUANTITY, VALUE, AND DUTY COLLECTED, BY COUNTRIES, FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1920, 1921, AND 1922, TO DATE.

Country	1920			1921		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty	Lbs.	Value	Duty
United Kingdom	.....	$.....	$.....	112	$ 49	$ 4 48
Australia	59,080	21,369	2,363 20	.....	.....	.....
Br. Sts. Settlements	24	24	96	.....	.....	.....
Hong Kong	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Newfoundland	1,340	503	53 60	1,049	461	41 96
New Zealand	149,240	59,000	4,478 32	1,533,280	918,589	48,119 68
Holland	.....	.....	.....	110	55	4 40
Syria	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
United States	188,271	96,098	7,530 84	2,207,077	886,555	88,283 08
Total	397,955	$ 176,994	$ 14,426 92	3,741,628	$ 1,805,709	$ 136,453 60

Country	1922, To Date		
	Lbs.	Value	Duty
United Kingdom	2,036,471	$ 586,381	$ 62,671 09
Australia	287,724	84,738	11,508 96
Br. Sts. Settlements	.....	.....	.....
Hong Kong	20	26	80
Newfoundland	170	49	6 80
New Zealand	2,148,752	681,685	68,804 00
Holland	.....	.....	.....
Syria	75	46	3 00
United States	1,332,210	448,342	53,288 40
Total	5,805,422	$ 1,801,267	$ 196,283 05

OLEOMARGINE IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of oleomargarine has been imported into Canada, and from what countries, during the years ending March 31st, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the value of the oleomargarine so imported during each of the said years?

3. What amount of duty was collected on such imports during each of the said years?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Statement of the imports entered for consumption of Oleomargarine, showing the quantity, value and duty collected during the fiscal years 1920, 1921 and 1922, to date, by countries.

Country	Quantity Lbs.	Value	Duty
Fiscal Year 1920			
United Kingdom	.....	$.....	Free
United States	6,497,031	1,872,104	Free
Fiscal Year 1921			
United Kingdom	.....	$.....	Free
United States	4,630,747	1,206,351	Free
Fiscal Year 1922 to date			
United Kingdom	6,000	$ 1,399	Free
United States	1,330,634	254,329	Free
Total	1,336,634	$ 255,728	Free

CUSTOMS REVENUE

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

What amount of Customs duty was collected in each province of the Dominion during the years ending March 31, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

STATEMENT OF CUSTOMS DUTIES COLLECTED IN THE FOLLOWING PROVINCES DURING THE FISCAL YEARS 1917-18 TO 1921-22 (11 MONTHS)

Province	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22 (11 months)
Nova Scotia	$ 4,378,192 64	$ 4,157,240 67	$ 4,943,802 65	$ 4,373,168 91	$ 2,360,816 35
Prince Edward Island	129,560 16	126,954 13	150,259 92	198,202 74	315,052 32
New Brunswick	4,294,106 43	4,342,127 66	6,165,461 73	5,377,429 02	5,585,704 28
Quebec	42,980,392 76	43,581,440 16	55,609,453 18	56,182,275 37	31,562,828 16
Ontario	79,969,478 45	77,334,332 91	90,565,833 12	82,532,697 29	47,396,065 65
Manitoba	11,674,421 58	10,664,827 55	12,153,306 80	11,395,327 45	6,009,616 71
Saskatchewan	3,805,981 02	2,858,349 00	2,697,031 09	3,478,836 35	1,474,671 89
Alberta	4,011,683 03	3,428,534 45	3,633,501 63	4,146,991 16	2,082,710 72
British Columbia	10,226,151 09	11,476,645 72	11,543,104 35	11,941,003 80	10,871,208 20
Yukon	118,012 25	74,004 24	58,881 02	59,927 19	38,144 76

BUTTER IMPORTS.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. How many pounds of butter were imported from New Zealand during the year 1921?

2. During what months of the said year were these importations made?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. 1,080,912 pounds.

2. January, 1921, 235,424 lb; February, 258,664 lb; March, 417,816 lb; April, 90,-776 lb; May, 73,472 lb; June, 1,960 lb; July, none; August, none; September, none; October, 2,800 lb; November, none; December, none; total, 1,080,912 lbs.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES

Mr. EVANS:

1. What steamship companies operating on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans are subsidized by the Canadian Government?

2. What is the extent and purpose of such subsidies?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. The following companies performing ocean services were subsidized during 1921-22, and the votes are repeated in the Estimates for 1922-23.

Atlantic Ocean:—Reid-Newfoundland Co., St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada and Newfoundland Service; annual subsidy $35,000.

Royal Mail Steam Packet Co., London, Canada, British West Indies and Demerara service; annual subsidy $340,666.66.

Elder, Dempster and Co., Ltd., London, England, Canada and South Africa service; annual subsidy $146,000.

Pacific Ocean:—Union Steamship Co., of New Zealand, Ltd., Dunedin, New Zealand, and Canada-New Zealand (Pacific) service; annual subsidy $130,509.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Pacific Steamship Co.—Victoria and San Francisco; annual subsidy $3,000.

2. The extent of these subsidies is indicated in the answer to No. 1. Their purpose is to assist the development of trade between Canada and the countries named, and also in some cases to provide for the transportation of mails to and from Canada.

Mr. JACOBS:

1. What sums are paid annually to steamship companies as subsidies by the Canadian Government?

2. What are the countries to which such vessels sail?

3. How much has so far been paid on account of such subsidies?

4. Do any vessels under the control of the Canadian Mercantile Marine sail to countries and ports to which vessels subsidized by the Government also sail?

5. If so does the Government intend to take action to discontinue subsidies to steamship companies competing with the steamers belonging to the Canadian Government?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. The estimated expenditure for the fiscal year 1922-23 under the head of Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions is $1,100,775.66. Of this amount $655,175.66 is for ocean services, and the balance, amounting to $445,600, is for coasting services in Canadian waters.

2. Vessels running on the ocean services referred to above sail to Newfoundland, the British West Indies, Demerara, South Africa, New Zealand, and the United States.

3. This question is too indefinite to enable a reply to be made.

4. Yes.

5. Canadian Merchant Marine vessels, when properly equipped to meet requirements of service should be entitled to preference.

TURTLE MOUNTAIN FOREST RESERVE

Mr. STEEDSMAN:

1. How many men were employed in the care and management of the Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve during the year 1921?
2. What were their duties and what salary or wage was paid to each of them?
3. How many head of livestock were pastured there during 1921, and what revenue was derived from same?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Five.

	Salary	Bonus
2. 1 Senior Forest Ranger	$1605	$263.25
1 Asst. Forest Ranger	$1020	$163.00
1 Asst. Forest Ranger	$1020	$172.82
1 Herder, April to November	$690.29	
1 Teamster, May to November	$517.48	

3. 1822 head, $3,652.90.

NOVA SCOTIA PENSIONERS

Mr. DUFF:

1. What are the names and post office addresses of all persons receiving pensions, in the Province of Nova Scotia, in virtue of service, and what are the respective amounts of said pensions?
2. What are the names and post office addresses of all persons in said province, receiving pensions by virtue of being dependents of soldiers, and what are the respective amounts received yearly by each said dependent?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: This question could, of course, be readily answered; but there exists in Canada a great divergence of opinion as to the advisability of rendering public the names of all pensioners in this country. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member to put on the Order Paper a Notice of Motion, with a view of ascertaining the sentiment of the House in regard to rendering public the names of pensioners. I am in the hands of the House. The moment the sentiment of the House is expressed, if it be decided that the names shall be made public of all pensioners, dependent or disabled, the question will be answered. In the meantime, if the hon. gentleman is agreeable, I would ask that the question be dropped.

Question dropped.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the total expenditure for the year 1921 of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. How was the total expenditure of the Department divided with respect to— (a) Pensions; (b) Treatment; (c) Vocational Training; (d) Land Settlement; and (e) Relief of the unemployed?
3. What was the total expenditure of this Department for the year 1921 for—(a) Administration of Pensions; (b) Administration and costs of treatment; (c) Pay and allowances of those on treatment; (d) Administration and costs of Vocational training; (e) Pay and allowances of those on vocational training; (f) Land Settlement Loans; (g) Administration costs of land settlement; (h) Unemployment relief; and (i) Administration costs of unemployment relief?
4. What was the total expenditure for the year 1921 for the staff salaries, and maintenance costs of each hospital?
5. What number of persons, full and part time, were on each hospital staff, and what was the average number of patients on the strength of each hospital?
6. What was the total expenditure for the year 1921 for travelling expenses of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment officials, patients not included?
7. What were the travelling expenses of each Commissioner of the Pensions Board for the year 1921?

Mr. LUCAS:

1. How many buildings or parts of buildings are rented by the Government in the city of Ottawa for office purposes?
2. What rental is paid in each case?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry):

1. What were the total payments made in each year by the Government from 1914 to date, (a) to or for the Canadian Northern System, (b) to or for the Grand Trunk System, (c) to or for the Grand Trunk Pacific System, (d) to or for the National Transcontinental, and (e) for the Intercolonial, distinguishing in each year the amounts loaned by the Crown, and in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, distinguishing between expenditure charged to revenue and expenditure charged to capital?
2. What were the several amounts in each year that were guaranteed for the said railways during the said periods, and the amount not borrowed of any amount guaranteed?
3. What portions of those amounts so paid or guaranteed (other than with respect to the Intercolonial) were for capital expenditure and what sums were to meet deficits?
4. What amount of each loan guaranteed was for refunding purposes?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What amount of money has already been advanced the Quebec Harbour Commissioners by the Government of Canada, and what are the dates of such advances?
2. What are the present terminal or wharf facilities at the harbour of Quebec?
3. Are the said terminal and wharf facilities being fully utilized?
4. If not, to what extent?
5. What is the daily capacity of the said facilities, both for incoming and outgoing freight?
6. What has been the daily average use of such capacity during the season of navigation?
7. Are such advances subject to interest?
8. If so, has such interest been paid in full?
9. If not in full, what amount, if any, has been paid?
10. What are the total arrears of interest?
11. What additional facilities, if any, are now proposed to be installed?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, and other documents exchanged between the Department of the Interior, or any of its officers or employees, and the Gold Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, or any other person, during the years 1919, 1920 and 1921, concerning the imposition of a royalty tax or Government charge upon the output of minerals, other than gold, from the Yukon Territory. Also a copy of the Order in Council in this connection.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and other documents exchanged between the Department of the Interior or any of its officers or employees, and the Gold Commissioner of Yukon Territory, or any other person or official, concerning the application to Yukon Territory of the Order in Council which provides that the mining recorders shall not receive for record, transfers of interest in mineral claims, when such interests are less than one-quarter interest. Also a copy of the said Order in Council.

Mr. WHITE:

For a copy of all correspondence passed during the year 1921, between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of Ontario, relating to the activities of Honourable Manning Doherty in England on the subject of the cattle embargo.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda and other documents passed between the Minister of Labour and Mr. J. B. McLachlan.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of the petition presented by Mr. A. Wick and others, asking for improved methods in the Quebec fisheries, together with all correspondence and other documents relating thereto.

Mr. CALDWELL:

For a copy of the contract entered into by the Government with the Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation for a supply of steel plates, along with a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Government and the said company relating to the above mentioned contract.

Mr. STEVENS:

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, letters and telegrams passed between the Minister of Immigration or any of his officials, and persons, companies, organizations, since January 1, 1922, regarding the placing of immigrants upon land in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta.

QUEBEC FISHERIES

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved:

For a copy of the correspondence and all other documents, regarding the transfer of fisheries to the Province of Quebec.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

He said: The question of jurisdiction in the matter of fisheries is not a new one, at least in this particular case. For many years past there has been a divided jurisdiction between the Dominion Government and the governments of several provinces. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that twenty-five years ago this very month, in 1897, on your invitation and the invitation of the Liberals of the county of Gaspé I became a candidate to represent that county in the legislature. I contested the election against the then premier of the province, the Hon. E. J. Flynn, who in the course of his campaign announced that the province of Quebec had secured a victory before the Privy Council in England by obtaining a decision which meant that from then on the provincial government would issue licenses to the fishermen in the tidal waters of Quebec. And so it happened that from 1897 until last year, without interruption, the government of Quebec controlled the issuing of licenses to the fishermen in the counties of Bonaventure, Gaspé, along the river St. Lawrence, and in the tidal waters generally of the province. In the month of November, 1920, following a reference to the Privy Council of the question of disputed jurisdiction between the Dominion and some of the provincial governments, and in the light of the decision rendered in the case of British Columbia, a new policy was adopted by the federal government then in office. Last session, wishing to know exactly what the policy of the Dominion government was, I placed on the Order Paper a question which was answered by Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I give the question and the answer:

QUEBEC SALMON NET LICENSES

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has any understanding been arrived at between the Government of Canada and that of the Province of Quebec regarding the granting of licenses for salmon nets in the tidal waters of said province consequent upon the recent judgment of the Privy Council?

2. Is the Government aware that the Province of Quebec has granted licenses for the present year?

3. What action if any does the Government intend to take in this matter in the public interest and that of the fishermen concerned?

4. Is it a fact that the Province of Quebec contends that it is the sole authority having power to grant licenses in such tidal waters because of its jurisdiction over the bed of rivers and bays and the shores generally of that Province?

5. If so, will the Government of Canada recognise the licenses granted this year by the Government of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The decision of the Judical Committee of the Privy Council of November 30 last in the Quebec Fisheries Reference decided that the administration of the fisheries in the navigable waters if the province that 'are accessible by way of navigation from the sea comes within the purview of the Federal Government. The Government of the Province of Quebec has been informed that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will undertake the administration of the fisheries in such waters from May 1 proximo. Any licenses issued by the provincial authorities will not be accepted as conferring authority to fish. No one will be permitted to fish in the said waters except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The House will realize the position in which the fishermen found themselves. They had paid for and been granted licenses in the usual course, as they had done for the last twenty-five years, and they were suddenly informed by the Dominion authorities that thereafter those licenses were worthless and that they would have to secure permits from the Dominion fishery officer. Of course, the fishermen had to accept the situation, and the electors in my constituency, in yours, Mr. Speaker, and throughout the province, were called upon to pay additional sums of $20, $25, $30 and $40 before they were in a position to fish. This anomalous condition of affairs then presented itself: Men who had fished for twenty-five years on a provincial license were told that they could not fish unless they secured a license from the Dominion authorities, while other men who had the Dominion license found it worthless unless they could show a provincial permit as well. The man who had the provincial license could fish along the shore belonging to the province, but he had to have a Dominion license if he fished in the waters that came within the purview of the federal government. Naturally, the fishermen asked that some remedy should be found for this state of affairs; and about a month ago we learned that negotiations had been entered into between the Department of Marine, under the control of my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe), and the government of Quebec, as a result of which a satisfactory solution had been arrived at. The fisheries have been transferred to the province of Quebec, so far as such a transference lies within the power of the Dominion government, who retain the control that is required by the British North America Act. I have been receiving letters from my constituents, who fish the magnificent Gaspé

4 p.m.

salmon, which is known the world over and is the glory and joy of men from all parts of America who love fishing, and they ask that the license fees paid to the Dominion government last year be refunded. I have submitted the matter to the minister, who informs me that he has it under consideration, although his first answer was not favourable. As an instance of what actually happened, I should like to read to the House a brief statement given to me by a gentleman who was at Port Daniel, one of the fishing villages in my constituency, last year, at the time of the conference between the Dominion and the provincial governments. This statement is as follows:

Statement of Louis Simpson re Complaints of Certain Salmon Fishermen of Port Daniel and District.

Last summer these salmon fishermen were called upon to pay for two several licenses to permit them to follow their occupation of fishing salmon. One license fee was paid to the Dominion Government, whilst another license fee had to be paid to the Government of the province of Quebec.

The official responsible to the Dominion Government collected the several fees and in return granted licenses, but after so doing did not notify the fishermen that it was the intention of the Dominion Government to alter the arrangement, which for years past had been permitted by the representatives of the Government of the province of Quebec (which Government until last year had administered the fisheries). One of these arrangements, was that, notwithstanding, the printed regulations, the fishermen fishing in the harbours open to the winds blowing from the gulf (such as Port Daniel and the other ports to the northeast) should not be required to tie up their nets on Sunday. It was recognized by the government official that nets, so tied, were liable, should a storm arise, blowing from the east to be destroyed. Moreover, at Port Daniel where the rivers emptying into the Baracbois are allowed to be poached, there was nothing to be gained by a strict adherence to these regulations.

The officials of the Dominion Government, without giving the fishermen any notice of their intention of withdrawing such permission or of their intention to make a custom, legalized by many years permission, which certainly can be claimed to have established, until withdrawn by notice, a legal right, raided the fishermen's nets, seized and sold the salmon found therein, and summoned the licensees to the county town of New Carlisle to appear before a judge.

The fishermen, against my advice, were induced to plead guilty of a technical infraction of the regulations and were each fined by the judge, two dollars and costs.

The loss to the fishermen was as follows:—

The value of the nets taken.

One day's work at the most important time of the year.

Expenses to New Carlisle and back.

Fine and expenses.

The fines, loss of time and expense will have exceeded ten dollars per man, while some of the salmon taken was allowed to go back and the balance was eventually sold at less than the market price for fresh caught fish.

The actual sum realized by the department from the sale of the fish is not known to me,

but the value of the fish taken will have exceeded $200, and the total loss to the fishermen over $500.

On my return home I called on the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and explained the matter to him, suggesting that the money received by the department from the sale of the fish be returned to the fishermen, but my suggestion did not find favour with Mr. Found, who ignored altogether my view of the case as to the equity if not the illegality of the seizure under the conditions herein stated, which view I still hold to be correct.

Louis Simpson.

I submit, therefore, that under the circumstances it was imperative, in the interests of the fisheries and in justice to the fishermen themselves, that some arrangement should have been arrived at between the two governments that would allow the fishermen to pursue their calling as heretofore without the irritation of having to submit to two fishery officers, one in conflict with the other. When I originally moved this motion I included therein a request for a copy of the Order in Council transferring the fisheries; but the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), having requested that the Order in Council be laid on the Table, and this being done, I amended my motion in consequence. The document having been laid on the Table of the House, I am now in a position to read a portion of it so that the House will be able to ascertain exactly the nature of the arrangement, and to consider the justice of the arrangement arrived at:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 13th February, 1922, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, submitting as follows, with reference to a minute of the Council of April 13th, 1921 (P.C. 1246) authorizing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to undertake the administration of the fisheries in the tidal and navigable water of Quebec that are accessible by way of navigation from the sea:

1. That following such authority, the Department of Marine and Fisheries undertook the administration of the fisheries in all the aforementioned waters, and allowed no one to fish therein, in a fishery in which licenses were required, without first procuring a license from it:

2. That as under the Privy Council decision of November 30th, 1920, the province has the exclusive power to grant the right to fix engines to the soil, where the soil is vested in the crown in the right of the province, so far as such engines and the affixing of them do not interfere with the right of the public to fish or prevent the regulation of the right of fishing by private persons without the aid of such engines, and as most of the licensed fishing in the province of Quebec is done by means of engines that are attached to the soil, the provincial authorities during the past season refused to allow anyone to fish with appliances attached to the soil where it claimed the ownership of the soil without first procuring a license from them authorizing the use of such fishing engines.

[Mr. Marcil.]

Thus the fishermen, through no fault of their own, were placed in the position of having to procure two licenses and pay two sets of fees before they could engage in fishing. Also under such conditions should it happen at any place that a fisherman who had procured a license from the federal authorities were refused one from the provincial authorities, or vice versa, he would be unable to fish and no fishing could go on at that place.

This dual jurisdiction also required dual expenditure in the administration of the fisheries, as each authority found it necessary to maintain a staff of fishery officers.

The Minister states that with a view to putting an end to such an undesirable state of affairs, he arranged for a conference with the representatives of the provincial Government, and to that end the Minister of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries and the Deputy Attorney General for the province of Quebec came to Ottawa, and on the 13th February instant the minister discussed the whole matter with them. At this conference it developed that the provincial authorities, in view of their interest in the river fisheries, and of the necessity for their maintaining a staff of officers for the proper administration and protection of these fisheries, are prepared to undertake, under proper regulation by the Federal Government as to conditions under which such fishing may be carried on, the responsibility for the administration of all the coastal fisheries of the province as well, with the exception of those about the Magdalen Islands.

The provincial authorities are also prepared to undertake the operation of the two fish hatcheries that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is maintaining in Quebec for the development of the salmon fisheries there.

In view of the important saving that would be involved to the federal exchequer, and of the eminent desirability of removing as far as possible all dual control in the fisheries, the minister recommends that the entire administration of the fisheries, under the Fisheries Act and regulations passed thereunder, be handed over to the provincial authorities, and that the staff of federal fishery officers, as well as the fisheries patrol steamer "Loos" be withdrawn, such to become effective on April 1st, 1922.

The minister further recommends that the Gaspé and Tadoussac fish hatcheries of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, together with all their appurtenances, be transferred to the provincial government of Quebec on the 1st July, 1922, when the present season's operations will have been completed.

The order further provides that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall continue the administration of the various acts which have been passed by this Parliament relating to the fisheries and shall retain such powers as cannot be transferred to the province.

My object in directing attention to this matter is to congratulate the Government on the action they have taken in obviating a difficulty which would otherwise have been a very awkward one for our people. The fisheries of Quebec have not the advantages of those of other maritime provinces. Our seasons are much shorter: on

Baie des Chaleurs the season extends for three, four or five months: on the St. Lawrence, especially on the north shore, it barely extends over three months. The province of Quebec, therefore, should receive particular attention from the Dominion government so far as the fisheries are concerned. I am glad to know that we have as one of the ministers from that province a gentleman who is familiar with the conditions there. The Government should continue to give all the encouragement they can to the fishermen of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baie des Chaleurs, that deserving class of our people who have to work under all conditions and in all kinds of weather. In giving that encouragement I trust they will not overlook the claim I have now made: that if at all possible the double license paid last year by these fishermen be refunded.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): In British Columbia dual licenses are exacted; that is to say, the fishermen have to take licenses from the Dominion as well as from the province. Would the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) be good enough to explain why this arrangement should be made with respect to the province of Quebec if a similar arrangement is not made with respect to British Columbia?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I have exhausted my right to speak, but the reason is this: for the last twenty-five years Quebec has administered its fisheries, and it is advisable in the interests of those fisheries that that system should continue.

Mr. McQUARRIE: As I understand it, British Columbia exercises control over the fisheries of that province, and has done so for years. I would suggest that the hon. minister give some consideration also to conditions respecting the fisheries in British Columbia.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the House will be indebted to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil)—at least, I am—for having brought this subject to its attention, especially in view of the misapprehensions that seem to exist in some quarters as to what has taken place in regard to these fisheries. There has been no transfer, much less an abandonment, of any right belonging to the federal government. An irritating question has been settled, in the interests, I believe, of all concerned.

Under the British North America Act, "sea coast and inland fisheries" are, by inclusion in article 12, placed under the legislative power of the federal government. The interpretation of this article has been the subject of many litigations, and I think a short history of the case will help to bring about an understanding of the situation.

There was no difficulty in connection with the fisheries until about 1882, when the federal government undertook to lease salmon angling privileges in non-tidal rivers in New Brunswick. In this connection the case of Robertson vs the Queen was submitted to the Exchequer Court of Canada and subsequently, on appeal, to the Supreme Court of Canada. The federal government had leased salmon angling privileges on the Miramichi river. The adjacent property was owned by a private company which permitted private citizens to fish in that river. Mr. Robertson took proceedings against these fishermen, and the latter were successful. Robertson then instituted an action for damages against the Dominion government in the Exchequer Court and later before the Supreme Court of Canada. The decision was that under the British North America Act the fisheries did not pass to the federal government, but remained the property of the riparian owners. As in all the provinces the Crown, in the right of the province was owner of the properties adjacent to the rivers. From the time of that decision until to-day the provinces have themselves administered those fisheries and leased the salmon and other angling privileges.

Following this decision the provinces claimed that they had jurisdiction in tidal waters as well, and it was finally decided to submit the case for a decision to the Supreme Court of Canada and to the Privy Council. This submission to the Supreme Court was in 1894, and the decision of the Privy Council was given in 1898. It was, in substance, that the exclusive power of regulating the fisheries, no matter where they were situated, was vested in the federal government under the British North America Act, but that any rights which the provinces had prior to Confederation were still kept by them. But the decision did not define what were those property rights of the provinces.

In Ontario all the fisheries are non-tidal, so the administration of all the fisheries in Ontario passed to the Ontario government, and has always been in its hands. Of course, this does not take away the power of regulation by the federal government, which applies to all the fisheries, inland as well as sea coast. Immediately

after that decision, the sea-washed provinces claimed the administration of all their fisheries. They took the ground that prior to Confederation they owned the fisheries not only in the non-tidal rivers but in the territorial waters as well. They did not go to the courts immediately, but after many conferences between the Dominion government and the provincial governments they came to an agreement under which the federal government continued to administer the fisheries pending a decision on the question of rights. This applied to all the provinces except Quebec. Quebec insisted on its interpretation of the clause of the decision, but finally there was also a modus vivendi between this government and the province of Quebec, under which Quebec kept the control and the administration of all the fisheries on the north shore of the river St. Lawrence and the gulf of St. Lawrence, on the north shore as far as a place called Pointe des Monts, and also of the rivers and their estuaries from Pointe des Monts as far as the boundary Blanc Sablon. It was found impossible to reach an amicable settlement as to the question of rights, and then it was decided to submit the difficulty to the courts again. This was done in 1912 or 1913. The province of British Columbia was the party to the litigation against the Dominion government, but all the other interested provinces joined in the case and were represented before the courts. The decision was given in 1913, and was, in brief, that since Magna Charta there has been under British law a public right of fishing in all tidal waters, and that the administration of this right passed to the federal government under the British North America Act. This decision settled the matter everywhere except in Quebec. Immediately after the decision was rendered, the government of Canada published in the official Canada Gazette a notice stating that on 1st January, 1915, it would assume control of the fisheries in the tidal waters of the province of Quebec hitherto administered by the federal government, and at the same time on the 25th of January the government of the province of Quebec published in the Quebec Official Gazette a notice that the decision of the British Columbia reference did not apply to the province of Quebec, and that therefore any person wishing to fish in the river and gulf of St. Lawrence and any tidal waters should make application to the Department of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries for the necessary permit.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

The province of Quebec contended that as the decision of the Privy Council was based on Magna Charta, and as Magna Charta did not apply to Quebec the decision did not affect that province;—it is well to remember that in civil matters the French law has always been kept in Quebec, though the country passed to the British Crown. It was consequently necessary to have a further reference to the court as far as that province was concerned. In the meantime the same modus vivendi applied and Quebec continued to administer her fisheries within the geographical limits I have described. The reference was arranged for in 1914, and the decision of the Privy Council was given in 1920. This decision was, in substance, that while Magna Charta did not apply to Quebec, there is a public right of fishing in all the waters that are navigable from the sea, but that there is no public right in the soil under the water, and that where the province or any private person owned the soil it could not be used for fishing without the consent of the owner. I think it would be well for me to read a sentence of the decision of the Privy Council:

> To the first question, neither the Government of Quebec, nor any member of the executive council, has the power to grant the exclusive right of fishing in the tidal waters so far as navigable of the rivers, streams, gulfs, bays, straits or arms of the sea of the province and of the high seas washing its coasts. In so far as the soil is vested in the Crown in right of the province, the Government of the province has exclusive power to grant the right to affix engines to the solum, so far as such engines and the affixing of them do not interfere with the right of the public to fish, or prevent the regulation of the right of fishing by private persons without the aid of such engines.

Now, it happens not only in the St. Lawrence river but on the coast of the gulf of St. Lawrence, on both the north and the south shores, that owing to conditions along the coast all the fisheries there are carried on by fishing engines attached to the soil. The water is very shallow along the whole coast, and in very many cases these fishing nets are out of the water at low tide; so that there really is a conflict of jurisdiction in the administration of these fisheries along the whole coast. The decision, of course—and this has never been denied—gives the exclusive power of regulating the fisheries to the federal government. In the province of Quebec the ownership of the soil is still vested in those who own that soil, either private citizens or the Crown—mostly the Crown in right of the province. So whatever rights of fishing the

public may have in those waters cannot be exercised there, on account of the conditions along the coast, without attaching engines to the soil, and this cannot be done without the consent of the owner, in other words, the province of Quebec. Last year, which was the first year after the decision of the Privy Council no settlement could be made; and the federal government undertook to enforce its rights in all the waters of the province that are navigable from the sea. To administer those fisheries and to issue licenses, which they had never done before, the federal government had to employ overseers. We appointed nine overseers, with an inspector over them, and we had to use a suitable boat for the purpose of supervising those fisheries. The cost of this service was about $85,000, and the total revenue from this portion of the district this year has been $12,573.39, and as the fees for salmon fishing licenses have been reduced the revenue from that source will be even lower in future.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has the federal government applied to the British Parliament to have this dispute straightened out by legislative action? Would that cure the difficulty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think it is at all necessary.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It is a very expensive business.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has been very expensive so far, but that will not be the case in future now that an agreement has been reached. I may point out that under the agreement the provincial government will continue what they were doing last year and furthermore will issue licenses. Great friction and conflict resulted from the divided authority last year as my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has stated. The fishermen in his district, and in other districts of the province, had to pay a double license at high cost. For instance, on one side of the Baie des Chaleurs, in my hon. friend's constituency, the fishermen had to pay twice the amount which was exacted from the fishermen of New Brunswick, on the other side, for the same right and the same privilege. There has also been litigation, as between the fishermen and the provincial government and the federal government, and it was a very unfortunate state of affairs. After all, under the present arrangement we have practically only repealed the Order in Council which had been passed last year after the decision of the Privy Council, which Order in Council provided that licenses should be required from all the fishermen along the coasts of the gulf of St. Lawrence and the river St. Lawrence. We have repealed that Order in Council, but we are maintaining our right of regulating the fisheries there, and we will always have the right to intervene if these regulations are not observed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who will report to the Government as to whether the regulations are observed or not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would say the fishermen themselves, and those who are interested in the fisheries there; there are many interested parties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You will have no officer to report to you whether your regulations are lived up to or not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no obstacle to the appointment of some man to see that the regulations are fully observed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is it the intention of the federal government to transfer to the province of British Columbia the administration of the fisheries on the Pacific coast? Has the government of that province requested such transfer, and has the federal government reached an adverse decision in the matter? If so, on what ground was that decision based?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The government of British Columbia has not requested any such transfer. Furthermore, I may tell my hon. friend that the legal and other conditions are not at all the same in British Columbia as in the province of Quebec. I do not know whether what is suggested could be done. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) shakes his head, but if the government of British Columbia applies for a transfer of the administration of fisheries the application will certainly be considered. However, I do not think such a request will be made, because the administration of those fisheries costs this Government about $400,000 a year, and I think the provincial government would hesitate very much before assuming such a large expenditure as that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has not the minister seen the despatches in the press to the effect that the government of British Columbia was making such a request?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No such request has reached me, but my hon. friend may rest assured it will be fully considered if, and when, it does come.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Can the minister state the amount of revenue received from the Pacific coast fisheries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot give my hon. friend that information offhand, but I have been informed by the officials of the department that the administration of these fisheries involves a cost to the Dominion treasury of about $400,000 a year.

With respect to the Quebec fisheries, as I have said there has been no giving away of any right. We have kept the power of regulation, we have not given anything which we should not have given; and the whole matter resolves itself into the settlement of a cause of conflict and difficulty. In view of the Confederation pact, which was the result of any agreement between various provinces by virtue of which they relinquished some of their rights and retained others for the purposes of administration and control, it is very important that any cause of conflict should be avoided. Any encroachment on the rights of the provinces—even the mere appearance of an encroachment—is dangerous to the peace and good order of this country. I think, therefore, it is a good thing that this question, which was certainly an irritating one, should have been settled in a way that will result in economy on the part of this Government at this time. I repeat that no right has been given away by the federal government, and this settlement should enlist the support of all good-minded people in the Dominion.

Mr. LADNER: Does the federal government draw any revenue from the fisheries as a result of this arrangement with the province of Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not see how any revenue could be enjoyed in view of the fact that we expended $88,000 last year and the receipts were only $12,000. So the Quebec fisheries will be a charge on the provincial government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend has no officers to see that his regulations are carried out this year, he will not have any revenue—he will only have the advantage of the expenditure.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The difference between the revenue and the expenditure was $76,000. I can give a pledge to my hon. friend that no officers will be paid any such sum as that to carry out the work of supervision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One officer would not be able to accomplish anything. This is merely a motion for the production of papers, and it is not wholly unobjectionable in itself, but is a motion which, in my judgment, should pass. Of course it is a motion on which hon. gentlemen have a right to speak, and the mover has taken advantage of it to congratulate the Government on its course, and the Government has also taken advantage of it to congratulate itself. I have listened with interest to what has fallen from the lips of both these hon. gentlemen, and I may say that their comment on the conduct of the Government has been helpful. The minister's remarks have been of value as interpreting the judgments delivered since 1882 by the Privy Council. I may go further and say that they are illuminating on every question except those questions which may possibly come in controversy and be of moment in connection with the conduct of administration, that is to say, on the question of the right of the Government of Canada to abdicate to any other government a function placed in it by the constitution, the right of the government of Canada by Order in Council to amend the British North America Act. At the present time I do not wish to enter into a controversy for the reason that on the motion that is before the House, for the production of papers, the judgment of the House could not possibly be obtained. I merely make this comment for the purpose of preserving the right, although I do not think it needs any preserving, of bringing the subject up on a later occasion should I be so advised.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to say in connection with this discussion, that I do not blame the lawyers at all, but the question at issue to my mind is in regard to the powers under the British North America Act, and the distribution of rights as between the provinces and the federal government. I think all these troubles could be remedied by legislation rather than by appeals to the court. But we do not happen to have in this country the right to amend our own constitution. They have that right in Australia, and now that we are a nation, and so described by everybody in this country—and especially so described in his reference to the free

state of Ireland the other day, by the Prime Minister of Great Britain—I think it is pretty nearly time that the Parliament of Canada had the power to straighten out this question of jurisdiction as between the provinces and the Dominion. If we had that power these questions would not be coming up. In other words these questions could be settled by conference between the provinces and the federal power, and the settlement embodied in a short act of parliament. Matters are coming up year after year, and we have conferences and litigation between the Dominion and the provinces, and it is an expensive business. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on it, when it could all be straightened out by legislation, rather than by litigation. Again I say, after hearing discussions for many years, and seeing the progress that has been made in curing these things by legislation, rather than by negotiation or by incessant appeals to the court, that a short way to cure the trouble would easily be reached, if the Parliament of Canada, perhaps in conjuction with the provinces, had the right to amend the constitution, so that it could be adapted to the requirements of the day.

Mr. McQUARRIE: As to the question which I asked a few moments ago, I do not wish it to be understood that I was urging upon the hon. minister that he should transfer the fisheries of British Columbia to that province, but having seen in the press despatches a statement to the effect that British Columbia had asked that to be done, I wish to clear up the matter. I think, as a matter of fact, there might be more reason for turning over to the province of British Columbia the fisheries than there would be in respect to the fisheries of any other province, because we are very far away from the seat of administration, and it takes us a long time to get a decision on matters which come up from time to time. The minister may remember that it was urged upon the previous government that a commission should be appointed or that an advisory board should be appointed in British Columbia to take charge of the administration of fisheries there, or, if that were going too far, to advise the minister from time to time as to the various questions which come up in respect of the fisheries on the Pacific coast. The minister will remember that that request was made by all those interested in the British Columbia fisheries, by the canners, by the fishermen, merchants, the boards of trade, and so on, by the returned soldiers, and by all others interested in fisheries in British Columbia. That request was refused by the previous minister, and I would like to take this opportunity of pressing that same request upon the present minister. I think something of that kind should be done, because Ottawa is too far away to look after all the matters which pertain to the fisheries away out on the Pacific coast, and we should have some board out there to assist the minister and the department.

Motion (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) agreed to.

QUEBEC, ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC, AND QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAYS

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved:

For a copy of the correspondence with the proprietors of the Quebec Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western railways or other persons on their behalf, concerning the operation or merging of these two roads with the Canadian National system.

He said: the older members of this House will remember that this question was discussed by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and by myself as representing respectively the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. To enlighten the new members of the House, I would like to preface my remarks by a reference to the proceedings in Parliament of the 9th April, 1884, nearly 40 years ago. Parliament voted $300,000 to build a branch of the Intercolonial from the lower end of the Matapedia valley along down to Gaspé bay. That vote was brought about by the request of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, and supported by Sir Hector Langevin, representing the province of Quebec. Unfortunately, the construction of the Intercolonial had been completed but a few years before, and, like most railways in those days, it cost much more than it should. A company organized under the name Baie des Chaleurs company induced the government in the following year to reverse its policy, and instead of building this railway as a branch of the Intercolonial to serve Bonaventure and Gaspé, handed over the subsidy and the undertaking to a private company called the Baie des Chaleurs Company. They secured the usual double subsidies from Quebec and Ottawa, and land subsidies in addition, the subsidies amounting to probably a million and a half dollars. They went through a chequered career for ten or fifteen years,

and finally the road was brought down to Paspebiac, a hundred miles from the starting point.

Things were in that stage when you, Mr. Speaker, were elected to the House, and in the same stage when I was elected to the House nearly twenty-three years ago. When we asked the then government to take over these railways as branches of the Intercolonial railway, because they were intended, at their very inception, to be branches or feeders of the Intercolonial, the government of the day told us that it would be advisable first to complete the undertaking and then the whole system would be merged into the Intercolonial railway. You, Sir, succeeded in encouraging and inducing a company of British capitalists to extend the railway from Paspebiac down to Gaspé Basin, where it has remained for almost the last ten years, and where it connects with deep waters in one of the finest inland ports in North America. This railway is owned by a British company who are holding the property merely for the purpose of getting rid of it. They are operating a train twice a day. They have very little rolling stock; they have very poor cars, and their locomotives are antiquated. The local rates paid on this railway by the people are deemed to be exorbitant and matters are at a standstill. I am treating now not of the case of the company; I know that at the present time the railway problem in Canada is the greatest of all our problems. Our railways are the backbone of the country; and remembering what was said last year by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and what no doubt the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) will say, I realize that this is a very poor time to advocate the taking over of any railway. I am not here to advocate the taking over or purchasing of these railways; I am here to advocate the cause of the inhabitants of the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs.

We have in these two counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé a miniature of Canada. We have the old Acadian settlement, the original settlers from Grand Pré, who came through the wilderness of New Brunswick and started the Acadian settlement. We have the United Empire Loyalists who, in 1812, were settled in our townships by the government of the day, and the Jersey fishers, who came over from the Island of Jersey and who exploited the fisheries of the Baie des Chaleurs, which, for 150 years, has been one of the most prolific fisheries in Canada. We have in Paspebiac the mother-house of the establishment now converted into a maritime provincial concern, of Robins, Jones & Whitman, which has been doing a steady business in the same place for 170 years and which has twenty-two establishments scattered along the coast of the Baie des Chaleurs and the gulf of St. Lawrence. We have, in connection with this mixed population, a most admirable soil, productive to a marked degree. We have resources unknown at the present time. The Gaspé peninsula, as you yourself, Mr. Speaker, said in your speech last year and as you have said on previous occasions, measures, roughly, 11,000 square miles, the size of two ordinary kingdoms of Europe. We have there on the south shore of the gulf and along the Baie des Chaleurs, which enters into this case, a population of only about 60,000 or 70,000 people and only a strip about three or four miles wide along the shore is inhabited at the present time; the remainder is a terra incognita. We have there pulpwood to supply the continent of America for I do not know how long. The builder of this Parliament building, Mr. Lyall, organized a company in Montreal some three or four years ago, and started looking for lead and zinc in Lemieux township, partly in Gaspé and adjoining Bonaventure. He has taken out of the earth there 400,000 tons of mineral ore for the reduction of zinc and lead, and according to the reports which he has, the probabilities are that lead ore can be found there in hundreds of thousands of tons. Our fisheries as I have said have been exploited for 175 years. Our forests are magnificent; the pulpwood is unlimited. The fisheries are splendid; the soil is fertile, and we have a hardy, law-abiding population. These two counties sent 1,000 men to the front during the Great War, and memorials to commemorate their deeds are now being erected along the coast of the two counties. The inhabitants live in happiness together. These people inhabit the oldest established part of the province of Quebec, because Jacques Cartier entered the bay of Gaspé and planted the cross there before he reached Quebec. These people, have, through their representatives, been voting steadily for the construction of railways throughout Canada so as to open up the great Canadian West and every other part of this country. You, Mr. Speaker, and I, myself, have, in their names, voted railway subsidies by the million, by the hundreds of millions. We have assisted in the establishment of new pro-

vinces, in opening up new harbours, in developing everything that Canada now possesses; but these old counties in Quebec seem to have been overlooked. The families of these people are very large, as is usual in Quebec; they have eight, ten, fifteen children. The young men have to leave the country; the young girls have to do likewise, and you will find them today, after the instruction which they have received at the different colleges in Quebec, scattered throughout the continent of America. Thus, these are all good, hardy settlers who have been lost to Canada. They are the descendants of the pioneers; as woodsmen they are unsurpassed in Canada. Put them in the hardest and roughest part of this country and they will make good. Some of them are engaged now in developing a part of the Abitibi country; they are developing that part of the country between Moncton and Lévis over the great Transcontinental railway. These people made good fighters during the war, and one of the Victoria Crosses granted to the province of Quebec was granted to a boy who came from the Matapedia valley.

I am pleading in their names; I am asking this new Government; the new Minister of Railways to consider the position of these two counties and to see if he cannot bring about a state of affairs by which they will be given an opportunity of earning their living properly, of developing the country, and of bringing business to the Canadian National railways, because this is the only way in which the deficit of the country can be met. Two years ago, a million and a half dollars worth of business was handed over to the Canadian National by these two small railways, and if they had had the ordinary facilities, this could have been doubled. They have very little rolling stock; their locomotives are antiquated; their passenger service is not a credit to the country. The man in charge of the organization is putting up a big fight to carry on, but the people are not getting the service they should have. Running a railway skirting the shore of the Baie des Chaleurs is a difficult undertaking in the winter time, and in some seasons the railway service has been interrupted. This year fortunately, the winter has been exceptionally mild in Quebec, and trains have been running with the loss of scarcely a day. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) received a number of petitions which I handed him in your name, Sir, from the county of Gaspé, and I myself handed him petitions from my people of Bonaventure county asking that something should be done. If it is impossible at the present time to take over these railways in any shape or form, I should like that they be considered as forming part of the Canadian National railway system for purposes of transportation.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Why could they not form part of the Intercolonial?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Perhaps some arrangement could be made by which they could be treated as forming part of the Intercolonial. At present goods are shipped by the branch lines as far as Matapedia where these railways connect with the Intercolonial. There another freight charge is made, and I am informed that shippers suffer a handicap of $4 per thousand feet on lumber shipped through these counties.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has the Intercolonial railway a lower freight rate than any other road in Canada?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I will leave that question to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy). I do know that goods shipped from any of the parishes in these counties are waybilled to Matapedia and then put on the Intercolonial railway. At Bonaventure there is a magnificent timber limit known as the Robitaille limit. It is a magnificent bit of forest, and was once owned by Mr. Robitaille, who was at one time Receiver-General of Canada, having sat for many years in the House of Commons. Some years ago this limit was acquired by Senator Edwards and is now owned by Mr. Angus McLean, of Bathurst, New Brunswick. Mr. McLean, and others operated a mill in this district, and they declare that it is impossible for them to ship lumber profitably over these railways. They have therefore closed down the mill, throwing hundreds of men out of employment. The logs are cut in this area and rafted across the Baie des Chaleurs to Bathurst, a distance of twenty-five miles, where they are sawn and manufactured. The same thing occurs in the Nouvelle river district, where the timber is cut and rafted across the Baie to Dalhousie to be manufactured at Dalhousie. This is a great injustice, and it recalls the fact that Sir Oliver Mowat at one time started a campaign in Ontario to stop the export of timber from Ontario to Michigan, and the present Minister of Justice stopped the shipping of pulp-wood

cut in Crown Lands to the United States. It is unfair to these people that they should be deprived of their resources and their only means of livilihood, because the Government of Canada has not seen fit to give them proper railway communication. I have given these two instances to show what might be done, and I hope that the present Minister of Railways will take the matter seriously into consideration. The first important step is to see that these people are put on the same footing as if they were on the south shore of the Baie des Chaleurs and on the main line of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is it a fact that the Intercolonial railway has a lower freight rate than other railways?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I am unable to answer that question. Now, apart from the traffic arrangements, I would remind the House that last year the advertising department of the railways made a great feature of summering in the Baie des Chaleurs district. Those hon. members who have not visited that country in summer time have not seen one of the most enchanting places of Canada. The scene from Campbellton to Gaspé is unparalleled for beauty. Every year thousands of tourists go down the Baie des Chaleurs. Once they reach Matapedia they have to take other cars in order to get to their various destinations. If a Pullman car left Montreal three times a week for Gaspé I feel sure it would be full during the months of June and July. At present there is a Pullman running to Campbellton, but it is practically worthless, because passengers leave it at Matapedia and take the local railway going down the Baie, and the Pullman runs empty to Campbellton. The passenger service undoubtedly needs improvement. I have it on good authority that the Canadian National system could easily put on, at a nominal cost, a Pullman car for the service of these people; and also locomotives and cars to assist in local transportation.

5 p.m.

I have so far spoken principally in regard to the part of the railway that extends through my country, but as Mr. Speaker is unable to take part in this debate we unfortunately cannot have his views on the subject so far as his own constituency is concerned. A couple of days ago I received a visit from Mr. Dubuc, who is well known in Quebec, and is a considerable promoter of the pulp industry. He gave me certain facts and figures. The pulp mills with which he is concerned at Chandler have been closed for the last six or seven months, but they were opened up again last week, and they give employment at present to about 300 hands. This gentleman tells me that his idea is to use the port of Gaspé where the Dominion government at considerable cost, provided excellent accommodation. We have also a splendid railway to New Carlisle; and if this part of the road on the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway were provided with the necessary service, it would expedite the whole business through the port of Gaspé, and utilize the wharf, which is now practically idle. With adequate facilities he could handle 40,000 tons of pulp. 6,000 tons of sulphur, and 6,000 tons of coal per year, and he suggests that the Minister of Railways might easily overcome the deficit, so far as that portion of these railways is concerned, and at the same time develop business in that district, by providing at a nominal cost 50 dumping, coal, platform and box cars. This would secure some return for the money that has been invested in these railways, and it would give the people the service they should have.

I do not intend to go further into this question, but I think I have put the matter in a nutshell, as the Speaker of this House did last year when he spoke on the same subject. The Chairman of the Railway Commission reports, as a result of the investigation held at New Carlisle, that there is no branch connecting with the Intercolonial anywhere that could compare with these two branch railways from the standpoint of the importance of their traffic. I direct the attention of the minister to the fact that by chapter 16 of the Statutes of 1915 it was enacted by this Parliament that any branch lines not exceeding 200 miles in length could be either purchased or leased without agreement to purchase, and brought under the Government railway system. The following roads have been taken over under that legislation:

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway	36.05
International Railway of New Brunswick	111.3
St. Martins railway	28.73
Salisbury and Albert	44.77
York and Carleton railway	5.46
Moncton and Buctouche railway	29.93
Elgin and Havelock railway	26.11
Lotbiniere and Megantic railway	29.59
Cape Breton railway	30.64
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway	80.01

I would ask the minister as a favour, before he reaches a conclusion in this matter and admits the reasonableness of my

claim, to compare the value of the business carried on by the railways mentioned in this list with that of the two roads to which I have referred. I suggest also that he compare the total earnings, tonnage carried, and business generally of the two Gaspé railways with others in the province of Quebec, such as the Roberval and Saguenay, the Temiscouata, and the Quebec, Montreal and Southern. He will realize at once that the two Gaspé railways are among the best feeders that the Intercolonial have.

The people have waited patiently for many years for the taking of some action in this matter. They were told in the old days that these railways would form an important part of the Intercolonial. Mr. Robitaille, who represented the county in the early days, advocated the construction of this railway. I may say in passing that the grain grown by him on his farm at New Carlisle, Bonaventure county, took the gold medal for Canadian wheat at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867. The possibilities therefore of the soil of that district, are immense. We have a hardworking population; we have men of business calibre; we have large resources of sea and land, forest and mines. I leave the matter in the hands of the Minister of Railways, and sincerely hope that he will see his way clear to put these roads on a proper footing, thus increasing the business of the Government railways and assisting in the development of that section of the country.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Essex, Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, the notice of motion of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is for a copy of the correspondence with the proprietors of the Quebec Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western railways or other persons on their behalf. I find that two returns have already been brought down with regard to this matter, the first on May 16, 1913, and the second on May 27, 1919. Since the last-mentioned date there has been considerable correspondence with the owner of the lines referred to, Mr. Read, of London, with a view to purchase, but the government of the day did not see fit to conclude an agreement with him. As I understand it, these roads are not to-day paying carrying charges, and if they are included in the national system the rates applying to their tariff will be the through rates rather than the local rates, and their deficits will be increased.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is Mr. Read getting any subsidies on these roads?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I do not know, though I understand from what was said by the hon. member for Bonaventure that he received two subsidies, one from the Dominion and one from the provincial government. However, that is not the point. The hon. member for Bonaventure has stated the needs of the people living along the line of the roads mentioned, and it is the duty of this Parliament to assist them in every possible way. The hon. member contends that considerable development in traffic, both as to freight and passengers may be anticipated. The Dominion government have had this matter before them in the past. There is on file in the department a report of the Chief Railway Commissioner with regard to it, and a very favourable report it is. Representations have also been made by residents of the district, and I assure the hon. member for Bonaventure that when the time is opportune we will give the matter every consideration. I need hardly tell him, of course, that Bonaventure is not the only part of the country which is demanding increased railway facilities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says that he will "give the matter every consideration." May I ask him what he means? I did not understand the hon. member for Bonaventure to ask for the absorption of these lines by the national railways.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I understood him to say that one of three courses might be adopted: absorption by the national railways, loan of equipment, or lease. When I said that the matter would be given consideration, I meant that we would go into it very carefully and if it were found possible to relieve the disabilities which are stated to exist there, we would be glad to do what we could. In the meantime, the Government will have much pleasure in producing the papers required by my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PROPOSED ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Sainte-Marie.) (Translation): Moved:

That in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Government substitute electric power to that of coal over its railways, in such centres where this natural supply abounds.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention in this present discussion to point out to this House all the localities in the Dominion where electric power might possibly replace steam for traction purposes, the subject would be too vast; I shall content myself with showing the possibility of its profitable use in my province, where this natural resource has been distributed profusely by Providence. The idea of utilizing electric power for the railways is not a new one. It is a daily topic in almost every European country; and in many of which, trials have proved sufficiently satisfactory so as to permit me now to state, that nowhere has it been deemed advisable to return to the old steam power method, especially when the direct current system has been utilized: as for instance in Switzerland, on the St. Gothard road; in France on the Paris-Lyon-Mediterrané and Orleans-Midi systems; in Italy on two railway sections of 62 miles in length where the triphase current system was tried out with very good results. Finally in Germany, England, Australia, Africa, and in Spain, it is the question of the day; however the country in which electric power has been applied on a larger scale as a propelling force, is certainly that of our neighbour the United States. In fact, the electrification of the New York Central, the New York-New Haven and Hartford, the Butte-Anaconda railway, then, and more particularly, the electrification on a gigantic scale of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul railways are experiments of the highest importance, since they were crowned with success. Seeing that all the countries are adopting this system, why does not Canada immediately follow in their footsteps? When we are confronted, in our yearly Budget, with an enormous deficit amounting to one hundred million dollars and we hear it said in this House that this deficit will continue for a whole decade; when we know that we import from our neighbours all the anthracite which is consumed in Canada; when we are forced to submit to their unreasonable demands, to undergo the hardships and after-effects of their strikes, to put up with the fluctuations of their market; when we realize that in the central part of Canada we have not a trace of any coal deposit and that according to geological data, we shall never possess any, am I not free to cast my eyes towards this magnificent chain of mountains, the Laurentides, where I see these thousand and one streams silent at times and at others tumbling about them, as they proceed, precipitating their waters in the mighty St. Lawrence, itself uncontrolled and unharnessed, I wonder why we should not call upon this element to help solve, if not to entirely solve, our railway problem, at least to ameliorate our situation with regard to railways. Doubtless, the economic side of the question was given full consideration in Europe as well as in the United States, with regard to the electrification of railways. I might consider the merit of the question with special reference to humanity for large centers such as Montreal, Toronto, etc,—and it is on this high ground according to me that we should look to the discussion of this problem. This country possesses vast forest reserves, but we should not be led to expect and believe that they are inexhaustible. The late Senator W. C. Edwards, an authority on forestry, in a report to the Commission on Conservation, did not hesitate to declare that as things were going, timber industry in a few years, would be very insignificant in the Eastern parts of Canada. If we look up the report of the Forest Department for the Province of Quebec, we find a statement of Mr. Piché, forestry expert, declaring that the loss each year through the destruction of wood, both manufactured and unmanufactured and buildings, amounts to the enormous sum of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, losses which for the greater part are attributed to sparks emitted from steam locomotives. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this enormous loss is well worth while that the Government should find means to eradicate this form of conflagration. In large centers, such as Montreal, Toronto and others, the requirements of cleanliness, health, quiet and rest for the population have for ever so long tended toward the discarding of the steam locomotive. I would ask you, Sir, to follow me, for a few moments, in the great metropolis, to pass through the counties of Saint Henri, Hochelaga and Sainte Marie and there to stop and to look at these windows besmeared with soot and gases, closed the year around, these walls equally blackened and I would moreover invite you to enter with me into the workman's abode who, owing to the scarcity of lodgings, is forced to seek shelter in the vicinity of stations and railway yards, there you will find, as if imprisoned, his wife surrounded with a large family, washing the clothes and beginning over again each day the same work. Snow

itself reaches the ground in a filthy state. Hark! the locomotive all night long fills the air with its hooting and deafening noise, thus depriving the sick child, the worn out spouse and the husband exhausted by his daily toils, from their legitimate and beneficial sleep. And we, the representatives of the Metropolis, would be deprived of the privilege to harness this powerful agent, the St. Lawrence river, so as to furnish us the necessary power to electrify all the railway systems which are in operation on the Montreal island. I feel certain that if such an advantage were offered to New York, Paris or London, this change would have long ago taken place. The first condition required for the carrying out of such an undertaking, is to ascertain if we have in this country water power in sufficient quantity and capable of being utilized. This is perhaps the point in my argument which is the most easily demonstrated. If we examine the report of the Commission on Waterways for the Province of Quebec we notice that the north shore of the St. Lawrence is specially endowed with water powers. But first of all we have the St. Lawrence which has a potential energy estimated at 2,500,000 horsepower. On the south shore, there is the Richelieu river, a tributary whose rapids at St. John, Chambly and Saint Ours can develop 40,000 horsepower. Flowing past Hull to the city of Montreal we find the Ottawa river with its tributaries, the Quinze river, the Gatineau, the Liévre, the Little Nation, the North, the Red and the Kipawa rivers whose united waterpower is calculated to be 481,000 horsepower. From Montreal down on the north shore to the St. Maurice river are to be found the tributaries of l'Achigan, l'Assomption, the river du Loup, the Maskinongé and the Ouareau whose total waterpower amounts to 20,500 horse-power. The Saint Maurice river itself which supplies at present 365,000 horse-power can be regulated so as to develop 800,000 horse-power. Following the north shore down from the St. Maurice river to the Saguenay river, are the tributaries of the Batiscan, Sainte Anne de la Perade, Jacques Cartier, Montmorency and Saint Anne de Beaupré which altogether can develop 30,000 horse-power. The Saguenay basin alone with its gigantic tributaries, the Grande Décharge, the Péribonka, the Mistassini rivers, mentioning but the most important ones, can develop 800,000 horse-power. Continuing along the north shore of the St. Lawrence from the Saguenay to the Hamilton river are the Sainte Marguerite, the rivière aux Outardes, the Escoumains whose united courses can be made to yield 550,000 horse-power.

The Hamilton river alone can develop 506,000 horse-power; we could also add to it two other water-powers in its vicinity, which are capable of developing 50,000 horse-power. On the watershed of James bay, we come across the Harricana, Nottaway, Bell and Rupert rivers whose combined water-powers can develop 753,700 horse-power. Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that this part of my argument has been clearly proved. There exists in Canada, on the St. Lawrence river and along the north shore, within the province of Quebec, an abundance of waterpower well capable of being developed.

Let us compare the water powers of which I have just given the potential energy, with the hydraulic forces utilized by the United States for the electrification of their magnificent Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul system; this railway has a total energy of 200,000 horse-power supplied by various separate plants some of which have no more than 4,000 horsepower, others varying as follows: 10,000 horse-power, 15,000 horse-power, 30,000 horse-power, and 80,000 horse-power. Therefore with 200,000 horsepower the Americans have found it possible to electrify the whole of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway system, 440 miles in length, and to maintain a voltage of 100,000 volts on the main line with substations which step down the voltage to 3,000 volts so as to distribute it to the transmission lines supplying the trains on their run.

It might perhaps seem venturesome for a young country like ours, almost ruined through its unlimited participation in the last war, to be the first to undertake this experiment, but when we behold France, which alone bore up with the greatest share of the burden of the war, and whose financial state is probably as bad as ours, undertaking the electrification of its vast Paris - Lyon - Méditerranée, Orleans - Midi systems, when we see the United States obtaining the most practical results by the electrification of their magnificent Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul system, first of all on a 440 miles run, but which has since been extended to 655 miles, when we have under our eyes the report of the Butte, Anaconda Pacific Railway which, for one year's operation, all expenses included, on a capital of $1,200,000 effects a saving of

$242,300, I say, Mr. Speaker, that what can be accomplished in the United States, the good results thus obtained by our neighbours can well be duplicated over here and that we should have no fear of ridicule in tackling the problem.

For us, representatives of the people in Parliament, our first duty calls forth the development and conservation of our natural resources for the welfare of Canada. According to an American engineer, Mr. Spencer, there exists between lake St. Francis and the foot of the Lachine canal about 2,000,000 horse-power undeveloped. It takes, approximately, two pounds of coal to produce one horse-power per hour, we are therefore losing each day 30,000 tons of coal. Let us suppose that it is bituminous coal, and the cost agrees with the price laid down in the railway statistics for the year ending on the 31st December, 1920, namely $6.47 per ton, we are consequently daily losing, owing to the fact that these 2,000,000 horse-power are undeveloped, the sum of $194,700, in other words, $50,565,500 per year.

I am aware that the operating of our railways by electricity, would not be very practical were we left to operate them solely from their earnings, having due regard to the smallness of our population and to the undeveloped state of our trade activities for the time being; however, seeing we have the option to utilize the direct current system with central power-houses and substations, allowing the withdrawal at each substation of a sufficient amount of current for lighting purposes, heating and for the needs of industry, I believe, we have in this a very useful complement to the electrification of our railways. Take for example the yearly cost of heating, in Montreal. On an average, six or seven tons of anthracite are consumed yearly in each home, which amounts up to 700,000 tons of coal per year. I suppose that the consumer pays $16 per ton, this gives us, for the 700,000 tons, a total of $11,200,000 per year, simply for the heating. I therefore contend that if it were possible to develop electricity at a low cost, all the oil lamps would vanish from every home, all would cancel their American coal orders and adopt this system absolutely hygienic and far more effective—the electric system—and moreover in large centres such as Montreal and others, it would allow the public to do away with gas-meters which are as detrimental to their purse as to their health.

[Mr. Deslauriers.]

In order to ensure the success of the plan it is evident that both private interests and companies should not be considered. My past experience with them, forces me to make this statement; at present the companies, in Montreal, which supply electricity for the purposes of lighting and heating, sell the kilowatt-hour at one and a half cent, this means that they charge $128 for what actually cost them $15 or one-fifth of a cent per kilowatt-hour. As an explanation of these business methods, I might point out that in their reports there are to be found numerous misleading entries included in their outlays, and much overhead expenditure in connection with the improvement and harnessing of water courses. I wish to say that if the Government utilized all of the 2,000,000 h.p. on the St. Lawrence river, it could sell electricity at such a low price that the whole public would benefit by it; what we, at present, pay $128 for, we could buy for $50 and we would only be paying a fraction of a cent per kilowatt-hour; this would permit us to make use freely of electricity. The main point in an electrification system is the high cost of the initial outlay which includes the dams, causeways, electrical appliances, transmission lines, the construction of central power plants, sub-stations, etc. Take for instance the Loutre dam, the largest dam in the world today, larger than that of the Nile and Panama, having a capacity of sixty billion cubic feet of water at the disposal of the industries which are established below the dam. These industries pay the interest, plus a certain sum to the sinking fund, on the capital invested and held by the province of Quebec, they moreover, pay a thirty-five cent tax per horse-power, I therefore state that if we followed this example, given the same conditions, we would also have a large number of industries establishing themselves below these dams, in our own country, thus bringing in revenues to the province and conserving our natural resources. I believe we should without any hesitation follow the advice of Mr. Mauduit, a French engineer, who having had some experience in the operations of these systems, knows what type of electric locomotive has given the best results in the United States; and is also in a position to know what system has proved the best, and this, through his serious study of the management and operation of the Chicago-Milwaukee and St. Paul system.

He states that this system is the most practical, safe and economical. If the cost of equipping the central power houses and the sub-stations is very high, the operating of the large railways by the direct current system is so economic, that we have in it, I believe, a reasonable compensation. The electric locomotive, in fact, gives such effective results that it is out of the question to compare it with the efficiency of a steam locomotive. Moreover, it is lighter and starts with no wheel slippage, has a more effective brakeage, a greater steadiness of pull easily regulated, and highly thought of for hilly and mountainous grades. While the steam locomotive has on the average a normal pull of 31,112 pounds, the electric locomotive has a normal pull of 65,000 pounds and more, which is steady on grades of 2 per cent, a feat which cannot be accomplished by the steam locomotive. Our neighbours have further established the proof of the efficiency of the electric locomotive when, on their great Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul system they have replaced 112 steam locomotives by 45 electric locomotives. The decrease in the number of locomotives brings up the question of salaries and hands. A trainman, I believe, receives $10.85 per day. Therefore, the fact of decreasing the number of locomotives entails also a reduction in our expenses in reference to salaries.

Comparing the electric locomotive with that of the steam locomotive of equal horsepower, the former weighs thirty to thirty-five per cent less and its weight is distributed on a number of driving axles distant from one another by seven or eight feet, while the steam locomotive carries its weight in one place; this means that in the construction of roads and bridges, the electric locomotive, owing to the distribution of its weight, enjoys an economic advantage denied to the steam locomotive. The strength in construction of the electric locomotive allows it to run a long time without having to be cleaned, inspected or repaired. This is not the case of the steam locomotive, for after having run one hundred or one hundred and fifty miles we have to see to the cleaning, inspection and most of the time to fairly costly repairs. This necessitates an outlay for equipment, inspection and repair shops, all of which are a cause of considerable expense, while we do not need any of these with the electric locomotive.

As we are obliged to import coal for the steam locomotives, the question of returns which are 6 per cent, and at the most 8 per cent, according to the Canadian Pacific, is worthy of consideration. This great waste is due to steam under pressure, to stoppages, either for traffic, coal or water, or again for the meeting of trains; whilst the electric locomotive gives a maximum yield, particularly when its source of energy is drawn from the water powers along the line, as would be the case in the province of Quebec.

The ordinary price of an electric locomotive varies to-day from $130,000 to $140,000. Formerly, it was $60,000. But, as I said previously, the electric locomotive being worth two or three steam locomotives, it is more economical to purchase an electric locomotive. The Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul railway, has invested a capital of $12,750,000 for the electrification of its 440-mile system, which compares with the distance from Ottawa to St. John, or Ottawa to New York, but, so as to have the actual cost, it is in order to deduct therefrom the actual value of the 112 steam locomotives which have been replaced by electric locomotives and which are laid down at a price much below their value, though they are still in use in other parts of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when I think that our coal resources, at the extremities of the Dominion, are fast being exhausted, because the more we utilize them, the less there is left of them; when I think that these coal resources which we so badly need for our metallurgic industry are getting exhausted; while the more we utilize our water powers, the smaller the waste; when I know that the United States, at each Congress, at each conference, and in both their houses, recommend that their natural resources be used economically; when I know that the Canadian Pacific, almost concluded a contract with the Shawinigan Power, a couple of years ago, for the electrification of its Montreal-Quebec system, then I think that, under the circumstances, this debate is not ill-timed.

Knowing, as we do, that the electric locomotive can overcome all obstacles and even take advantage of them, can ascend the mountain grades, as well as descend them; knowing, as we do, that the electric locomotive may reach points which until now it has been impossible to utilize for the starting and developing of new industries; knowing, as we do, that the electric locomotive makes it possible to operate a railway system in a rolling, mountainous country, at very low cost, on account of the

steadiness of its pull; knowing, as we do, that this locomotive can face a storm, can brave the severest cold weather without itself being affected; knowing, as we do, that it can easily haul heavy trains up steep grades; knowing, as we do, that, in the Rocky mountains, Americans are using the electric locomotive to pull their steam locomotives out of the snow banks; knowing all this, I do not think it reasonable to compare it to the dirty locomotive which besmears everything in its way, which is powerless in difficult roads, is helpless against a storm, is stifling in a subway, and at times even incendiary.

When we know that the difference in cost, for electric power, for the same distance, the same work, during the same time, is in proportion of 88 to 200 in favour of the electric locomotive, that the cost of repairs is 8 to 18 in favour of the electric locomotive, I wonder why the St. Maurice Valley railway which has 800,000 horsepower at its disposal, is not electrified. I wonder why all the railway systems which run on the island of Montreal are not electrified by this time; I wonder why the Government railway systems, from Montreal to Ottawa, are not electrified; I wonder why an electric railway should not be built to the Gaspé peninsula, in that mountainous district where an electric locomotive would be so useful and so advantageous in the development of our mining resources; I wonder why an electric railway should not be built to the coast of Labrador thus providing an outlet for the beautiful and immense forest resources we own there.

In concluding, I feel confident that the present Government will always, in directing its future policy, bear in mind a truly national and patriotic spirit, and that it will avoid, contrary to what has been done in the past, conceding water-powers like those of the "Cèdres" to the Aluminium Electric company of Massena, New York, which disregards each year the clauses of its contract, pays nothing to the province and withdraws yearly from the St. Lawrence 65,000 horse-power. I hope that this Government and the provinces will have sufficient national pride so as not to advertise themselves in the future as pawn-shops in order to dispose of our national resources in the interest of private companies and strangers. I have confidence that the Government will always remain national so as not to forget this ever-living motto of our regretted grand leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Canada first, second and last.

[Mr. Deslauriers.]

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, for a moment I want to refer to a matter that concerns the whole House. I am speaking to-night, as I did the other day, from this centre line as between the Progressives and the official Opposition, so that I may be heard all over the Chamber, and I would make this suggestion to the House, and especially to the leader of the House whom I see in his place, that henceforth any one who wishes to address the House and to be heard all over should have the privilege of coming to the centre—

Mr. McMASTER: That does not fill the bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (York):—and that ministers, when their estimates are up, should always occupy the centre seats in the front row opposite. In that way everybody could hear, and it would improve the debate. I am throwing out that suggestion to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the leader of the House, so that after this we can try and get those who wish to be heard—and I wish to be heard to-night; I have no trouble in maying myself heard—to come to the centre. The electrician also has told me that with very little trouble he could attach a light to the two centre desks. I think if my suggestion were adopted the debates would be improved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Without wishing to interrupt the hon. member I might say that although the rule is that an hon. member when speaking should address the House from his own seat, yet in view of the poor acoustics of the Chamber I shall not, if such is the judgment of the whole House, apply that rule against any hon. member who would like to speak from the centre of the Chamber in order to be heard.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am very glad to hear you say that, Mr. Speaker. I would expect that from you, having regard to your knowledge of the House. I also speak from my knowledge of the House. Only to-night one of the members of the Hansard staff approached me and said, "Mr. Maclean, would you mind speaking from the

centre of the House so that we can hear you better?" I said, "Yes, I have been considering that." I hope that some arrangement will be made so that the two seats here and on the other side can be used by hon. gentlemen and by ministers when their estimates are going through. Everyone in the Chamber would then be able to hear, and the debates would be improved.

For a few moments I want to refer to the motion that has been introduced by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) in favour of the electrification of the railways of Canada. When he raised that question this afternoon he raised the most important question in connection with transportation that has ever come up in this country, and I am especially pleased to see the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) here to-night. I hope that he will not only listen to the discussion, but take part in the debate.

I have been an advocate of the public ownership of railways, for years and years, and the basis of public ownership of our railways is their electrification. Now that the electrification of the railways is coming, I hope that the State will have control over it. Not only is that the view here in Canada, but the President of the United States, amid all his duties and responsibilities, and especially the responsibility that was his when the new treaty was made between the powers in the direction of disarmament, took occasion to make a very important deliverance to the people of the United States in regard to transportation. He spoke in favour of the electrification of the railways, and he based his deliverance on the report of the International Joint Commission that was appointed by the United States and by Canada to deal with this very question and other similar ones. The International Joint Commission made a special report to Congress and to this Parliament, and in that report, which is now in the hands of hon. members, they come out unitedly in favour of the development of the St. Lawrence waterways, and in connection with that development, the development of water-power for transportation, a subject in which hon. gentlemen to my left are especially interested. The President of the United States within the last three months has practically said that there is no solution of the transportation problem as far as he could see except in two directions, and his proposal was that we must develop the waterways of the St. Lawrence, and develop them not only as waterways so as to allow ocean steamships to get right up to lake Superior, but develop them also for water-power, for the electrification of the railways.

The hon. member for St. Mary spoke in support of his resolution in French this afternoon, and although I did not get all of what he said, I think I understand fairly well what his argument was. He said that the province of Quebec has probably the greatest store of water-powers in her rivers of any portion of Canada. I could not quite make out though whether the hon. member was making the argument I am making to-night, that these powers should be developed by the State for the use of our own railways; and when I speak of the railway question I have only to repeat what I said in this House two weeks ago on that question, that the corporation-owned railways of the United States have absolutely failed in their mission. They have broken down; they are practically all hamstrung to-day, and in bad financial condition. Their champions, and they have several, have said in the prominent American newspapers and magazines in the last few weeks that the only salvation for the American railroads lies in their electrification, and, that before that can be done the two hundred company-owned lines in the United States must be consolidated into ten or twelve systems. If that is done, and the railways are electrified, there may be some hope for the American roads, and still more hope if the magnificent waterways we have in connection with the St. Lawrence are developed for the transportation of steamships and for the generation of power.

There is one man in Canada who, like Joseph in Egypt, saw what was coming. Joseph had divine inspiration behind him, but there is a man in Canada to-day who had the foresight of Joseph, and who saw that the development of electrical energy was to be his main mission in life, and Sir Adam Beck to-day has this to his credit: He is the one man who foresaw what was coming, and he had the hardihood—and it is said to be a crime that he is guilty of—to see that the great development of water-power energy by the public would go a long way toward the settlement of the transportation problem. And Adam Beck has this further achievement to his credit, that he has the greatest public development of water-power in the world at Chippawa and Niagara. He has only two of his units working to-day, but each is producing 55,000 horse-power.

The two generators were run the other day up to 120,000 horse-power. Not only has he these generators but he has eight others ready to install when the proposed development is completed. The progressive section of the people of Ontario, who represent the municipalities there, are lining up behind this movement. They are even putting mortgages on their property to promote these great developments of horse-power for the purpose of improving transportation. As I said earlier, before the year is over Sir Adam Beck will have developed 600,000 horse-power; and I believe that ultimately he will even have a million horse-power. And yet at the inception of the Chippawa plant Sir Adam was told that he was a crazy man. Why there will ultimately be an income of $10,000,000 from the horse-power generated on the Niagara and Chippawa rivers. The other day Sir Adam asked the Progressive party in this House to go up some Saturday and see the plant at Chippawa and Niagara, and inspect what is being done there in the way of developing electric energy for the railroads of Canada. I want to tell the Prime Minister now that if he wishes to be up-to-date he must have in his Government in the future a Minister of Power. I do not say go to Adam Beck and secure him for that office; although he may be looking for a position before long if we are to judge what is going on in the legislature of Ontario. In Sir Adam Beck we have a man like Joseph of Egypt; he had the force and capacity to go and induce the municipalities to stand behind him and to give him the credit in order to generate this power. It is this very power, in connection with which my hon. friend (Mr. Deslauriers) moved his resolution this afternoon, that will be the salvation of the country as far as transportation is concerned. I hope the leader of the Government will pay some attention to what I am saying. I repeat that the first man he ought to get is a man like Sir Adam Beck in connection with the administration of our national railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Do you want to kill us?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I certainly do not want to kill you. Here are our members from Quebec speaking. Our friends there are afraid—

Mr. BUREAU: Not a Frenchman but the French member for Three Rivers.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): My friend has a splendid electrical development in his constituency at Three Rivers, but the people do not own it.

Mr. BUREAU: No, but they are making money through it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In that case you ought to be proud of it. Unfortunately our friends in Quebec do not want to hear what Ontario is doing although the latter is carrying out this development in the public interest. In the province of Quebec they think that work can only be done by private companies. If I understood the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Deslauriers) this afternoon, he sees what is coming; he hears the sound of the "going in the mulberry trees," and that these private companies are getting ready to sell out and turn their enterprises over to the Government. My suggestion to the Prime Minister is that he should get as soon as he can a good man to act as chairman of the National Railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, Sir Joseph Flavelle.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Sir Joseph Flavelle is acting in that capacity at the present time, but I understand the position may be vacated soon. The Government must get a man as chairman of the national railways who possesses the capacity not only to bring about the generation of power but to go ahead and buy out these companies. Perhaps he can buy out the Montreal power companies and then it will be possible to proceed with the electrification of the railroads of Canada. If President Harding's scheme is carried out in connection with the waterways in the St. Lawrence and the generation of the electrical energy there; if Adam Beck is able to develop his million horse-power, as I think he will, at Niagara; if some of the available water-power is developed on the Ottawa here; if water-power is developed by Adam Beck also on lake Superior and on the Abitibi—taking all these developments together, and including in them the energy to be derived from the Montreal power scheme, there will be enough power available to drive every train that is run on the Canadian railroads from the city of Quebec right up to lake Superior and along the front of our country to Windsor. That power is the cheapest in the world; it will solve the question of cheap motive power for our railways. Not only that, but it will render us independent of the coal owners of the United States upon whom we are now dependent for our coal and

for the fuel for our railways. Why we are sending millions of dollars every year to the United States for the purchase of coal to supply motive power for our Canadian railways. The province of Ontario has started in the right direction by making this a question of public ownership. The right solution of the transportation problem in America is going to result from this power development. I am not giving my own view but am simply citing the opinion of men who have studied this question—from the President of the United States down to even the champions of private ownership—when I say that there is no solution of the problem of transportation except through the electrification of the railroads.

The hon. member who brought up this resolution this afternoon has done a public service in directing our attention to it, but he did not handle the question in the way in which I would have handled it because I maintain that this power must be owned by the people. We are saying the same thing in Ontario to-day and we have made a great success of power development. And it is because of that success that we hear so much opposition to it in Montreal. I have nothing to say against our friends in Montreal; but for some reason or other all, or at least the main part, of the opposition to what has been done in Ontario comes from outside that province. A great deal of it emanates from the power trust —I will not call them the power ring— that is centered in Montreal. My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) is a member of the Government. If the only view he has about the public ownership of power development is that it is a dangerous thing in connection with transportation in this country he cannot very well say that he is a Liberal or even a Progressive: he is an old-timer, he is a "die-hard," he has joined the party of the "die-hards."

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask my hon. friend what party he has joined?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have not joined the "die hards" but the public ownership party. I think my hon. friend is with the "die hards."

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend's companions are far worse than the "die hards."

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Well, our friends the farmers have grasped that solution of the transportation problem to which I have alluded. At the same time I give the province of Quebec credit for what it has done. Down at Three Rivers and on the lower St. Lawrence there has been some fine water-power development. Let me remind hon. members—I think I referred to it the other day in connection with this water-power question—that some years ago a very innocent bill was introduced into this House and into the Railway Committee and very nearly got through. That innocent bill went in this direction: That all the water-power developed at Cornwall and on the Long Sault, on the St. Lawrence river, was to be given to the greatest metal trust in the United States, the Aluminum Trust. They very nearly got all those water-powers that President Harding now says ought to be used for the electrification of their railroads over there. However, the plan did not succeed because some of us members in the House stopped it. So there is a free field open now for water-power development. The example has been set by the province of Ontario; and soon I hope there will be one million horse-power available for motive power for our railways and for the benefit of the people of the province.

As I said when the railway question was under discussion the other night, I think I know what the C.P.R. desire more than anything else. While they have denounced, or somebody has denounced, Adam Beck and his radials in Ontario, nobody would be so glad to get the Sir Adam Beck radials and water powers as the Canadian Pacific railway. I give them credit for that. We are going to keep that water power for the Canadian Pacific Railway, if they come to us as a customer, but we do not want them to get control of those powers. Just wait and see how soon some big trust will reach out, on the lines of the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Deslauriers), and endeavour to grab the water powers now centered in the power companies in Monteral. Perhaps the Canadian Pacific Railway would administer them as well as they could administer many other things, and I give them credit for that. But the Canadian Pacific Railway is strong enough as a transportation company in this country, and I should not like to see it get this water power. I think the Government should get those powers, and have for a minister a man with foresight to handle the proposition. All the Dominion has to do is to get into the province of Quebec. There are many rivers there that have not been taken over, and if they can get two or three of those rivers, such as

the hon. gentleman spoke of this afternoon, they can show how cheaply water power can be developed as a public proposition, and they will be able to generate all the power required down there at a fair price. I do not want to see the investors lose a cent, and I do not want to see them use the energy they have to put up the transportable charges.

When I spoke of transportation in connection with waterways, I told the story of the barrel of herring that was obtained by a United States merchant in the Alaska fisheries. When these herring came to be sold in the eastern States the charge was $5 a barrel, while the products of the fisheries of Scotland were brought by some steamship to New York for 50 cents a barrel. That is the difference between transportation by rail and transportation by water, and when they have reduced the cost of the development of water power there will be almost a like reduction in freight charges. I want to tell my Progressive friends that they are improving transportation, that there will be a great improvement in the future and that they are entitled to the benefit of it. A man cannot succeed in farming under the present rates unless the transportation charges are reduced. Electrification of the energy for the railways, and waterways as competitors of the railways, will do a lot, and the way to get the full benefit of electrical energy for transportation in this country will be by the state owning the water powers. Especially will it be the duty of the Minister of Railways, in his reconstruction of the National Railways, to select a chairman who will make it his main business to study the water power question, and see where he can get his power for the lowering of transportation charges.

In Ontario the development of our electrical energies for transportation and for industrial purposes, and most of all for improving life on the farm, would be of immense benefit. The Hydro-Electric of Ontario is distributing electrical energy for all purposes through the farms. They have broadened their policy, they are going to reduce prices and subsidize the lines which will distribute the electrical energy. It will be a great source of wealth and strength to the people of Ontario to have that development, and we are going on with it. We start in the right way when we take it up as a public ownership proposition. Transportation must be a public ownership proposition. Everybody sees that it has to come, and I hope the Minister of Railways will announce that he is going ahead with a system of consolidation, so as to put the railways in a position to use this electrical energy. When we get that announcement we will know that the country is prepared to move ahead.

While I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman speak this afternoon, and beg to express my appreciation of his effort in drawing public attention to the question, I want to see that effort, as far as this House is concerned, realized on the lines of public ownership, particularly in the way of getting a chairman of the National Railways who will have two main duties. His first duty will be to assist in the real consolidation of our railways and provide electrical energy, so that we will be independent of our neighbours in the United States. They have been good friends to us, but they cut us off from our supplies from time to time. The President of the United States has said that he is for the development of waterways in order to lower freight rates. We have done the same thing, and made a success of it, and I hope there will be no more talk in this Parliament or in the legislature except on the lines of public ownership.

I want to speak of the West. I have been reading for a great many years about the West, and the information I have—and I think the members from the West will confirm it—is that there is enough power in the Saskatchewan river, the Red river, the Assiniboine and other rivers, to run every train, and to move every bushel of wheat, even when there will be five times the number of farmers they have on the prairies, by electrical energy instead of coal. Of course they have coal mines in the West, but that coal is dear, and then there is a better way to use the coal at all seasons of the year than by the present method.

The coal can be burned at the mine and they can generate electrical energy, and instead of shovelling coal and loading it up, they can burn it right down in the mine, as they say, and convert it into electrical energy. That energy has the one supreme quality that nothing else in the world has; it transports itself along the wire, travels itself and delivers itself, wherever it is wanted. There is no trouble about that. I forget how much of the energy of our railways is devoted to carrying their own coal, but it is a large proportion. The electrical energy has this marvellous quality. It travels along the wire and delivers itself wherever it is

wanted, right into the engine, or it can deliver itself into an individual motor in a car. I was glad to hear the hon. member speak this afternoon in favour of development of electrical energy as a motive power in this country. He is a supporter of the Government, and after he has made that statement, I think the Government will listen to the suggestion I have made, that is to put a chairman at the head of the National Railways who will make it his business to develop two or three water-powers at cost price, and see at what price he can buy water-powers from the companies already possessed of them.

When the Minister of Railways commences his consolidation of the railways—and I hope he will begin in Ontario and make a demonstration there—I trust he will be ready to take all the power that the Hydro Electric system of Ontario will be prepared to deliver in almost a few days. To show how successful Adam Beck's system is, let me state that three of the power systems that have been taken from private companies are comparatively so inferior to the modern development that Sir Adam Beck has at Chippawa, that he will scrap those three great plants at Niagara Falls. That shows what progress is being made along that line. The Toronto Power Company, the Ontario Electrical Development Company, the big company that was bought over from the private interests in Buffalo, that owned it, and the other power company at Hamilton, which is ready to sell and which has fixed its price, will all have to be scrapped because the development of electrical power by the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission has been so successful.

This commission has made a great success of the development of electrical energy in the interest of Ontario; it has made a success of the Toronto Street Railway. I wish hon. gentlemen who criticise street railway systems would visit Toronto and see the system of street railways owned by that city. If the city authorities are charging the people six cents for transportation, it must be remembered that they are spending a great deal of money on the equipment. It is a fine example of a publicly-owned transportation system operated by electrical energy, owned by the people, and a system the purpose of which is not primarily to make profits, but to give service.

Who has brought that about? It is not private companies that have made this great demonstration to the world. The municipalities of Ontario have given this example, and up to date they have not lost a dollar in this connection. People say: "Adam Beck has made this and that mistake; he has exceeded his estimate," and his great critic is the Drury government. But when a government begins to criticise another organization for extravagance or carelessness, let me ask how their estimates compare with those of Sir Adam Beck? He has kept well within his estimates and he has made good. The people who are behind him have not lost a cent, and there has not been any graft in connection with the development of this power. The power is there; the exhibition of it is there, and you can see it every day now. Let the new Minister of Railways start to electrify the railways at once with all the power that he can get from the Ontario system, and let him begin to move cars from Niagara to the Detroit river, and from Niagara through Toronto where most of the traffic is. We have there two great National roads, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern. We can also sell some electrical power to the Canadian Pacific if they want it. I believe the Canadian Pacific are willing to buy power; they are simply waiting to buy power for the electrification of their railways. They hope to buy it from companies in Montreal, and I should like to see them get it there; but no matter who gets the power, the Government must take control of the electrification of railways and must fix the price.

I have almost finished my remarks, but I come back to the same statement I made the other day in regard to transportation. I have been in this House long enough to see freight rates reduced time after time by the Railway Commission that we established in this country, and every time a dollar was taken off railway freight rates in the moving of our crops, that dollar was put on by the steamship ring that controls transportation on the Atlantic. That cannot be done when the people own the transportation facilities, and therein lies the protection of the public. When the government of the United States—and this is what private transportation companies are afraid of—join, as I hope they will gladly join, with the present Government in developing electrical energy on the St. Lawrence river right in front of us and in two or three other places where power can be generated, we shall have the railway companies of the United States and of Canada in the hands of the people. This will give

us a better lever for controlling freight rates than any commission or anything of the kind. We will furnish power to move your trains, provided you make the freight rates reasonable. There is the real problem of transportation in this country, and the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) pointed it out to-night. I have studied this problem, and I hope we shall hear more to-night in favour of electrification of the railways of Canada, based on public control, and best of all, if it can be effected, based on public ownership of the sources of electrical energy. If we have that, we shall make real progress towards lower freight charges in this country.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St. Henri): Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to speak to the resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers). This question may be viewed from many angles. I think the whole House has been well informed about the matter from a technical point of view; but the question may be looked at from the point of view of local interests. For instance, every hon. member knows my constituency, Westmount-St. Henri, which is divided into two big portions, one on the upper level, namely, Westmount, and the other on the plains, the two wards of St. Henri and St. Cunegonde. Hon. members who have travelled through the province of Quebec via the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern, or the Central Vermont, have passed through those centres, and they know how the population is suffering as a result of that traffic, and from the smoke which spoils everything, and is even injurious to human life.

This resolution must also be considered from a general point of view as far as public health and civic progress are concerned. In Montreal, there are electrical locomotives leaving the Canadian National railway station, and in all parts of the United States electrical locomotives are being used with great success. No doubt, the problem can be easily solved by the electrification of locomotives; the population, especially in urban centres, will not be inconvenienced by the dense smoke, and great benefit will ensue in connection with public health and child welfare if this resolution is adopted by the House.

I understand that the Government is obliged to say that it is shouldering very large expenses; but if this discussion has the result of inducing the Government to do its utmost to remedy the situation, the populations of the large urban centres will benefit thereby. I remember reading that Max Hopkins used to say, when he was looking at a locomotive, "I take off my hat to it." If fuel locomotives are replaced by electrical locomotives when trains are passing through cities, the people will continue to practise that maxim by raising their hats to this new electrification of progress.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways): The thanks of the House are due to the member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) for bringing this resolution to its attention. He has displayed a keen interest in the question of the electrification of our railroads, which is one of great moment to the people of the country. The member for South York (Mr. Maclean) also made an interesting contribution to the debate, although, perhaps, he discussed the matter from a different angle from that of my hon. friend from Montreal. Those of us who come from Ontario, however, and who know that the hon. member for South York was one of the pioneers in the advocacy of the electrical development of our railways, and all that goes to make for the successful development of eletrical energy in our province, feel sure that those who have the matter in charge will give the hon. member's views every consideration. I have taken this matter up with the Board of Directors and the Board of Management of the Railways, who are keenly alive to the situation and know what is being done not only in this country but also on the other side. They are aware that the New York Central, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway, and many other roads on the other side, use electrical energy, but they feel that in Canada the change at present would entail a very large expenditure, which the result of investigations that have been made is hardly conclusive enough to warrant. It is considered, therefore, that it would be better, for the present at any rate, to defer action in the matter. Probably all that my hon. friend from St. Mary had in mind was just to bring the matter to the attention of Parliament, and I know that he will feel satisfied when I tell him that everything in connection with the development of electrical energy is being closely watched by the Board of Management of the Railways. They are not only interested in the question, but are also sympathetic, and when the right time comes they will do their part. In the meantime I would suggest to my hon. friend, if it meets with his approval, now that we have

had a discussion of the subject, that he withdraw his resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to withdraw the resolution?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might direct the attention of the House to the fact that, at first sight, the resolution does not seem to be in order. It reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should take steps to electrify the Canadian Government railways on all lines where electric power is available.

Reading it a second time, however, I find that it contains only a pious wish, on the part of the hon. member who moves it, that the Government should take certain action in respect to the matter he brings before the House. The hon. member invites the Government to make an investigation; that, undoubtedly, is what is meant by "taking steps." Section 54 of the British North America Act reads:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill, for the Appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any Tax or Impost, to any Purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by Message of the Governor General in the session in which such Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill is proposed.

I must remind hon. members on both sides of the House that when a resolution is adopted it is binding on the Government; and any resolution that calls for the expenditure of public moneys must originate with the Government. In the present instance, the resolution is simply a request that the Government should investigate the matter in question. For that reason I have allowed the discussion, which otherwise would not have been in order.

Motion withdrawn.

TERMINAL FACILITIES AT ST. JOHN, N.B.

RESOLUTION NOT IN ORDER

On the Order:

Mr. CALDWELL:

That in the opinion of this House, terminal facilities should be provided by the Government of Canada at the port of St. John, New Brunswick, in the shape of a frost proof warehouse, to enable Canadian grown potatoes to be shipped during the entire year from a Canadian port.

Mr. CALDWELL: Stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the hon. member does not propose to proceed with his resolution, I would ask that he amend it in conformity with the section of the British North America Act which I have just read. If the resolution were adopted as it stands, it would be binding on the Government, as it calls for the expenditure of public money. The hon. member may bring it forward at another sitting of the House in an amended form.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917 AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. JAMES S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. 18, to repeal the Military Service Act, 1917. He said:

I shall not say much on this motion. I take it that the Military Service Act was very fully discussed on almost every political platform in the country. I understand that it is a matter of legal dispute as to whether or not the act is still operative or whether it became void automatically with the cessation of the war. If it is dead, it seems to me that the least we can do is to give it decent burial. The war has ended, and we are glad to think that the circumstances which may or may not have made necessary the passing of the Military Service Act no longer exist. I therefore ask that that act be repealed.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If the Military Service Act were still in operation the Government would be only too glad to accept the hon. member's suggestion and repeal it. But the act has ceased for some time past to be operative, and there is therefore, in the opinion of the Government, no need for the proposed legislation. My hon. friend has said that it is a matter of legal dispute whether or not the act is still in force. I can, I think, give my hon. friend assurance on that point which will be satisfactory to him and to the House. I have the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, agreed to by the Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Gisborne. There is no doubt whatever in the minds of authorities who advise the Government on legal matters, as to the exact position of this legislation. The opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice is as follows:

The Military Service Act, Chapter 19 of 1917, was passed, as the recitals show, for the single purpose of enabling the Government to embody, by selective draft, re-inforcements not exceeding 100,000 men (section 13, subsection 4) "to maintain and support the Canadian Expeditionary Force now engaged in active service overseas". By section 4, sub-section 1, the Governor General in Council was authorized

to call out by proclamation any of the classes of men described by the Act for service "for the duration of the present war and of demobilization thereafter." The Act plainly had its application only to the circumstances then existing, and in relation to the war then in progress. The Act is now exhausted and spent and could not be invoked for another emergency. Therefore it is not necessary to repeal it.

If the statutes were being revised, Mr. Speaker, the commissioners would simply drop this act altogether. For us to proceed any further would be to take action which is wholly unnecessary.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Of the correctness of the position taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) there is no doubt whatever. The act has no present force and effect; there is no room for legal dispute of any kind on that point. The act plainly applied to the then war, and to no other; it could not by any government be applied to any other emergency, contingency, or war whatsoever. Consequently, on the termination of that war, the act became obliterated so far as actual operation at any time is concerned. However, the fact that it applied to the one state of hostilities and to that alone did not prevent a very prolonged and bitter assault being made upon it in the late campaign, and I have no doubt many hon. members of this House count it among their pledges that they would repeal this law,—a law which already was repealed; a law which, if you can speak of it in that way, was functus offiicio—absolutely without power of operation. That was the plan adopted of attacking the method of selective conscription which that law embodied.

If, however, it is the purpose of the hon. member or of any other hon. member or of the Government to wipe conscription from our statute book, there is yet much to be done. The Militia Act contains a provision for conscription, for compulsory military service—not through selection by tribunals; not by selection of any kind, but merely by the casting of lots,—by chance. The Governor in Council is empowered under the Militia Act, as it is to-day and has been on our statutes for decades, to compel military service in this country or out of this country for the defence of Canada at any time the Governor in Council or Parliament deems such a course necessary. Consequently, the principle of compulsory military service is as much embedded in our law as the principle of compulsory financial service by way of taxation. If, therefore, there are those pledged against it who desire to redeem their pledge—which, of course, I have grave reason to doubt, on this or any other subject—the course to be pursued would be to attack the Militia Act of this country. I for one will await with much interest, though with little apprehension, any attack that may be made upon it.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I desire only to correct a misapprehension on the part of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). He seems to be unaware of the campaign that was carried on in my province with regard to the Military Service Act at the last election. My right hon. friend says that there are men in this House who sit here, probably, because they took a pledge to have that act repealed. I wish to tell him that those who took that pledge were defeated at the last election, and they were the friends of my right hon. friend. We were opposed by the friends of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, mind you, because we were supposed to have supported conscription. We, they said, were those who had been in favour of conscription; and they attacked us because we did not ask the repeal of that act after the war was over. The position I took then, the position we on this side of the House took, was the position that has just been taken by my right hon. friend: that the Military Service Act is no longer in force and that these gentlemen, supporters of my right hon. friend were absolutely mistaken.

I will give my right hon. friend some further information. His colleagues, the new ministers who were appointed to represent the province of Quebec,—Dr. Normand, fellow citizen of my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Bureau); Mr. Monty, and the others—came down to the province of Quebec and said in their speeches that we were responsible for conscription; that if they had been in the House at the time they would have opposed it; that we were the conscriptionists and that the colleagues of my right hon. friend were those opposed to it. That was the campaign in the province of Quebec at the last election, and my right hon. friend is mistaken when he states otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend permit me to ask again a favour I so often ask,—that is, that he support his assertions as to other people by quotation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Everyone knows that in my province; no one would deny it. All those who read newspapers, whether they live in the province of Quebec or elsewhere, know that what I say is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will support mine.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) does not, perhaps, know of the service rendered to me in Three Rivers at the last election by the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen). It was my privilege to have as my opponent the then President of the Privy Council. This gentleman came on the stump and asserted—and a list of the members in question was published in one of the papers supported by the friends of my right hon. friend—that those who voted for and supported conscription were the Liberals in Opposition in 1917. But I was saved in this way: My right hon. friend came to Three Rivers and said in the course of a speech there: "I am the father of conscription". I called a meeting and I asked the President of the Privy Council, who was right, he or his leader; and when he was caught between the two he did not answer. Thus the situation was saved.

Now, my right hon. friend wants quotations. If he will have patience and wait until to-morrow I will send him the newspapers of Three Rivers from which he will see that prior to his visit to that city there was not a speech made by the President of his Privy Council—and we had three or four meetings every evening in those days; it was a great fight—in which it was not stated that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the then Opposition, naming your humble servant as one of the members of it, were the fathers and promoters of conscription. But after my right hon. friend came to Three Rivers, they changed their tune. They said: "Well, conscription was not invented in 1917; it was instituted at the time of Confederation. Sir George Etienne Cartier was the father of conscription. Subsequently Sir Frederick Borden changed the act; it was he who imposed conscription upon the people; therefore, the law of 1917 was nothing new; we simply took your act and put it into force." Then we put the question, "Why did you change it if you already had authority to raise armies for overseas? Why didn't you use that law? Why did you pass a new one?" "Oh," they said, "the war was a new thing; the conditions were entirely new; everything was new." I make the statement here that in the province of Quebec the fight was made, whether it was inspired by the leader of the Opposition or not, on the charge that the Opposition of that day, in 1917, were the people that brought about conscription. But when my right hon. friend went through the province saying that he was the father of conscription these people changed their minds and said, "So it dates from the consolidation of the Militia Act," and they were opposed to it and said: "The Militia Act will be wiped off the statute book. We as a self-respecting nation do not want that." My right hon. friend does not need to ask for quotations, because I could load him up with so many that it would take him the balance of the session to read them. So I will ask him to "dispense"; it will save him work and the country will be as well informed.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): I should like to gratify the request of the leader of the Opposition for a quotation. I happen to have one in my pocket at the moment. During the recent campaign Mr. Belley the ex-Postmaster General, was the candidate of my right hon. friend in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency and I can quote from a speech he made as reported in the Quebec Chronicle, the owner of which was the late Sir David Watson, a well known friend of the Tory government and of the government that has just passed away. This is what that newspaper report says:

With documentary evidence in hand Mr. Belley proved that the Conscription Act was contained in the Laurier law,—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARENT (reading):

—as it appears in the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1906. The Borden Act did not change this Act, but simply changed the mode of raising troops. By the Laurier Act the troops were raised by lottery while the Borden Act provided for selection by exemption tribunals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All true.

Mr. PARENT (reading):

By the lottery system enacted in the Laurier Act hundreds of young men would have gone to war, but under the Borden exemption system not a single young man of Charlevoix county went to the war. But the point which impressed the audience most was the voting of five hundred million dollars which Mr. Borden had obtained in the session of 1918. He explained that the Borden Act was passed before the elections of 1917, the elections having been held in December that year. At the beginning of the session of 1918 Mr. Borden presented a bill bearing No. 38, by which he asked Parliament for a sum of five hundred million dollars which

was required, amongst other things, for the enforcing of the Conscription Act. Not a single member had voted against the granting of this money, not even the Liberal members, who had taken pledges only a few months before that they would ask for the repeal of the Military Service Act.

Several members then sought Mr. Belley's permission to ask him a few questions, and he readily consented and answered all questions decisively.

I hope that quotation will satisfy my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I may be permitted a remark, I am thankful to my hon. friend for confirming precisely what I stated was the case.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): My hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Parent) has just given the House a quotation from the Quebec Chronicle with reference to the campaign of the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Belley) in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency. I happen to have been the fortunate candidate in that election. I succeeded in beating one of the ministers who had enjoyed office for a few days under my right hon. friend who now leads the Opposition. Every word that has been quoted by my hon. friend from Quebec West is absolutely true. I could also quote to the House, if I wished to detain it, many more statements circulated in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency at the expense of the people of this country to show that conscription was the work of the Liberal party. I answered each and every one of these statements on the platform, and with the aid of some of my friends, especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), I succeeded in obtaining the victory over one of the ministers of my right hon. friend opposite. The first statement which was published referred to the voting of $500,000,000 which was required among other things for the enforcing of the Conscription Act. I answered that which was not absolutely correct, and several other statements that were made about conscription at that time. We did not raise the issue. It was the hon. gentlemen now sitting angularly opposite who raised it, although they accuse us of having raised the issue to get us back into power. I want to say publicly here in the House that if the election in the province of Quebec was carried on the conscription issue, it was not carried by the Liberal party, but by hon. gentlemen sitting angularly opposite from me here. I shall vote with pleasure for the repeal of this law.

[Mr. Parent.]

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion this bill is useless. I agree with my hon. friend the Prime Minister that the law is not now in operation, and I only rise to answer in two words the right hon. ex-member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) who now sits angularly opposite by the grace, generosity, and skilful tactics of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I happen to have with me a few quotations that he challenged my hon. friend from Quebec East to produce I have a quotation, for instance, from a speech made by the ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Monty, on conscription, as reported in La Minerve, a Montreal paper carrying on its front page the photograph of the leader of the official Opposition. I will translate from La Minerve of November 5th, 1921 as follows:

The Hon. Mr. Monty in Beauharnois

The Hon. Mr. Monty spoke afterwards on conscription. He declared that in 1917 he was opposed to that law. No one could doubt it. He had defended hundreds and hundreds of conscripts. He had adopted and he was still willing to defend the principle of Sir John A. Macdonald that Canada should have an army only for the defence of Canadian territory. He openly declared that if ever in future the same question came up he would oppose conscription and defend his anti-conscription principles. "You can say," repeated the Secretary of State "that I was against conscription, that I am still against conscription, that I will be against conscription on the 6th of December, that I always will be against conscription."

If this quotation is not sufficient I can read further extracts from a newspaper that was published in the constituency of Three Rivers, the St. Lawrence Valley Chronicle, quoting speeches delivered by the Hon. Dr. Normand. That gentleman, who was president of the Privy Council is reported as saying the following:

Conscription is not a matter of principle but simply a matter of contribution, and I said it and I repeat it again, and I always said during conscription time, that I was opposed to conscription, and I am still opposed to conscription. I thought it was a bad system of administration. I was also opposed to it because I considered it the wrong way and I am still opposed to it. In the present election there are Nationalists who state that we should never participate in the wars of the Empire. I am with those, I am somewhat of a Nationalist myself.

Dr. Normand also said that he had always opposed conscription which he condemned vigorously saying that on that question he agreed with the Nationalist idea on the subject. Now I will not further occupy the time of the House in reading these newspapers. I have probably

ten or fifteen numbers of the paper La Minerve showing the whole fight in the province of Quebec carried on by the ex-ministers—the ministers pro tem as I might call them—was on this question. The Liberals did not bring on this issue in the province of Quebec. It was the friends of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I can quote from another copy of La Minerve a list conspicuously printed on the first page of Liberal members of the province of Quebec who were accused of having voted for the principle of conscription.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And I was one of them.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The list sets forth the names of Messrs. Bureau, Brouillard, Bickerdike, Boivin, Bourassa, Boyer, Cardin, Deslisle, Demers, Devlin, Ethier, Fortier and so on. That was the fight that was waged by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the province of Quebec in the last election. How different from the fight conducted in 1917 when the Liberals were accused of being friends of the Kaiser and not willing to do their duty in the war. I will not say anything further, but I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will not insist upon any more quotations, and will be a little more chary about issuing challenges in future.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never contended, and have never even said, that the ministers who came into the Government had been or were in favour of conscription.

Mr. DUFF: But you took them into the Cabinet.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was the question of the attitude of the ministers on conscription never discussed before their entrance into the Cabinet?

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME (Drummond-Arthabaska): The bill proposes to repeal a statute which is no longer in effect, because it is exhausted. The Government takes that view and so does the leader of the Opposition. That is also the opinion of the law officers. Surely the war was concluded by the ratification of the three Treaties, Versailles, St. Germain and Sèvres. There is nothing for us to discuss here, so why bring such a question before the House. The discussion will not advance the business of the House one iota. Its only effect is to transfer to this Chamber—for a motive I am unable to appreciate—a debate which will have not the slightest effect upon the members of this House, whatever influence it might have if conducted from the hustings.

Mr. HENRI E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): When conducting the fight in my constituency at the last election I had to face opponents who demanded of me that I should ask Parliament, if circumstances permit, to repeal the Conscription Act. At that time I happened to have as my opponent Mr. Armand Lavergne, the chief of the Nationalist party in the district of Quebec. That gentleman opposed me on the ground that I had not asked Parliament to repeal the act of 1917. Mr. Lavergne was supported in that fight by chiefs of the Conservative party, some of whom were the intimate friends of the leader of the Opposition. I told the electors at the time exactly what the hon. member who has just taken his seat has stated to the House—that the Conscription Act was dead and that there was no need to repeal a dead law. Now I am happy to have the statement I made at that time confirmed in this House by no less a person than the leader of the Opposition himself.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle), (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have but a few remarks to add with reference to the proposed legislation which is before this House. I do not wish to recall the unpleasant reminiscences of the last general election. The electors of the county of Labelle returned me with such a large majority that I can afford, in this instance, to be magnanimous and not take any notice of the declarations made by my opponents. I then declared in the presence of my electors that there was no necessity of a special bill for the repeal of the Military Service Act as the latter did not exist. These declarations, I believe, are absolutely identical to those made in this House by the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King), and moreover by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I still hold to this opinion as I contended before my electors, that no necessity exists to bring in a special bill for the repeal of the Conscription Act. However, seeing that the Prime Minister has given us communication of a letter of the legal adviser to the Justice Department, leading to the belief

that perhaps in certain parts of the country, there seems to exist doubts on the advisability of such a bill, I emphatically declare that I am in favour of this bill, if its mover persists in submitting it to the consideration of this House. I have always been opposed to conscription, and if the measure is necessary, I shall gladly give my support to a bill which would repeal the Military Service Act of 1917.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my judgment this discussion is out of order. Any resolution presented in the House must have something positive as to its effect. If a motion is made or a bill introduced with a view to repeal legislation, that legislation must be in existence. From the opinions of the Law Officers of the House of Commons and of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and, after the opinion expressed by some of the leaders on both sides, I come to the conclusion that the Military Service Act, 1917, cannot be repealed, because it has exhausted itself, and is considered as non-existent at present in the statutes. Therefore I give it as my opinion that this bill should be dropped and that the discussion should not proceed and I so rule.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved—1. That it is expedient to bring in a measure to create a department of the Government of Canada to be called the Department of National Defence, over which a Minister of the Crown shall preside who shall be the Minister of National Defence.

2. That the Minister shall be charged with all matters relating to Defence, including the Militia, the Military, Naval, Air and Police Services of Canada.

3. That there shall be a Deputy Minister of National Defence who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, and hold office during pleasure, and such officers may be appointed as are necessary for the carrying on of the business of the department.

4. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister may appoint an officer who shall, in relation to the Naval Service exercise all the powers and duties vested in the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service by or under *The Naval Service Act*, and who shall have the rank and salary of a Deputy Head of a department, and shall be a member of the Defence Council.

5. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister may appoint an officer to be known as Comptroller, who under the Deputy Minister of National Defence, shall be charged with all financial matters pertaining to the Department of National Defence.

[Mr. Fortier.]

6. That any person whose position is abolished on the coming into force of the Act to be based upon these Resolutions may, on the recommendation of the Minister, be appointed by the Governor in Council to such position in the Department and with such rank, title and salary as shall be prescribed.

7. That if any person is removed from office or an appointment in consequence of the abolition of his office or his appointment by the Act based upon these Resolutions or by any order or regulation thereunder, or is retired within two years after the coming into force of the said Act, the Governor in Council may grant him a gratuity, retiring or superannuation allowance, or pension not exceeding such as he would have been entitled or eligible to receive if he had been retired under the provisions of any Act applicable to him, after adding from one to three years, as the Governor in Council may deem advisable, to his actual term of service.

8. That provision be made to vest the powers, duties and functions vested in the Ministers and Deputy Ministers under the various Acts relating to the Naval Service, the Militia, Militia Pensions, the Royal Military College, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Dominion Police, in the Minister of National Defence and the Deputy Minister of National Defence respectively:—Provided that the powers vested in the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service under the Naval Service Act shall be exercised by the officer appointed for that purpose as aforesaid.

9. That provision be made to constitute a Defence Council to advise the Minister on all matters of Defence, including or relating to the Militia, the Military, Naval, Air and Police Services of Canada, and on all matters referred to it by the Minister, and to perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

He said: I beg to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution commends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—AGRICULTURE

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Department of Agriculture:—	
Salaries..	$ 640,717 50
Contingencies..	135,000 00

Mr. SPENCER: On page 87 there is an item, "Chief, sheep and goat division, $3,210." Will the minister tell me what the duties of this gentleman are?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): That gentleman has charge of the marketing of these animals and the development of new strains or breeds. It may seem strange to my hon. friend that we should be raising goats in our country, but we are. They are in use, sometimes for milk purposes, as well as for their meat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it would be opportune now if the Minister of Agriculture would give us an explanation of an appointment which has been made in his department to a post that it had not been considered necessary to fill for some time, and the making of which, so far as any information I have goes, was wholly against the provision, the spirit, if not, indeed, the letter of the Civil Service Act. I refer to the appointment of Mr. Duncan Marshall to the position of Commissioner of Agriculture. The Civil Service Commission classified this position and fixed the maximum salary, I think, at $4,200. Even with the classification there, owing to the fact that the Agricultural Instruction Act had got wholly under way, there was no very great difficulty to be encountered in the completion of the grants to be made under that act. It was not considered necessary to fill the position and incur that expenditure, because the officers of the department felt themselves wholly capable of taking care of all the work that had been done previously by the commissioner. Notwithstanding this the present Government has appointed a Commissioner of Agriculture, and as the reports state—and I do not think it is disputed—has repealed the Civil Service recommendation as to salary, and gone beyond the maximum by about $1,800 to commence with, giving Mr. Marshall $6,000 a year at the public expense. I believe that in relation to certain subjects in his department we have had the spectacle lately of the deputy minister—who by the way draws only $6,000 himself—having an officer under him drawing the same salary. I do not know whether the minister counts the Commissioner of Agriculture under the deputy minister or not. Possibly there are two executive heads in his department. We have had the spectacle of these two officers giving diametrically opposite statements as to matters affecting the department in relation to the embargo. I think the House is entitled to an explanation as to why they saw fit to fasten this charge on the public, and whether or not it was on the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, a most efficient officer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is a matter that does not come under the head of civil government as Mr. Mashall's salary is dealt with in the estimate for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, however, I will be very pleased to give the explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does the minister justify taking an officer's salary, which is a civil government matter, out of civil government, and putting it under the other estimate?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Duncan Marshall has not been appointed Commissioner of Agriculture at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What position has he been appointed to?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If I have the permission of the Chair, I will read the Order in Council, and probably that will speak for itself. I may say that I think answers to questions in regard to this matter were tabled to-day: This is the Order in Council:

> The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 1st February, 1922, from the Minister of Agriculture, submitting that the Agricultural Instruction Act under which the sum of $1,100,000 annually has been granted to the Provincial Departments of Agriculture for the purpose of aiding agricultural instruction in the provinces expires March 31st, 1923.
>
> The minister states that in view of the extraordinary and exceptional conditions in the agricultural world it is highly desirable that an investigation be made into the advisability of the continuation, discontinuation or emendation of the provisions of this Act; the amounts to be paid, and the methods of calculating such amounts in the event of its extension; and the scope of the work of the provinces to be undertaken with the assistance of funds provided thereunder.
>
> It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38c of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the Statutes of 1921, to conduct the investigation indicated above, and to inquire into such other agricultural problems as may be desirable and necessary.
>
> The minister, therefore recommends that Mr. Duncan Marshall, of Olds, Alberta, be appointed as a commissioner for the above purpose, and to perform such other duties of a cognate nature as may be delegated to him.
>
> The minister further recommends that Mr. Marshall be paid a salary at the rate of $6,000 per annum, said salary to be paid from the appropriation provided for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act and that this appointment date from January 15, 1922.
>
> The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

I will read simply that part of section 38-c, beginning within five lines of the bottom, which has to do more particularly with the subject under consideration:

> Nothing in this Act shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner or other member of any Royal or other commission or board, or any deputy head.

The appointment was made under that section, not as Commissioner of Agriculture, but as a commissioner to make certain investigations with respect to the continuance, or non-continuance or amendment of the Agricultural Instruction Act. That is what he is engaged in doing now, and I hope we shall have his report in time to determine what will be the character of the legislation. The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), in his speech on the Address, referred to the absence of any reference to this. We are contemplating bringing down legislation; but before doing so, we shall have the special report stating how this legislation can be improved or extended, or whether it should be left just the way it is.

Mr. CRERAR: Am I to gather from my hon. friend's remarks that this question is not a permanent one?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a temporary appointment.

Mr. CRERAR: How long is it expected to last?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: About six months, probably.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister of course, could not help noticing, as he read the Order in Council, that the duties assigned to Mr. Marshall are just the duties that would be performed by the Commissioner of the Agricultural Education Branch, were he appointed to fill that office for which the Civil Service Commission fixes a salary of $4,200 a year only. Did Mr. Marshall, as part of his duties in this office, make a trip to Mexico recently?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He has not been here for two or three weeks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the trip to Mexico a part of the investigation into the Agricultural Education Branch?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it a trip at the public expense?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: So far as I know, he did not go to Mexico.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it Florida? Was his trip there part of his duties under the Order in Council?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That was not amongst his duties enumerated in the Order in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did he take that trip as a public official, or was it a private job?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the right hon. gentleman has finished, I will endeavour to answer his question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the first question. The next is this. Surely the minister does not contend that that section of the Civil Service Act can be utilized merely by giving a man another name as an excuse for giving him another salary.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With respect to Mr. Marshall's duties, apart from the investigation into the working of the Agricultural Instruction Act, I may say that he is conducting an investigation with respect to the exhibition grant throughout Canada. As my right hon. friend knows, in the past about $180,000 have been paid by the Dominion Department of Agriculture by way of exhibition grants. That seems a large sum of money, and he is conducting a special inquiry as to how much those grants can be reduced without materially affecting the success of those exhibitions. Another matter is the question of the working out of the "accredited herd" policy of the present Government. This work is being taken up with great vigour; the amount of money set aside in the past for it has not been sufficient to meet the situation, and certain amendments are under consideration. I might point out that no herds under twelve in number have been inspected, and the result has been that complaints have been made about discrimination in favour of the man with the big herd, inasmuch as the man with the small herd does not come within the scope of the act. When Mr. Marshall comes back and completes his report with respect to these matters, as I hope he will be able to do in the course of two or three weeks, we have under consideration sending him to some South American countries, either Argentine, or Brazil, or Chili, or probably them all, this matter depending on the information which we get from the Department of Trade and Commerce as to which of these countries will prove, at the present time, the best market for our pure-bred herds that just now have difficulty in finding a market. As my right hon. friend and the committee know, the foot-and-mouth disease, that is so prevalent in the old country at this time, makes it impossible for any of these countries to get their breeding animals from the usual source in the United Kingdom. It was, therefore, thought that this would be a good time to set up a market for our pure-bred animals in these countries, and that we might possibly be able to continue it. Their business relations with Canada

are good at the present time, and as they are not able to get pure-bred animals from the United Kingdom, we thought it would be a fortunate time to send one or two representatives of this department to these South American countries with the object that I have stated in view. Mr. Duncan Marshall, when he returns, with probably another gentleman, Mr. Dryden, will be delegated, if the information we get from the Department of Trade and Commerce justifies us in sending them, to these South American countries to open up a market more particularly for pure-bred animals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was his last trip in connection with?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With regard to Florida, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and I sometimes exchange the work of our men. If the right hon. gentleman had been in the Chamber on Friday evening, he would have heard how we lent some of our entomologists to the Interior Department. Some of them went out in scouting parties and in aeroplanes to guide the lumbermen in directing their operations and in taking care of their lumber areas that are menaced by the spruce bud worm. There was a large exhibition in Florida, where the Department of the Interior was represented by Mr. Marshall, who did some work in connection with immigration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like the minister to take a note and, when he hears of any immigrant coming from that district, let me know. Evidently Mr. Marshall is in for a good time. I believe Chili comes next, then the Bermudas, and so on. Will that expedition to Chili be for immigration, or in the interests of pure bred stock?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought I made that plain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The South American trips would be in the interest of the Department of Agriculture. I am afraid that six months will go by without much study into the question of the continuance of agricultural grants.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am sorry if my right hon. friend has never heard of the prospects of the live stock markets in the Argentine, in Chili or in Patagonia. There is an exceedingly good prospect there for pure bred animals, especially as they are not available in Great Britain, where they were formerly got.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not that the work of the trade commissioners? If the trade commissioners are not good enough, would it not be better to have Mr. Marshall appointed under the Department of Trade and Commerce and be paid a salary for this sort of work?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: You could do it that way, but inasmuch as Messrs. Marshall and Dryden are both practical, first class live stock men, it was thought that they would be as successful as anyone else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The salary limit was pretty low under the Civil Service Commission. That question came up too, I suppose.

Mr. BRETHEN: I think it is quite well understood that some of the countries that have been mentioned—the Argentine and Chili—are already in the market for Canadian pure bred stock. They have already purchased our stock. Why have the Commissioner of Agriculture and Mr. Dryden been selected to form the committee? It is well known that both of these gentlemen are competent and are zealous in looking after the interests of beef breeds of cattle; but why have not the dairy interests been considered? It is dairy cattle that have been going to Chili and to the Argentine, and I cannot see why there should not be some one to represent the dairy breeds, which, I think we all agree, are quite as important in Canada as the beef breeds.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Neither Mr. Marshall nor Mr. Dryden is unfamiliar with the dairy interests. It is true that they have paid more attention to beef cattle, but in regard to any one whom we might appoint the question might be asked: Why not appoint some one else? Judging from the nature of questions on the Order Paper, one might be inclined to think that it was something different that some hon. members had in view. The question is asked, for instance: Was one of these gentlemen a defeated candidate? I do not see that that has anything to do with this subject. If any hon. gentleman thinks it has, let him ask the question.

Mr. HANSON: Is not Mr. Duncan Marshall himself a large grower of beef cattle, and will he be prohibited from doing business on his own acount while travelling as a representative of the Goverment. He might have an eye for the main chance, and the minister might say whether there will be an express prohibition against his doing business in his own behalf.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand from the newspaper reports that Mr. Marshall has sold out his live stock and has rented his place. He is therefore completely at liberty to represent the Government. I do not know what his future plans may be, but I learn from the newspapers that he has disposed of his stock.

Mr. TOLMIE: I endorse what my hon. friend (Mr. Brethen) has said with regard to the necessity for including an expert dairyman in the delegation which is going to South America to secure more trade for Canadian breeders of cattle. While both the gentlemen mentioned are well known and of great ability, we must remember that they have both specialised of late years in the beef cattle industry. It is well known that our dairy herds have been developed to a very high point indeed. In fact, we are producing certain specimens of dairy breeds that are among the very best in the world. We also know that there is a tremendous development of the dairy industry in South America, particularly in the Argentine. That country has been making very rapid strides of late years in the production of dairy breeds, and their products are shipped to Great Britain in competition with our own. I think therefore that the minister would be well advised if, in that delegation, he included an expert dairyman to explain to the people of the Argentine the benefits to be derived from the importation of Canadian dairy breeds. I am greatly interested in what the minister has to say with regard to the accredited herd system. This system is costing a great deal of money, but I think that it is accomplishing considerable good in Canada in eradicating tuberculosis from our herds. As we all know, tuberculosis has been making alarming progress, affecting not only cattle but hogs, and this is shown in our abattoir inspections. In the past the accredited herd system has been conducted largely through the minister, the deputy minister and the veterinary director general. I do not quite appreciate the reason for appointing a man, who is not a veterinarian, for the purpose of reporting upon this kind of work. I used to think that the old combination worked well indeed, and if there was any fault to be found with it, it was the barrier that we encountered when we went to the Minister of Finance for further assistance. The old combination worked well enough, and I do not think it is necessary to make any change now. Is it the intention to renew the fund, under the Agricultural Instruction Act, which will run out at an early date; and, will approximately the same sum of money be appropriated for the purpose for which that fund was provided? Does the Government intend to disburse that money in the way it has been spent during the past ten years, namely, by the provinces with a slight control exercised by the federal authorities? I should like to know also if the expenditure for agricultural grants for fairs has been cut down this year. These grants have done a great deal of good in developing exhibitions throughout the country, and I do not think that there is any particular agency that has rendered a greater service to the pure bred live stock business of Canada and the cattle industry generally than the encouragement of these exhibitions. The reduction in grants will not be felt to any great extent by the larger exhibitions, but the smaller and medium sized fairs that obtain grants from the department will suffer considerably as a result of a cut, I understand, of 50 per cent now under contemplation. On behalf of the exhibitions throughout the country from coast to coast, I would ask the minister to consider this point carefully and try to make the reduction less in the case of the smaller exhibitions than in the case of the larger ones that will not feel the reduction to the same extent. By following such a course he would let down the smaller exhibitions gently, so to speak, and would not interfere unduly with the work that they have carried on. The plans for these exhibitions are prepared in most cases, about a year in advance, and if a severe cut in their grant is made without warning, they may be involved in serious difficulties, particularly if bad weather is encountered and the gate receipts are much smaller than in former years.

Mr. WARNER: Was it through Mr. Marshall's recommendation that the reduction in these grants was made?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Should Mr. Marshall's report indicate that injustice is being done to these exhibitions, the matter may be considered as reopened. I understood when we decided on the reduction of these grants that all the exhibition managers had been notified of the intended reductions from six months to a year ago. There is some doubt, however, about the accuracy of my information in that respect, and should Mr. Marshall's report indicate that hardship would follow as a

result of these cuts, there will be an opportunity of reconsidering the matter when we come to the vote in the Supplementary Estimates. In the Finance Minister's absence, of course, I do not want to say anything about the Supplementary Estimates that will startle him, but at least the matter can be considered. The member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) knows as well as I do that large sums of money have been handed out to exhibitions all over Canada during the last three or four years. There is no use in talking economy about a $2,000 civil servant, and then handing out $180,000 to these big exhibitions. There is no sense in that sort of thing. We have a certain amount for agriculture; what is the best way to spend it? Do we get as much value out of this expenditure as we would get out of $180,000 spent for other purposes. That is what we have to determine. In my opinion we get less value from the money granted to these exhibitions than we do from any other expenditure that is made in the Department of Agriculture. If we made the grant the same as before, I am sure my secretaries and stenographers would be saved a good deal of trouble in answering telegrams and inquiries of all kinds; but in my judgment a substantial reduction is justified. As I have intimated, however, if it is found that the exhibition managers did not get proper notice, as I understod they did a year ago, the matter will be looked into, and possibly we might make the reduction only twenty per cent this year, with a further cut next year.

Another very proper question was put to me by the hon. gentleman who was my very capable predecessor—and I want to pay tribute to him; I found the department particularly the live stock branch, in excellent shape when I took office, and consider myself fortunate in being able to step into it. Now the hon. gentleman asked why Mr. Marshall interfered—I am not sure that is the word he used—with the accredited herds. That is a matter which has been left largely to the veterinarians. Only those who have had their animals tested and found to their dismay that they were affected with tuberculosis and had to be destroyed, know what it feels like. There is a good deal of feeling throughout the country that the tuberculin test is not the last word with respect to the diagnosis and treatment of this disease, and the view prevails that there ought to be some representation of the man whose herds are proposed to be slaughtered. Both Duncan Marshall and myself know what it is, experimentally, to have one's herds slaughtered on account of tuberculosis, and there is no doubt that those who own the cattle should be represented in such an important matter,—not merely the veterinarians, much as I may think of them. I may say in this connection that investigations are being made in Europe with a view to discovering some serum or vaccine or antitoxin that will take care of this disease by immunizing the animals when they are young, just as is done in the case of blackleg. If you could not treat blackleg when the animals are young, the mortality would be much greater than it is. Some progress has been made in that investigation. It is not one of the matters that I intended to have Duncan Marshall deal with, but what I do want him to get at is the viewpoint of the man who owns the herds. There is another point in this connection: the man who has only three or four head of cattle who is exempted from the operations of the accredited herd regulations wants to know why the big man should have access to this accredited herd money while he has not. These are some of the reasons why we want this matter inquired into, and I do not know any better man to do it than Duncan Marshall. He is himself a stock raiser; he has had his herds infected by tuberculosis, and has been co-operating with the federal Department of Agriculture in the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act.

Mr. MANION: What exhibitions are qualified to receive the federal grant, and on what grounds are they so qualified?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I cannot have my whole staff here to deal with these various matters; this is the result of our getting away from the civil government estimates and into the matter of exhibitions. However, I can tell my hon. friend offhand that in Saskatchewan seven cities and towns receive grants from the federal treasury, amounting to almost a fabulous sum. As to Ontario, the city of Ottawa, for instance, gets a grant. I read in one of the morning papers the other day that the Ottawa fair had a surplus of $10,000 as a result of last year's operations, and that another exhibition had a surplus of $14,000. In the West, large salaries are being paid to the managers of exhibitions, in some cases as much as $10,000 a year, where large grants are given by the Do-

minion as well as by the province. These $10,000 salaries are somewhat large compared with Mr. Marshall's modest $6,000, and in view of the surpluses which these exhibitions have in many cases it seems to me that with the exchequer in its present condition, a continuance of the usual large grants would be a little too prodigal.

Mr. MANION: Can my hon. friend give me the qualifications which entitle these exhibitions to grants?

Mr. CHAPLIN: If this matter comes up under another item, why should we discuss it under the civil government?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have here the statement of conditions under which grants were made to summer and fall exhibitions for the year 1922. There would be very little change this year. I might quote a few paragraphs:

Exhibition Associations whose shows are open in all live stock classes to the whole of the Dominion of Canada, will receive grants under the following conditions on the basis of the expenditure in prize money in the utility classes of live stock and poultry at their last exhibition:—

1. Fairs, which have expended at their last preceding exhibition a minimum of $4,000.00 and up to $16,000.00 of a maximum of their own money for prizes in these classes and which have not received a grant from the Dominion Department of Agriculture for the show at which this expenditure was made, shall receive the minimum grant of $1,250.00.

2. Such fairs as have not received a grant for their previous exhibition shall be entitled, in addition to the minimum grant as stated above, to a grant of 50 per cent of the expenditure over $4,000.00. The maximum grant, in no case, shall exceed $2,500.00.

3. Fairs, which shall have expended at their last preceding show a minimum of $4,000.00 and up to $16,000.00 of a maximum of their own money for prizes in these classes plus the amount of the grant received from the Department for their preceding show, shall be entitled to the minimum grant of $1,250.00.

I take the ground that we should not let them down too suddenly. They went up gradually, and we should try and arrange it so as to give the least jolt to those concerned. The matter will undoubtedly be reconsidered later on when the report of Duncan Marshall comes in, as well as that of Dr. Grisdale, who has just returned from the West.

Mr. GOULD: I have complete faith in the Minister of Agriculture spending the moneys that are voted in a proper manner. I see that the staff contains from forty-eight to fifty new members, but hon. members will remember that in the discussions concerning agriculture in this House I have always expressed the belief that the Department of Agriculture was nearer the point of starvation than any other department of the Government.

With regard to this vaccine or antitoxin, I am sure that we should approve of the expenditure. A good many members of this House will recall along with myself that there was a time in the West when our stock was not inspected, and the thought came to me as the minister was speaking of a visit he himself had from an inspector who destroyed a certain portion of his herd on the ground that they were infected with tuberculosis. I remember once an inspector came on my farm and shot horses that were supposed to be suffering from glanders. He was receiving five dollars per head for every horse that he found infected with the disease, so naturally enough he was successful in finding a goodly number roundabout that were infected. I mention this in order to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture should be provided with sufficient money to provide for proper officers, so that we shall not be subjected in the future to enormities such as those I have described. I do not think the House is really opposed to voting this money. In past years, owners have suffered materially in Canada because of the ravages of various diseases among their stock, and those diseases are becoming even more prevalent in the herds of Canada to-day.

Mr. TOLMIE: Speaking of the grants for these agricultural exhibitions, while some of them may have reached a point where they are beyond the need of assistance, it must be remembered that though we have in western Canada five or six of the best fairs on this continent, they had to be built up by assistance from both federal and provincial governments, and without that assistance they would not have been the excellent shows they are to-day.

As far as the salaries are concerned, that is a matter for arrangement by the management of each exhibition. These exhibitions do not consist altogether of agriculture; manufacturers and many other lines are represented, although the grant is made on the ground that a certain sum of money has been paid for live stock at the exhibition of the previous year, so the ten thousand dollar salary paid to the manager of one of these western exhibitions is not only for his services as manager of the live stock, but for managing the whole show.

I was interested in what the minister had to say with regard to the accredited

herd system. He said that tuberculin, which is being used for the purpose of testing these cattle in the accredited herds, was not the last word in diagnosing tuberculosis. I claim that it is, so far as we know, and while we do not recognize tuberculin as an infallible agent, it is the very best we have including three tests for diagnosing tuberculosis. When we take into consideration our great loss from this disease, particularly in our abattoirs and in swine from dairy districts, I think the Government has been quite justified in the past in using the very best methods at hand for the eradication of this disease. There is a great deal to do in that direction in the future.

Wtih regard to the use of serums for immunizing, and so on, that has nothing whatever to do with the accredited herd system, but a system of experiment should be carried on along these lines whenever any agency is found that gives promise of combatting this great disease. But that has nothing to do with tuberculin as a diagnostic agent.

Mr. WARNER: I would point out that it is not possible for the fairs in the West to get the attendance or the admission fees possible in the East with its heavier settlement, and consequently it is more necessary to give assistance to the western fairs. I have had experience enough to know that if these fairs are not given the grant this year, probably many of them will be spoilt. I think they should have, at the worst, at least one year's warning before the grant is withdrawn, because they have made their arrangements on the basis of receiving the grant. They could not possibly carry on with any fair amount of success with a very much lower grant from the Dominion Government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is a question I would like to ask the minister in connection with this vote and it is this: Considerable anxiety was expressed at one of our recent sittings by reason of the fact that insufficient encouragement is given to those who are deserving of promotion in the Civil Service. That being the case does the Minister of Agriculture consider it a desirable thing to give to an outsider like Mr. Duncan Marshall what the public would consider a plum in the Civil Service? Is this an encouragement to those who have worked so long and faithfully in the Civil Service?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has raised a very good point and it is one I considered very carefully before I made my decision. The present Government, it must be remembered, has only been in power about three months. Now it was only at the beginning of the new year, or very shortly afterwards, that it was made apparent to me that the Agricultural Instruction Act would have to be dealt with at this session of Parliament. That information came to me quite unexpectedly and quite suddenly. My staff at that time were all busily engaged; there was a convention in progress at one end of Canada with regard to a particular topic, and another convention dealing with something else at the other end of the Dominion at which our officers were in attendance. Even at the present time a number of the staff are just returning from a live stock convention at Saskatoon; and we had not at the time I refer to a single man available to take up that particular line of investigation work. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) can testify if he likes that when he presided over this department the staff were all busy. They are always busy and particularly in the early months of the year. Here was the session coming on, and we wanted to deal with this question in a thorough and intelligent way; we wanted to ascertain just what the facts were. Very well, how are you going to get facts unless you send out a representative to procure them? Take my position to-night. I am without proper assistance owing to the absence of the deputy minister. It is quite true that on the civil government estimates the official who is here advising me is as good an authority as I could get; but in the matter of experimental farms and exhibitions Dr. Grisdale is the best authority available because he has been so closely identified with them. Now then, so far as the qualifications of Mr. Duncan Marshall are concerned he has been, as my hon. friend knows, a provincial Minister of Agriculture, and has worked in connection with the federal Minister of Agriculture under a signed contract each year on the administration of his quota of the moneys to be expended under the Agricultural Instruction Act, and amounting probably in the case of his province to $75,000 per annum. Mr. Marshall knows, as few other men could possibly know, the weaknesses of that act. In this connection I think there is one very pronounced weak point in the statute and it is this: Although the statute is called the Agricultural Instruction Act and under its provisions

something like a total of $10,000,000 is distributed, the distribution does not take into consideration the rural population at all but is made on the straight basis of population. That is one of the weak points emphasized by Mr. Duncan Marshall. I would therefore ask who should be better qualified to investigate the conditions of an act than the one who represents a province that has suffered under the past system of distribution. I am now opening up what may be a controversial question and I do not want to continue on that line—I would rather go ahead with my estimates. However I simply wished to demonstrate the facts and establish why we selected Duncan Marshall for this particular work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I was very much pleased to hear the minister state that Mr. Marshall's appointment was due to the fact that owing to pressure of public business at that time no men in the Civil Service were available. I am sure the minister will therefore be quite willing to give the committee the assurance that the appointment of Mr. Marshall to the position of Commissioner is merely temporary, and that as soon as possible one of the deserving members of the Civil Service will be promoted to fill it. If for no other reason than a desire to improve the morale of the service and to encourage the civil servants who are to work in conjunction and co-operation with him, he should now give us a guarantee that one of them will be appointed to the office as soon as possible.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): If I can get the attention of the minister away from the subject of exhibitions I would ask him if it is the intention of his department to put into operation this season the Dairy Grading Act which was passed during the last session of Parliament.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend refers to the Dairy Produce Act.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Will the minister please answer my question?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We were hoping to put the act into force the first of May so that by the time the rush of the season came on there would be as little disturbance as possible, but if so, matters will have to be greatly accelerated. The Civil Service Commission makes the necessary appointments and it may take them three or four months to do so—in fact I may not get the act into force at all for some time. Sometimes nearly a year elapses before they make appointments, so that when I speak of the date at which the act is likely to come into force I do so with that reservation in mind.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I see from the estimates that a new officer is being appointed as a "Canning Specialist." I would like to know what the duties of this new officer are?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is an appointment made at the Experimental Farm. The position is vacant now but I understand it is to be occupied by a lady who will deal with the canning of fruits and vegetables and demonstrate the various processes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to know how many of the officers of the department are connected with the Experimental Farm in Ottawa?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Do you want a list of the employees at the Experimental Farm?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I assume the minister is not going to get through with his estimates this evening, I would therefore like him to provide a list of the officers who are connected with the Central Experimental Farm. I think that is a question that relates to the civil list and I would like to discuss it. In my opinion that is one of the sources of great extravagance in Ottawa and if you want to put in the plug in the interests of economy that is a place where it ought to be done.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: At the Experimental Farm?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It would only lead the discussion very much afield if I went into that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I asked the question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is the specific vote.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Can the hon. gentleman answer the question?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It would take a long time.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 41 deals with the Experimental Farm, and will be found on page 92. It will come up later.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If this list goes through, I will not get the information I want when I come to the Experimental Farms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have the list here. It will be rather slow if I pick them out. They are initialled on the left-hand margin.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not want the minister to take up time now. He can give me information another time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend would ask for a return, I think it would be the simplest way.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That would be all right.

Mr. STEVENS: The list should be prepared and brought down in its entirety.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is all here, if the committee desires it, but it would be a laborious task to pick out the information.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister says he borrowed some of his help from the Minister of the Interior. Did he ever borrow any of the astronomers from the Minister of the Interior? I inquired of that minister about his astronomers, but he never gave me the information. Has the hon. Minister of Agriculture ever borrowed any astronomers from the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Could the hon. minister tell me if the position held by Mr. Marshall is permanent or temporary?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Temporary. He has not been appointed Commissioner of Agriculture. He has been appointed a commissioner to make a certain investigation and most assuredly it must be temporary. I should like to answer one question, asked by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) which the hon. gentleman from East Peterborough (Mr. Brethen) referred to, namely, why both these representatives are required. These representatives were appointed to investigate markets in South America. Whether they will do this work or not will depend on whether they are available, or whether they have other work that is pressing. We have that work in mind, if we can carry it out. However, I will consider the appointment of a dairy representative to take the place of one of these gentlemen. We would like to keep down the expense as much as possible. The point is well taken, and I will be pleased to consider the advisability of having a representative of the dairy interests take the place of one of these gentlemen, inasmuch as both of these positions are tentative.

Mr. BRETHEN: Coming back to the position of the deputy minister, I desire to ask a question, but I do not know that we can hold the minister responsible, because it will probably work back to the Civil Service Commission. I should like to know why, in a department of the importance of the Department of Agriculture, the deputy minister gets $5,500, while in some of these small departments, and all the other departments, excepting one where the deputy minister gets $10,000, the salary is $6,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may assure the hon. gentleman at the outset, that I am not going to deny responsibility in any matter. The principle of ministerial responsibility is part of our constitution, and I would like to say that a ministerial responsibility should carry the power to act. Dr. Grisdale gets a house in addition to his salary. It is not usual to put that item in the estimates. His salary is reduced in the estimates from $6,000 to $5,500, the $500 being represented by the house. He was a director of the Experimental Farm before he took this position, and one of the conditions of his taking the present position was that he would remain on the Experimental Farm.

Mr. BRETHEN: That answers my question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Had it been as my hon. friend suggests, there would have been just ground for complaint. I hope I will have my hon. friend's assistance in making bona fide corrections in these matters. The salaries attached to these positions are so unattractive that we cannot get them filled. A process has been under way to try and get more money in order that we may get men fitted for the work.

Mr. THOMPSON: As to the grading of the dairy produce, have the regulations been drafted yet, and if so, what are they?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, there was a conference in Ottawa about two weeks ago of the dairy representatives from all parts of Canada,—cheese, butter, and wholesale interests—and they proposed regulations that they thought would work out. All the parties interested were there, including the middlemen. These regulations

have not been approved either by myself or by Council. We have not yet dealt with them, but we hope to within a very short time. Possibly the cheese will be assembled at some convenient place for grading.

If it is a convenient railway centre and a large number of small factories around, we would assemble it for grading. If it was a large factory with a large output we would grade it right in the factory. The regulations will come to me when they are licked into shape, I will go over them, and they will be finally approved. If my hon. friend has any representations to make in regard to this matter, I will be glad to have them. We have had before us representatives of the dairy interests of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, including the wholesale dealers.

Mr. LADNER: I notice by the Canadian Grocer that an official announcement has been made that the importation of oleomargarine is to be prohibited after the expiration of the present act in July next. I should like to know from the minister whether other hon. gentlemen are receiving communications of the kind or not. I know I have received communications from urban centres in western Canada where oleomargarine is used, and I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the act by which the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine under regulations may be carried on.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think permission to import and manufacture expires on the first of September. So far as I am concerned, it can expire forever.

Mr. LADNER: Undoubtedly the minister has given some consideration to the matter. It is a very important one for the people, both consumers and producers. Do I understand you to say it is the policy of the Government not to allow importation when the act expires.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought I made it quite plain that the Government had not dealt with the matter. It is a few months ahead, and we are so pressed with our daily duties that we meet questions when we come to them. We do not cross the bridge until we come to it. I have not discussed it, even with my colleagues. I could not give an official reply, inasmuch as it must be the policy of the Government. I have given my personal views, and I do not think it necessary to elaborate them at this time.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I understood the minister to say that the grant for exhibitions would be cut down, and in his statement he said something about associations making large surpluses and the managers claiming large salaries. I might say, with regard to the fair at Ottawa, that the grant from the federal government was $5,000 and, according to newspaper reports, it is to be cut by $2,000. The outcome of that will be that the prizes that the live stock men receive will be cut down by just that much, and they are the ones who are getting the big benefit of this federal grant. For instance, according to our fair in Ottawa last year, if a man showing horses paid a dollar for entry money, he got eight dollars out in prize money; if a man showing cattle paid a dollar for entry money, he got seven dollars out in prize money; if a man showing sheep paid a dollar for entry money, he got five dollars out in prize money; if a man showing poultry paid a dollar for entry money, he got three dollars out in prize money. The outcome of this policy will be that this prize money will be reduced proportionately by $2,000, and that will be a hardship, not so much on the fair board as on men who are exhibiting stock.

Mr. MILNE: I notice in this estimate that we have fourteen statisticians. If we do not already have enough statisticians to carry out the work of the department, we soon should have. I notice we have five animal pathologists and two plant pathologists. Where are their laboratories, and do they co-operate with gentlemen who are doing the same work in the provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With regard to the animal pathologists, we have laboratories at Ottawa. Dr. Watson has charge of the whole of this work, and a large number of serums and antitoxins are made in the laboratories. Some of the provinces have laboratories, but they find it more economical to import serums and antitoxins or to ship them in from large centres. I had the pleasure of meeting some of the gentlemen engaged in this work. As a matter of fact, I do not know where one-half of the buildings are that contain the staff of my department. There are eleven buildings, I think, and when I get time, I shall avail myself of the opportunity of, at least, finding out where they are. The statisticians are engaged in compiling statistics for filing purposes, for library purposes and, more particularly, for market purposes. I can assure the committee that,

so far as I know, there are no drones around the department, and I have the department just as it was handed over to me. As regards the Experimental farm, I visited the poultry plant, but I did not go all over it to see whether the staff were all on the job or loafing. I know Mr. Archibald, however, and I do not believe he is a man who would permit loafing, so that I do not think the remarks along that line were warranted. But there is nothing so good that it cannot be improved, and we have had some valuable contributions and good suggestions this evening. I like the suggestion that was made about a dairy representative going down to explore the possibilities of South America in connection with the dairy breed of cattle. No branch of agriculture is getting so hard hit to-day as dairying.

Mr. MILNE: I do not believe the minister quite understood my question. Do these investigators under the federal department co-operate with investigators under the provincial departments, or, when they are investigating, do they simply walk indiscriminately all over the field?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is co-operation and there should be a good deal more, but it is not an easy task to undertake. The hon. member for Victoria city (Mr. Tolmie) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) were not long at their work until they realised the necessity of more co-operation between provincial and federal departments. I thank my hon. friend, because that is one of the works of my special messenger in the person of Mr. Duncan Marshall, namely, to see if we cannot cut out some of the overlapping, particularly in the live stock branch. It is not easy to do so, but I think it can be done. A resolution was passed last session in the Saskatchewan legislature recommending just such a policy, and it was proposed to extend it to the administration of experimental farms in that province. That opens up a big field of research, and I think a great deal can be done especially in the live stock branch where the provincial government has a live stock policy and the federal government has almost a corresponding one, with the necessary paraphernalia connected with both. Some co-operation has been effected and I hope more will be.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): What is the last item in this appropriation, $4,000, for new positions and promotions?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I explained that the other night, and that is the saving feature of all these items. New positions may be found necessary between now and next year, and if it is found that some of these salaries are not sufficiently attractive to secure applicants, we shall have to ask the Civil Service Commission to regrade these positions at higher salaries. If that is done, some source will have to be provided from which to get the additional money, and that is what this sum of $4,000 is for. It is quite necessary, and a safeguard in the whole business.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did I understand the minister to say that his policy is to cut off grants for agricultural exhibitions?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, my first proposal was to reduce them, on the ground that I understood the associations had all been notified a year ago that these grants had been so generous during the war that they ran up in the aggregate to $180,000, and they would be cut down. I am not criticising the grants adversely. During the war, when there were so many calls on individuals for various purposes, it was found advisable by the then government to give substantial additional grants for these shows. I understood from my officials that the associations have been notified that the grants would be cut down, and the proposition was to cut them in two with due notice. I find they all claim now that they were not notified, and it is quite possible that we may be able to modify our proposal when we come to the Supplementary Estimates. If subsequent reports indicate that there is going to be a severe strain on these fairs as a result of cutting the grants in two, at the beginning we may start with a cut of 20 per cent, and gradually make further reductions, but we can consider the matter further when we come to the Supplementary Estimates. I cannot give any assurance that this will be done; I shall have to wait and ascertain what the reports are. If my hon. friend ever tried to reduce the grants to agricultural societies he would find it a difficuut job. Someone has to stand up and advocate it. At the same time I do not want to be harsh or unjust to the institutions that have their programmes prepared for the coming summer.

Mr. THOMPSON: Will the regulations with regard to the grading of dairy products be considered by this House before they are finally adopted? If not, I want

to express the views of my constituency, which is the second largest cheese producing county in the Dominion. The people I represent are absolutely opposed to the grading of cheese being done in Montreal, as proposed by the minister. For years we have had a system whereby the cheese is inspected at cheese factories, which are large and commodious; and the work of inspection has been carried on satisfactorily and with the best results. I was present at meetings held at Peterborough, Campbellford, Stirling, Picton, Belleville and Madoc, and while I am not speaking for any place outside of my own constituency, I can say that resolutions have been passed at all of these cheese boards absolutely opposing the grading in Montreal. Copies of these resolutions have been sent to the minister asking that the grading be done in the cheese factories. The people believe that this system which has worked satisfactorily in the past, is very much better than the one now proposed. The man buys his cheese and inspects it at the factory, and there is a proviso in the regulations that if there is any dispute between buyer and seller, the instructor of the district, who is a disinterested party, shall act as sole arbitrator, his decision being final. This system has given every satisfaction and the people are therefore unanimously opposed to the proposal to send the cheese to Montreal for inspection and grading. If the Government wishes to carry on grading they do not offer any objection, although they do not see the need for it; but they do certainly oppose strenuously the attempt to change the system and send the cheese to Montreal. Besides the convenience there is in inspecting the cheese at the factory, there is this fact, which is of considerable importance, that when the inspection is done under the eyes of the cheese maker, defects can be pointed out to him and he can readily remedy them.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the hon. member has recommendations to make in regard to the regulations I shall be glad to receive them, but I think that the inspection in the past was done principally by those interested in buying the cheese. In regard to grain, for instance, the grading is done by the buyer, where the grain is sold locally. What we want is to have a government grading of cheese. We have received some objections, but they were from the buyers of cheese. Sometimes we have had a few objections from farmers who have not understood the matter; but as a matter of fact no change is ever introduced without some objections. The grading of butter has been practised in the West for years, with entire satisfaction, and I have no doubt that when we establish the system with regard to cheese it will be found to work satisfactorily. We have to do it whether we like it or not.

Mr. THOMPSON: The delegates from Peterborough, Campbellford, Stirling, Picton, Belleville and Madoc cheese boards, who attended the meetings which the hon. minister refers to, opposed the grading in Montreal. They represent about $10,000,000 worth of cheese exported, and their views should be considered. Whatever may have been done with regard to butter in the West is no reason for enforcing on cheese makers regulations which they do not agree with.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On page 22, item 45 we have cold storage warehouses and dairy, and we should discuss this matter under that item.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): Under what item does poultry inspection, in regard to record performance, appear?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On page 87. This comes under "Chief, Poultry Division." In some cases we have two sets of what appear to be the same officials, one for the Experimental Farm here, and another for outside work at some other experimental farm.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The inspectors to which I have reference are not in connection with any experimental farm, either in Ottawa or anywhere else. They go to the individual farms that participate in the contest. Last year there were some 11,000 birds entered.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The inspectors of poultry are paid out of the live stock vote on page 22. These are civil government estimates.

Mr. TOLMIE: While I heartily sympathise with the minister in his desire to increase salaries—because I know very well that some of the experts are not as well paid as they should be—still I note in the last item on page 89 the sum of $4,000 for new positions and promotions. Is this in accordance with the Civil Service Act, and did the minister consult the Department of Justice before including this item in the Estimates?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I hope to be able to prevail on the Civil Service Commission

to increase salaries to get the right men. The Plant Pathologist whom we hope to get I do not believe will be attracted by the salary offered. We shall go to the commission and make out a case for better salaries.

Mr. COOTE: There is an increase in travelling expenses from $75,000 to $85,000. Does the minister really think that his department is justified in asking for an increase of $10,000, particularly when we expect railway rates to come down? If any part of this $10,000 is to be incurred on trips to the Argentine or Chili, I think he should ask the Department of Trade and Commerce to reimburse him to that extent. I believe that we have trade commissioners in South America, and if the Department of Agriculture sends specialists there, it is only fair for the minister of that department to ask the Department of Trade and Commerce to shoulder that expense.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have explained that; possibly the hon. member was not in the Chamber at the time. Almost every year representatives of the department have to attend meetings or conferences overseas. The Agricultural Institute meets at Rome this year; it has to do with the compilation of farm statistics from all over the world. That accounts for a considerable amount of the $10,000 for this year. In addition, the travelling expenses of a number of officers in the administrative branches have been transferred to this vote, augmenting the amount to that extent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In respect to the item of $4,000 for new positions and promotions, I notice on page 88 that increases of salary are provided for thirty-six positions, while five or six remain at the same amount. Why, then, should there be provision for this $4,000 also?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend refers to some getting increases and others not, I may point out that it depends upon what stage of the salary range they have reached. If at the top, they stay there until put into a higher grade by the Civil Service Commission; if at the bottom or somewhere between the bottom and the top, they go up according to the classification.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why is it necessary to provide for $4,000 for possible further increases?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Because these salaries may not attract the men we want. As a matter of fact, some of them will not.

Mr. LADNER: What new positions are contemplated in this vote of $4,000?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These figures, of course, are estimates; the amount is an approximation. There may be some outbreak which the Entomological branch will have to deal with; if the season is hot and dry, invasions of insects are possible and may come overnight. I do not anticipate that there will be many new positions, and I hope there will be sufficient extensions of salaries to get the positions all filled. If the money is not required it will not be spent.

Item agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: I think we have done pretty well; we might adjourn.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, April 4, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

MARKETING OF WHEAT

SECOND AND THIRD REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, as follows:

That without delaying investigation by this committee as to the advisability of the re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board, the matter of the constitutionality of such re-establishment be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and that every effort be made to secure decision at an early date.

Also the third report of said committee, reading as follows:

That the reference to the committee of the memorandum of Council of Agriculture be enlarged, and that the committee be instructed to consider also the suggestion of a "Voluntary Pool" under control of the Government and working in conjunction with the elevator system now owned by the Government, and also the proposal of marketing of the wheat crop by the co-operative system, and to report to the House its finding.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. That it is expedient to bring in a measure to create a department of the Government of

Canada to be called the Department of National Defence, over which a Minister of the Crown shall preside who shall be the Minister of National Defence.

2. That the minister shall be charged with all matters relating to Defence, including the Militia, the Military, Naval, Air and Police Services of Canada.

3. That there shall be a Deputy Minister of National Defence who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, and hold office during pleasure, and such officers may be appointed as are necessary for the carrying on of the business of the department.

4. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister may appoint an officer who shall, in relation to the Naval Service exercise all the powers and duties vested in the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service by or under The Naval Service Act, and who shall have the rank and salary of a deputy head of a department, and shall be a member of the Defence Council.

5. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the minister may appoint an officer to be known as Comptroller, who under the Deputy Minister of National Defence, shall be charged with all financial matters pertaining to the Department of National Defence.

6. That any person whose position is abolished on the coming into force of the Act to be based upon these resolutions may, on the recommendation of the minister, be appointed by the Governor in Council to such position in the department and with such rank, title and salary as shall be prescribed.

7. That if any person is removed from office or an appointment in consequence of the abolition of his office or his appointment by the Act based upon these resolutions or by any order or regulation thereunder, or is retired within two years after the coming into force of the said Act, the Governor in Council may grant him a gratuity, retiring or superannuation allowance, or pension not exceeding such as he would have been entitled or eligible to receive if he had been retired under the provisions of any Act applicable to him, after adding from one to three years, as the Governor in Council may deem advisable, to his actual term of service.

8. That provision be made to vest the powers, duties and functions vested in the ministers and deputy ministers under the various Acts relating to the Naval Service, the Militia, Militia Pensions, the Royal Military College, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Dominion Police, in the Minister of National Defence and the Deputy Minister of National Defence respectively:—Provided that the powers vested in the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service under the Naval Service Act shall be exercised by the officer appointed for that purpose as aforesaid.

9. That provision be made to constitute a Defence Council to advise the minister on all matters of defence, including or relating to the Militia, the Military, Naval, Air and Police Services of Canada, and on all matters referred to it by the minister, and to perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

He said: Although the statement appears in Hansard that His Excellency the Governor General has been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution and commends it to the consideration of the House, it does not appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think a few words of explanation from the minister would not be out of place at the present time with regard to this important resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: I proposed to make a statement on moving the second reading of the bill.

Mr. McMASTER: We cannot hear at this end of the Chamber.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the first time I was ever accused of speaking in too low a tone. I am quite willing to make a short explanation now as to the object of this resolution; but I shall reserve the further and more detailed statement until the motion for the second reading of the bill.

As hon. members know, announcement was made some weeks ago that it was the intention of the Government to bring under one ministerial head what might properly be termed the defence forces of Canada. There are four branches,—the Militia, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Naval Service and the Air Service. The object of the present resolution, and of the bill to be founded on it, is to bring these branches under one ministerial head, in the hope of thereby promoting efficiency and economy. It is a fair question to ask: In what direction does the Government expect to promote economy? I will just mention one phase of the matter which I think will appeal to every member of the House. In all these branches there are quite a large number of temporary employees. Now the word "temporary" used in this connection has not the significance we usually apply to the term. A clerk in one of these departments, or in any other department, may be properly termed temporary though he or she may have been in such department for years. The fact may be that they have failed to pass the necessary examination entitling them to become permanent employees, or even some may have passed such examination and still not have been made permanent under the act. Now, in the departments referred to there are a large number of temporary employees, and the Government hope that by the amalgamation of the different branches in question the services can be approximately carried on by the permanent staff. If our hope in that direction be realized, I think there

would be a saving on this account alone of between seven hundred thousand and a million dollars per annum. Then there are other directions, I think, in which economy can be promoted; for example in the amalgamation of the various executive forces of these different branches, those engaged in buying and selling—what we call the purchasing departments—and other services of this nature. By amalgamation it is hoped that we can do the business just as well, or perhaps a little better, with a smaller staff. There is a question involved in the uniting of these branches that is a difficult one to solve. Hon. members who have been ministerial heads of departments will perhaps appreciate the fact more thoroughly than those who have not held such a trying position. There are not a few semi-heads of branches, including men quite prominent in the land, splendid men, whom it will be perhaps a little difficult to establish under the new organization; but I am taking the House into my confidence when I say that I will endeavour, as far as possible, to see that in the carrying out of the new organization no injustice will be done to these men who have given years of service to the public. I do not know that it would be wise, or even necessary, at this stage to enter upon a consideration of the details of what is proposed. I think it would be more satisfactory to do that when the bill has been printed and placed in its entirety in the hands of hon. members.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has the Minister made provision for these changes in the Estimates that are before the House?

Mr. GRAHAM: It will take months to bring about this organization; and I may say that discussing it with a gentleman, not in the employ of the Government but one who has had experience in several departments, he assured me that if it were accomplished in one year it would be good work. But the Estimates had to be prepared for the fiscal year, and we have just entered upon a new fiscal period. It has not been possible to adopt any other method in this respect than that which we have followed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the committee will agree that the resolution forecasts a bill which, in general, will be to the advantage of Canada; and while we cannot give to the present minister the credit for originating the idea still, I think, we may accord him full credit as the first Minister of Militia in Canada who has brought forth a concrete scheme, or proposal, for accomplishing the purpose. So far back as the year 1909 or 1910, the older members of the House will recollect, Sir Frederick Borden, then Minister of Militia and Defence in the Liberal Administration of that day, considered it would be desirable to bring together the Naval and Military services. It was at the time of the discussion in this House of the act known as the Naval Service Act of Canada, but there were difficulties in carrying out the proposal at that time and there have been difficulties since.

Mr. GRAHAM: And there are difficulties now.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In fact it has been said that the only time properly to consolidate several departments of government into one is at the beginning of a new parliament and upon the formation of a new ministry. The Naval Service section of the defence forces of Canada has heretofore always been under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who was known also as Minister of the Naval Service. The Mounted Police were, for many years, under the jurisdiction of the President of the Council. The force is still under the President of the Privy Council, but under the late administration the holder of that portfolio was, for a time, also Minister of Immigration and Colonization. The Air Board was, I think, at its inception attached to the Department of the Secretary of State. Shortly afterwards it was transferred to the Department of Militia and Defence, but only in so far as the minister himself was named as the chairman of the board; the board did not function under the Department of Militia and Defence save in regard to the chairmanship of the Minister of Militia. In a scheme advanced by Sir Frederick Borden, and in another scheme suggested to Parliament in a report by Lord French—made, I think, in the year 1910 or 1911—the suggestion was advanced that all the military and naval forces of Canada should be brought under one department. Speaking subject to correction let me say that neither in Sir Frederick Borden's suggestion nor in Lord French's report was it proposed that the Mounted Police of Canada should be made part of the Department of National Defence. Then at a later stage, following the late war, General Sir Arthur Currie, while chief of staff in the Department of Militia, made a report and I had the pleasure and honour of discussing that report with him. It will be found, I think, in the militia report of

1920. In his report Sir Arthur Currie recommended that the military force, the naval force and the air force should be brought under one department, and also that there should be a committee of national defence in the government, but he, I think, likewise excluded the Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

We have, however, waited until the present time before taking action in regard to the matter. The proposal of the minister is to take all of our defence forces and all of our police forces not strictly of a military or naval nature and place them under one central control and in a single department of government, and by so doing the minister says—and I think he has reasonable ground for the statement—that he will to some extent reduce the expenditure in regard to national defence. I assume that that will be one of the results of the proposed action of the minister. I, for one, am very much gratified that he is taking this stand in regard to national defence. From statements made in this House last session and the session before, and from speeches made during the recent election, I feared very much that the present Government upon attaining power would not do anything in regard to national defence at all. I felt gratified when I looked over the Estimates and found that the proposals for expenditures on national defence this year were practically about what they were the year before and the year before that. It was a matter of gratification for me to see that the proposed expenditure this year in the Department of Militia is just about ten million six or seven hundred thousand dollars and I think I am within the mark when I say that all we spent in the Department of Militia last year just closed was ten million two hundred thousand or two hundred and fifty thousand or about half a million less than the proposed expenditure for this year. I feared from what I had read and heard in this House that a severe assault was to be made upon the militia system of Canada and I am greatly gratified to find that that is not the case but that substantially the Government proposes to maintain in this country what we have maintained from Confederation down to the present time. I believe it will be in the general interests of the service and of the Dominion to bring the various defence forces together as the minister proposes, but I am going to reserve, during the present discussion, from expressing any opinion in regard to the proposal to bring the Mounted Police into the Department of National Defence, as part of the defence forces of Canada. No one knows better than my hon. friend the minister (Mr. Graham) and the Government of which he is a member, that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police was originally established upon the distinct understanding that it was not to be a military but essentially a civil force. While it is true that it has always been drilled and organized upon military lines, its duties and functions have always been distinctly civil, as apart from military. The late Sir Frederick Borden did not suggest taking it in, neither did Lord French nor Sir Arthur Currie, and the ground of their refusal to suggest its being taken in was that it might be continued as a purely civil force. I do not think I am going beyond the facts when I say that the chief benefit derived in the Dominion of Canada from the Northwest Mounted Police has been in regard to civil work. It has been of tremendous advantage to this country that we have had such a force. It has been engaged in the investigation of crime, the preservation of law and order, just as an ordinary municipal police force would be, and if you now turn that purely civil into part of your military establishment or part of your national defence, you will rob that exceptional force of the distinctly civil character which it has enjoyed heretofore, and by reason of which it has been so useful from its inception to the present time.

Also, I point out to the committee at this stage that the present resolution forecasts a bill, and the bill will be brought in, in due course. The resolution and the bill, I am satisfied, are mere skeletons, they merely state that a department of national defence shall be established, but the whole machinery for the establishment and carrying on of that department is left to the Governor in Council. It is rather strange that in a short resolution such as the present one we find that in no less than six different instances the Government proposes to carry out this scheme by Order in Council. This intention on the part of the Government is even more marked in the bill than in the resolution. The Government boldly proposes to reserve to itself the right to deal with this new department, to carry on the great matter of national defence, by Order in Council. If the committee will stop to count the references in this short resolution, they will find that the Order in Council method of dealing

with the matter is adopted in no less than six instances, and it occurs more frequently in the bill than it does in the resolution. For any one who sat in this Parliament during the last three sessions, and heard the members of the present Government, then in opposition, condemning in the strongest language, in season and out of season, what they called "government by order in council," it is a strange thing that the first piece of real legislation which they have to present to the House this session is merely a skeleton, and that the present Government, which formed the Opposition during the last three years, now deliberately proposes to carry out this measure under the powers which can be exercised by the Governor in Council.

I was glad to hear the minister state that it was his intention, as far as possible, to take care of the experienced members of his staff although it is quite possible that he may not require the services of them all. I think it is worth the time of the committee to give some consideration to that question. We have to-day in the Militia Department—and I can say this without any qualification—the most highly-trained men and the most thoroughly experienced military staff that we have ever had in the history of the Dominion. That is, of course, by reason of the fact that the men who are now in the commanding positions in that department were men who served with the Canadian forces throughout the great war. We have now in that department, or had until very recently, as Inspector-General, Major General Sir Henry Burstall, one of the ablest officers that the Dominion of Canada has yet produced. We have as Chief of General Staff, Major General MacBrien, as Master of Ordnance, Major General Sir Edward Morrison, as Adjutant General, Major General Elmsley, and as Quarter-master, Major General Ashton, a group of men, who, as field commanders in time of trouble, or as advisers and adminstrators in time of peace, it would be hard to surpass. These officers are all highly experienced staff officers whose places could not be easily filled in this country. Most of the men have been trained, to some extent, at the expense of the Dominion of Canada. Three, at least, of them have been sent by and at the expense of this country to the staff college in Great Britain, and they have taken brilliant courses there. They have been equipped, at the expense and for the benefit of Canada, with the highest kind of military training, and they are all yet within military age. I believe, if this bill goes through and this reorganization takes place, some of these men will have to leave the service to seek other walks of life, and I believe it is proposed to promote some juniors in the service to their positions. Is it in the interest of Canada to have specially trained officers, to spend our money to send these men to the staff college in England, and then to cast them adrift rather than to continue to utilize their services? It is of the highest importance that such men, as those whom I have enumerated, should be retained in the Militia of Canada and that their services should not be dispensed with. If it be wrong to train men and to send them to the staff college in England, let us stop doing so now; but let us have the services of those men who have heretofore been trained, not only in the staff college, but in the long and hard school in which they served during the years of the Great War.

In connection with the retirement or release of officers, there is another point which should be especially drawn to the attention of the committee, and that is the provision for their retirement. If they are to be retired, I want to see them liberally dealt with; but I do not know that the minister has adopted the right course. He is proposing to add to their years of service for the purpose of increasing their pensions. We have not been accustomed to let out our privates on that basis, and I think the 400 clerks, who were let out of the Militia Department on the first of this month, were not treated in that way. I do not know that it is a proper principle to add unserved time to time served, for the purpose of increasing pensions, but that is the power which the minister is taking under this bill.

Mr. VIEN: What other course would the hon. gentleman recommend if he wants these men to be treated generously?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would retain their services instead of putting other men in their places. We have now a Militia Council, and its place is to be taken by a Council of National Defence. This will mean that new men will be taken on or that other men will be promoted.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman said: If the department has to dispense with the services of these men, I wish the minister would treat them generously; but I do not agree with the minister in his proposal of adding to their years of service so as

to increase their pensions. I put this question to the hon. gentleman. If he does not agree with the policy of adding years to their years of service for the purpose of increasing their pensions, what other course does he suggest, if we admit that their services must be dispensed with?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not admit that their services must be dispensed with. The services of the men, who are now there, and whom I have enumerated, should be retained, and I am asking that they be retained.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the present law, the Government has practically carte blanche to add to their years of service for the purpose of pensions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then why put this provision in the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM: Outside of the men who come under the Military Pensions Act, there are men in the other branches who do not come under that provision.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I hope the minister will be able to convince me when we come to deal with that clause, which struck me as an odd clause when I read it. My experience is that experienced men, whom Canada has educated, of whom Canada is proud, who did so well in the Great War, should be retained, and new men should not be introduced, either by promotions or new appointments.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend believe that seventeen generals are necessary to manage the affairs of the Militia of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is some applause to that sentiment from the Progressive side of the House. These seventeen officers were not Generals before the war; but by reason of the fact that these men succeeded in the war, they were promoted at the most critical time in the history of this country and its people. Thus it was that they rose to high command. Should that now be a disqualification? Does it justify us in saying: "Now, you cannot stay in the Militia? You must make way for less experienced men." The seventeen Generals of whom my right hon. friend speaks, are men who did not rise to that rank before the great war; but by reason of their good and hard work during the war, they attained that rank, and we should retain them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to say just one word as to what my hon. friend has stated about the references in this resolution to Orders in Council. I think no one understands better than my hon. friend that there is a great difference between asking Parliament to authorize certain administrative acts by Order in Council, which acts can be performed only in that way, and the Governor-in-Council taking to itself power, to all intents and purposes, to enact legislation on matters which should be the subject of legislation in this Parliament. What we on this side of the House took strong objection to in the case of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were sitting on this side, was that, having been given certain general powers for war purposes, they continued to use those powers for the purpose of putting through by Order in Council enactment after enactment which should have had their origin in this House, if they were to have an origin anywhere. My hon. friends will recall that it was more or less a habit with them to pass Orders in Council and then to come to Parliament and ask Parliament to legalise the effects of those Orders in Council. I remember, in the case of one bill relating to some matters affecting coal mining operations in the West, the government of my hon. friend opposite presented to this House 180 Orders in Council and Parliament was asked to re-enact these Orders in Council, to give them beyond question the effect of law, although Parliament, at the outset, was not even favoured with copies of the Orders in Council. They were enumerated by number, from number 1 to No. 180, and this Parliament was asked to give the force of law to Orders in Council that were enumerated in that way. What we are asking in this resolution is for Parliament to authorize the Governor-in-Council to do certain administrative acts which are necessary to give effect to the intention of Parliament with regard to this legislation. If, in any particular, hon. members think the powers asked should not be given for certain specific acts, they will not be further asked for. It will be for the House to decide whether these particular administrative acts should be performed by the Governor-in-Council; and if the House decides that they should not, to suggest some other method of doing what is proposed. I think it is but right that the point to which we have taken such strong exception in the matter of Orders in Council, should be made clear. The objection is not to the Governor-in-Council discharging necessary acts of administration, but to the Governor-

in-Council usurping certain powers of legislation by proceeding by Order in Council where legislation should be sought.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to say a few words about the resolution and also a few words as to this monthly sermon that we receive from the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King).

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are receiving a daily one from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Right from the pulpit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sometimes the obstinacy of the audience puts an unnecessary burden on the instructor. As regards the Governor-in-Council or the government that has gone out of office taking to itself powers, I do not know what meaning that has in the mind of the Prime Minister. I know it has no meaning at all in mine, and I am sure it has no meaning at all in the mind of anyone who takes a practical grasp of what a Governor-in-Council is, of what an Order in Council is. A Governor-in-Council can take no powers to itself, no more than can a gentleman take powers to himself, no more than this Parliament can take powers to itself. A Governor in Council cannot add to its powers, nor can any Order in Council at all expand the powers vested in the Governor in Council by the Parliament of Canada. There do come times in the life of every government, and never so much, certainly, as in the life of the late government —because the late government had charge of the affairs of this country during by no means ordinary times, to put it mildly— when it is found that the Governor in Council must anticipate the will of Parliament if it is to do its duty by the nation. We did that frequently during the war, and we had to do it subsequent to the war, because the conditions that prevailed then were really not different from those that obtained during the days of the war. To say that the late government did anything different from what every government in the world did is simply to speak without any knowledge of the facts. The late government passed its war Orders in Council under the provisions either of ordinary statutes or of what was known as the War Measures Act, an act which virtually gave to the government the powers of Parliament and which passed this House unanimously. The British Government had a corresponding act entitled the Defence of the Realm Act. Our act was out of effect at least a year—although I think I should be closer to the exact time if I said two years—before the corresponding act went out of operation in Great Britain. Great Britain was legislating under her Defence of the Realm Act, and the King in Council, for a year, if not two years, after our act was out of force, was passing orders in council in the Mother Country. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we passed 180 orders in council which we had to come to Parliament to have confirmed. I have some recollection of what he refers to particularly. During the war we were compelled to establish an office, the exact title of which I do not recall.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Director of Coal Operations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Director of Coal Operations. Hon. gentlemen will remember the difficulties that arose in the coal mines in the province of Alberta, difficulties that involved an imminent peril to the whole of western Canada. We appointed the Coal Controller and empowered him to make orders fixing various conditions as between the workmen, on the one hand, and the mines on the other. He made many orders under the powers vested in him by the Governor in Council, which powers were exercised under the War Measures Act. That is the time when the 180 orders were passed. And, by the way, I do not know how many of them were of any consequence, nor am I sure that all of them were not wholly legal, under the powers vested in the Controller by the instrument that appointed him, which instrument was passed by virtue of the War Measures Act itself. But there arose a doubt as to whether, the Governor in Council having acted under the War Measures Act and passed an Order in Council empowering a man to do certain work, that man himself could issue written orders having the force of law. For that reason we came to Parliament and confirmed the whole matter. But to say that everything should have stood still, and the whole chaotic state of affairs allowed to continue, without anything being done until Parliament met, is merely to speak what has no basis in common sense, if indeed it has any basis in sanity. I am pretty sure that the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was a member of the government when we appointed Mr. Armstrong a controller. If I am wrong the hon. member will correct me. It will be recalled how perilous the condition was; and, standing

here, I am prepared to say, and leave it to the judgment of the House, that our conduct in the crisis of the coal situation in Alberta at that time, and its results, may be very favourably compared with the conduct of the present Government in the coal crisis in Nova Scotia to-day. That is the basis of the hon. gentleman's allegation in that regard. Occasionally, let me repeat, the time comes—and naturally it comes more often in troublous, tempestuous months and years of war, than in the ordinary times of peace—when it is essential, unless the Government runs away from its duties, that it anticipate the will of Parliament. And I do not think that any one can look back to-day and say, wherever we considered it absolutely essential in the public interest to do this in the days that have gone, that our conduct, when it came before Parliament for consideration, was ever open to question as to the rightness of the course we had pursued. Of course, there was the usual talk that this was government by Order in Council, and that Parliament should have done these things. Had it been possible to wait for Parliament, undoubtedly that course would have been adopted. However, this is not the time to draw the parallels; but let me suggest to the Prime Minister not to be over confident; because since he has been in office Orders in Council have been passed in fairly quiet times, when the sun was shining and all was quiet without, as respects which, if they are to have validity, he will have to come to Parliament for ratification.

Now, this resolution foreshadows a bill which is considered of such moment that it was thought necessary to refer to it in the Speech from the Throne; and very considerable beating of drums and sounding of trumpets have been going on as to this very vital piece of legislation. I think, first of all, that the disposition of the responsibilities of departments and branches of departments among ministers is a matter which might well be left to the Government in office, a matter more or less of domestic arrangement; and as respects any such disposition I should not be inclined to offer very severe criticism. I think a government should be permitted to dispose of its work among its ministers as it may deem best. There might, of course, be arrangements as to the distribution of work that would be incongruous. In one respect the present proposal is open to that objection, and only as regards that do I feel like offering criticism. But to say that this is any great outstanding piece of legislation is surely rather to reflect on the weight or moment of the programme which the Government has in mind. The Government could practically do what it now proposes under the legislation that has been in effect for years. The late government brought departments and branches of departments together under that legislation. It is true that by the existing provisions you cannot wholly amalgamate and get rid of deputy ministers. Under those provisions you can keep departments separate, but under one minister; while under this legislation you can get rid of deputy ministers and effectually amalgamate departments into one. Whether anything more will actually result under this proposed legislation than could be done under the machinery now in force I doubt very much. I, at least, do not think, and I do not believe that any one else does, that there is any doing away with ministers by this legislation. Previously the Marine and Fisheries Department, the Naval Service Department, the Militia Department, the Air Department, the Mounted Police, and External Affairs—I name six—were all under the review and the charge of three ministers, the Minister of Militia, ordinarily so-called, the Minister of Marine, and the Prime Minister. Those six departments, when this legislation goes through, will still be under three ministers, just the same number as before. The work will be differently disposed among them, that is all. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have charge of Marine and Fisheries alone; the Naval Service goes from him to the Minister of Militia. The Prime Minister will have charge of External Affairs; and the Mounted Police, which before was under myself, will go from that department to the Militia Department. So that the six services that previously were under three ministers will be under three ministers still.

As to taking the Naval Service out of the Marine and Fisheries Department, so called, or really disjoining it from the Marine and Fisheries Department—for it is a department in itself—and putting it under the Militia Department, I have no criticism to make. I fancy that as the duties of the Minister of Militia now will be very much lighter than they have been in the last eight years, it may be a division that will more equitably take care of the services and responsibilities that fall to the various ministers. And it may be that the Naval Ser-

vice is really more akin to the Militia service than it is to the Marine and Fisheries service. I presume it was really joined with the latter as two departments under the one minister because both the Marine and Fisheries and the Naval Service are departments that have to do with our waters. That the Naval Service should be taken out and now joined to the Militia Department is in my judgment a matter for the Government itself to determine, and does not lend itself to criticism.

But I do object to the Mounted Police being taken out of a civilian department and made part of the military forces, and I see no reason for the step whatever. The Mounted Police from its inception has been a civilian force, and the very credit that accrues to it to-day throughout this Dominion is derived more from the fact that it is a civilian force than from any other consideration. Make it a military force and throw around it the atmosphere and the trappings of the militia, and you will not find the Mounted Police held in the same regard; the attitude of the public towards that force will not be maintained. The Mounted Police is not a defence force in any sense whatever; it has been a civilian force all through its history, and there is more reason for maintaining it as a civilian force now than there ever was before. Why? Because two or three years ago the Dominion Police, which had been administered under the Justice Department, were joined with the Mounted Police and under the title of The Royal Canadian Mounted Police. So here we have the Dominion Police and the old civilian Mounted Police in one force, now to be merged in the Militia Department and to be administered as part of the defence forces. By what turn of language can the Mounted Police or the Dominion Police be described as a defence force? They are in no sense such a force. I think that the use of the Mounted Police has been solely for the purpose of supplementing the work of the local police in taking care of emergencies that the latter were incapable of handling, and hence municipalities called upon the Mounted Police for assistance. That use will not be availed of with the same freedom, and the Mounted Police will not be held in quite the same regard, if the local authorities feel that it is really part of the militia they are calling in to do service that they would rather have performed by a civilian force. The Mounted Police investigate crime, they go into the far remote parts of our country and ferret out the criminal. Why should men engaged in that pursuit be attached to the militia? This suggestion I remember was made before I had the honour of being head of the Government, and after consideration it was felt that it would be a mistake to take the Mounted Police out of its civilian rank and put it under a Minister of Militia, although it was never even considered that they should be assigned to militia service and to that extent be given the character of a defence force. I think the minister would be well advised to reconsider this resolution in the light of that experience. Beyond that I offer no objection to the resolution, but I think it will be regretted in the days to come if the Mounted Police with its splendid history is taken out of the category of a civilian police force and placed before the public as part of the militia or defence force.

Mr. MARTELL: I have only one short observation to make as regards the amalgamation of these various departments. I do not know exactly from the resolution what the Minister of Defence, as he is to be termed in future, contemplates doing with the fishery protection service, but I hope that he will take into consideration the advisability of putting back this service under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Some years ago I had the honour of being an official in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and unfortunately the fisheries protection service was placed under the Department of National Defence. The result was that when the departmental officials sent in reports to the department complaining that Americans or others were poaching and in other ways breaking the Fisheries Protection Law, they had to take the matter up with the Naval Service Department, and there was so much red tape that it took three or four days before a naval service boat was despatched to the scene of action. I really believe that it is in the best interests of our fisheries administration that when this co-ordination of the service is being brought about the fisheries protection fleet and all its officers should be put under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Their function is not as a defensive force against an invader, but primarily to see that the fishery laws are observed, and under no department can they be so thoroughly and efficiently enforced as under the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. MEWBURN: I wish to offer my congratulations to the hon. minister on his

endeavour to bring some of the departments together in the way suggested, but I have one or two minor exceptions to make. As the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) pointed out, this is not a new proposal; it was suggested years ago, during the war, and since the armistice, but it did not then seem feasible to carry it into effect. I am not particularly interested in the post-mortems respecting orders in council that the hon. leader of the Government and my right hon. leader have been sparring about; I should like to get down to the essentials of this bill.

I do feel very strongly that the Mounted Police should not be interfered with. The reason that has already been given I entirely concur with. Our Royal Canadian Mounted Police has beyond a question of a doubt been respected not only in Canada but the world over as the finest force for the preservation of law and order that has ever been organized. It is entirely a civil force, but the minute it is merged with the militia it cannot help but be known all over this country as part of the military forces of Canada. I am convinced that if the Mounted Police, which has now within its fold the old Dominion Police, could remain, for administrative purposes, under the Prime Minister, it would be much wiser and sounder. We have had troubles in the past, strikes and that sort of thing, and although under the present Militia Act it is within the power of a municipality to call upon the militia to turn out for the preservation of law and order, that is the very last resort that should be adopted in this country. The Mounted Police are available, and if it were not for the petty jealousies existing throughout the various provinces they could be utilized to much greater advantage than they have been up to the present time. The moral effect of the presence of one or two Mounted Police is the most wonderful thing in this country. I know that in the province of Ontario not very long ago, the Attorney General called for the services of that force in connection with some trouble at Thorold or Merritton. I think the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) will bear me out that the work that the Mounted Police did was a very vital force in the community. One or two members of the Mounted Police force can do more for the preservation of law and order than any number of militiamen that might be called out. Furthermore, every individual man of the Mounted Police force is a trained constable, possessing nerve and judgment and experience, and in the case of any trouble where the services of the Mounted Police may be required, there is far less danger in utilizing their services than in calling out the militia. I would therefore urge that the minister seriously consider eliminating the Mounted Police from the scope of this bill.

There is one other matter that I would like to touch upon. It may not be serious, and can be discussed more fully on the second reading of the bill. I notice that the resolution provides for two deputy ministers. I do not wish to make any severe criticism, but it seems to me that the services of one deputy minister are all that should be required. We already have a deputy minister of the Naval Service, a deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries, and a deputy minister of Militia and Defence, and from my own personal experience I think that the present deputy minister of Militia and Defence is capable of carrying on three or four important departments now that the war is over, and, I think, with due economy. If you are going to have two deputy ministers, you will be practically carrying on the same administration as we have to-day in the Naval Service and Militia Departments.

I wish to concur heartily in the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) about some of the staff officers. A good many people in this country and elsewhere are very prone to criticise staff officers and the "brass hat," but those who do so fail to realize that it is no choice of these men how they are dressed or what uniform they wear. Behind the staff uniform there has been an education going on for years, and during the late war an experience and ability have been gained through the testing of time. I think, instead of sneering at these men, this country owes them the greatest possible debt of gratitude, and I sincerely trust that the minister will use the services of these men whom it has cost the country something to educate. Some of these men have cheerfully given up their lives, and those who are left are prepared to give the benefit of their experience to this country, to the second and third generation. I commend the minister for the efforts he has made on their behalf.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I just wish to be sure that I understand what my hon. friend has in mind. If I gather rightly, he is of the opinion that the Mounted

Police should be kept under the Prime Minister in order that they may be available in times of industrial disputes to be sent into the area affected to act on such occasions. As against that, the method which has prevailed in the past has been for the civil authorities to request the calling out of the militia, if additional aid is needed when there is an industrial dispute in any locality. My hon. friend, I gather, thinks that that course should no longer be followed but that the mounted police should be used instead in these industrial disputes.

Mr. MEWBURN: Not at all. My hon. friend entirely misunderstood me. I said that the Mounted Police have always been known as a police force, a civil force pure and simple, not as a military force, and I thought it was far better to have that force under the Prime Minister, as it was in the past until a change was made and the force was put under the Privy Council. I do not say that the mounted police should be called into any area where there is a dispute or a strike, or anything of that sort. What I said was that it would be far better if the Mounted Police force, for administrative purposes, was entirely under the Prime Minister, and was known all over the world as a civil force rather than as a military force. I pointed out that I realized that in the event of any trouble arising in any municipality, at the present time the municipal authorities can request the aid of the militia, but I say that before that step is taken, the presence of a few Mounted Police, who could be sent in there to investigate, has such a moral effect in many instances as to prevent further trouble arising.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is most desirable that the Mounted Police should not be drawn into these industrial disputes at all. I might point out to my hon. friend that if we had followed the course he now suggests, there probably would have been very serious trouble in Nova Scotia. A request was made of the Government some two or three months ago to do just exactly what my hon. friend suggested, that is, to send the Mounted Police into these areas in Nova Scotia where there has been industrial trouble and have them skirmish about, as my hon. friend says, keeping order, and in that way obviate possibly worse happenings later on. But the Government took the position that if we wished to create an industrial disturbance of very serious proportions, possibly the best way we could go about it would be to order the Mounted Police into those areas. The matter came to my attention directly, and I refused absolutely to countenance sending the Mounted Police into these areas at that time. We told the municipal authorities that if they were unable to maintain law and order themselves, as they were supposed to do, they had the right under the Militia Act to call in the aid of the militia, but that they would be responsible for so doing and would have to be prepared to meet the expenses of the militia when called out. If you once open the door to having the Mounted Police called in to aid the civil authorities on any occasion when there may be alarm on account of industrial disputes, you will in a very short time have the federal government discharging a function in the matter of keeping law and order which it was never contemplated it should discharge. I think that if an injury has been done to the Mounted Police, it has been that under the late government on two or three occasions the Mounted Police were brought into these industrial disputes where it was absolutely unnecessary for them to have been brought in.

Mr. MEWBURN: My hon. friend says that he refused to send the Mounted Police to Nova Scotia, and quite right. He can always refuse to send them. The Mounted Police, under my suggestion, would only be sent when the Prime Minister acceded to a request for their services and where those services were absolutely essential. I hope that the Prime Minister will never be required to give his consent, but the day may come when he will be very glad to have the force at his disposal and to be able to accede to such a request.

Mr. CRERAR: The principle underlying the resolution that is now before the Committee has been pretty fully explained by the Minister of Militia, and further elaborated in the debate which has taken place. With this principle, which is that the different defence arms of Canada should be united under one control and direction, I am in hearty sympathy. I think such a step is in the right direction. It has several things to commend it. In the first place if it is necessary—and I am not among those who believe that it is not the duty of a country to provide for its own defence—if it is necessary to provide for defence, a

unification of the arms of defence, particularly in a country like Canada, should lend itself to efficiency in control and in operation. That is my first point. In the second place the step that the minister proposes to take, as outlined in this resolution, should bring about a greater efficiency with greater economy; and that certainly is to be desired at the present time.

As to the details of the bill in respect to the status of deputy ministers and other officials now in these departments, that is a matter that can, of course, be much better discussed when we are considering the measure clause by clause. There is one point, however, on which I find myself in general agreement with the position taken by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and that is in respect to the inclusion of the control of the Mounted Police in this measure, in the amalgamation that it is sought to bring about. Either the Mounted Police is a defence arm or it is not. If it is intended for purposes of defence, then by all means it should be included in the proposed co-ordination or amalgamation; but if it is intended for an arm of defence why do we need it at all? We do not require it for that purpose; we have enough scope in the Militia law for the provision of defence without creating an additional arm for that purpose. On the other hand, if the Mounted Police is a civil force, and it certainly has been a civil force, intended for the administration of civil law, then I submit it is not sound policy to include it with the arms that have to do with defence. I am among those who believe that the administration of civil law and the maintenance of civil order should be kept away as far as possible from that relating to the defence of the country—I think that is a sound principle upon which to proceed. I am a little bit doubtful also of the wisdom of including the Canadian Mounted Police in the co-ordination as suggested because of the fear that the association of that splendid force with the arms of the service that have to do with the defence of the country, may create a wrong impression in the public mind, and may create a wrong impression altogether in the mind of the force itself in relation to its public duty. I take second place to none in this House, or out of it, in my regard for the distinguished service that the North-west Mounted Police—the forerunners of the present body—gave this country. They have a very distinguished place in our history and a very distinguished record. I believe I am on record as expressing a doubt as to the wisdom of creating the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as we have it at the present time. I think the step taken in converting the Mounted Police into the present organization was one of very doubtful wisdom. After all, the maintenance of civil law and order is a function that belongs to the provinces. Why then should there be any attempt to create a Canadian police force for this purpose? In the olden days, in the large unorganized territories in western Canada, it was absolutely essential to have this police force, which was created in the days of the Mackenzie government for a specific purpose. In those days the force rendered admirable service to western Canada. But to take the position now that we must have a federal police force, with headquarters in the Capital city of the Dominion, sending its officers and constables into all parts of Canada, has no justification either on financial grounds or for reasons of utility. Consequently I am favourable to this idea—that recognizing as I do the splendid traditions of the force, recognizing the admirable service it has rendered to Canada in the past, the time has come when this force might very well be discontinued excepting in so far as it is necessary to police the territory in Canada that still remains unorganized. For that reason I trust the Government may be able to give consideration to the suggestion made that the Mounted Police, at any rate, or such of it as we may retain, should not be included under the administration of the Militia Department that has to do purely with matters of defence. I think that is a sound principle to adopt in relation to this matter.

Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that I cordially support the principle of the bill. I think it is a step in the right direction, because it will make for greater efficiency, or should do so, and will at the same time make for greater economy. I trust the Government may be able to give consideration to the suggestions advanced in connection with the Mounted Police. I for one would be very glad indeed if the Government could see its way clear—

An hon. MEMBER: To get rid of it.

Mr. CRERAR: No. I shall not say get rid of the force, but at any rate to reduce its personnel to what is necessary to police the unorganized territory of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am very much pleased with the reception the committee have given to this proposed legislation. I do not make any great claim to be the origi-

nator of this suggestion; but a suggestion that is only originated and never acted upon does not get us anywhere. I think I may say that I am the first minister who brought in a concrete proposition dealing with this subject.

I concur in what my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said with respect to the military officers he named; and in discussing the question of the militia of Canada we ought to remember one thing—that the men who now hold these offices largely went to war from the volunteer forces of Canada on their own volition and were advanced in rank, some of them from the rank of captain, to the positions they now hold. We therefore do owe them respect, and we ought to take advantage of their experience, so far as we possibly can, when they are willing to give us that experience. That is the way I feel about it. I am not an enemy of the militia of Canada—not by any means; I have reason to be otherwise—but what I I do want to accomplish if I possibly can, and I think we all have it in mind, is to have a well organized, snappy, defence force that will be a credit to Canada without being too expensive.

Now as to the officers mentioned by my hon. friend and the law pertaining to them, I may say that one of the gentlemen who have retired has been given more than a year's leave of absence by the Government which proves that the law touching this matter exists and that the Government has the power to do such a thing so far as the militia is concerned. I want to say further that as regards Sir Henry Burstall he is one of the men who brought distinction to Canada every time he was called upon to take a stand for the good name of the country not only at home but on the battlefield. General Gwatkin, one of the generals who has been retired, came from Great Britain and during the war rendered Canada great service by reason of his experience and his advice. I tell the House now that under the existing act the Government thought it fair to give General Gwatkin one year's leave of absence. So far as Commissioner Perry is concerned, he is one of the great men of this country. He asked to be retired the first week I was here, I think, giving good reasons, but remained on for a while. The Government, acting on its right under the statute, has given Commissioner Perry one year's leave of absence. Consequently, no matter what my confreres of the press may say, there can be no successor appointed for one year, because Mr. Perry will draw the salary for this year. The suggestion made by some hon. members in regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is certainly worthy of consideration. The object of the Government and of the Militia Department was not at all to make soldiers of the Mounted Police, but we thought that, for convenience and economy, that department lent itself more readily than any other department to the combination of the executive or accounting forces of the different departments. That is the only object, and the matter is worth consideration and discussion. The question has been raised as to the amalgamation of the Northwest Mounted police. That force was established in 1874, and performed the work that no other body of men could have performed, and whether people assembled in small numbers or in vast crowds throughout the western territory, one or two of these mounted police were able to maintain order where, perhaps, the ordinary policeman could not have done so, even if there were a dozen policemen present. No person has a higher regard than I have for the work done by that grand body of men in the years gone by. But the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) called attention to one phase of the matter that is worthy of thought. Has the time arrived when the Northwest Mounted Police, or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as they are called now, should be reduced and the responsibility placed on the provinces for the maintaining of order? I have been in communication with the various provinces in this respect, and personally I am of the opinion that, whilst there are services to be carried on yet by the federal authority which probably could not be carried on well by the provinces, speaking in the main the provincial authorities are responsible for maintaining order within their several areas. There still exists unorganized territory to which the application of federal authority cannot be questioned. The Dominion Police, I think, were organized away back in 1846, and they have carried on their work splendidly. Their work included what we might call secret service work all over the Dominion of Canada, and it was not confined alone to eastern Canada. If I were not a member of a government, and were sitting somewhere else, I might express the personal opinion that I think the secret service of Canada ought to be under the Minister of Justice. It seems to be along the line of his work rather

than the Militia Department, and I am free to confess that the Government would be advised by me to take into consideration the advisability of handing that part of the Royal Mounted Police work over to the Justice Department, rather than have it under the Militia Department. I assure hon. gentlemen that this bill is meant to carry out just what I have indicated. When we are in committee I will be glad to have both sides of the House help to make the bill as perfect as possible. What we want is the best defence force that we can get at as little expense as possible, all with keeping in mind that no country is fully equipped as a nation that has not an armed force of some kind.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to endorse the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Those of us who have been old-timers in the Canadian Northwest will recognize the splendid work which the Mounted Police performed in the early days. Some of us who have been on the plains know the work that they did in connection with the cattle thieves and the Indians, I venture to say that in the last few years we have witnessed a complete transformation of the activities of that force, and I would go so far as to say that I doubt very much, indeed, whether the honour which was once attached to that force is maintained to-day. Speaking as a representative of labour, I believe that there is no other organization that causes so much friction in our communities as the Northwest Mounted Police. Perhaps, that is rather a serious charge to make, but since the whole matter is under consideration with a view to re-organization, possibly this is the time when it should be discussed. The Mounted Police to-day are no longer the "riders of the plains" that we used to hear about. To a very considerable extent they are reduced to the position of being a secret service department. I might say they are a very large spending department; last year they cost almost $4,000,000—to be accurate, the expense was $3,927,798.82. Some of these items are of very special interest to those concerned with industry. I notice that, not only are amounts spent for the police themselves and their activities, but amounts are paid to outside people and to agencies. In the criminal investigation branch the expenditures are as follows—

Services and expenses of special agents, $87,236.14.

We are not told who those agents are—

[Mr. Graham.]

Employers' Detective Agencies, Services and expenses of operators..	$5,608 00
Pinkerton's Detective Agency, Services and expenses of operators..	2,412 15
The Thiel Detective Service Company, Services and expenses of operators..	1,473 92

About $100,000 has been spent on those items alone, for which no details are given. I learn from the report that the services of the Mounted Police have been used for spying upon labour activities. Among the expenses of the members of the force in various investigations at Toronto we find—

O.B.U. Activities..	$ 234 62
O.B.U. Labour Unrest at Winnipeg..	2,173 30

Then an expenditure at Regina. Another item for duty altogether outside this country was:

Special duty at Boston and Springfield..	$ 190 70
Investigating Bolshevistic and labour conditions..	3,380 40
Expenses at Prince Albert, agitators and suspects..	49 55
Lumber Workers' Industrial Union of the O.B.U..	356 10
Expenses at Edmonton, attending the Labour Church..	4 00
Bolshevist and Labour conditions..	22 10
At Lethbridge, attending a labour meeting..	7 00
Agitators and suspects..	31 75
At Vancouver, attending labour meetings..	18 86
Self Determination League..	328 80

I suppose this last was the meeting which Lindsay Crawford held in Vancouver, and which was broken up by a gang of rowdies. So the report goes on down the line. It would seem that there is an atmosphere of suspicion throughout the entire report. The Police have been conjuring up all sorts of hobgoblins, and then proceeding to say that when they arrive on the scene, by their moral influence everything evil vanishes. It is rather a serious thing when we undertake to employ detective agencies, and even to employ American detective companies to keep up a system of close espionage upon labour movements. About a year ago there was issued a very close study of the American spy system—and remember three of these firms whose names I have given are American firms. These are some of the instructions that were given to a spy:

We want you to stir up as much bad feeling as you possibly can between the Italians and the Serbians. Spread data among the Serbians that the Italians are going back to work. Call up every question you can in reference to racial hatred between these two nationalities.

I am quoting from a series of articles by Sidney Howard, Investigator for Dr. Rich-

ard Cabot, now Professor of Social Ethics in Harvard University. Again the spy says:

I was expressly told by Russell's general manager, Burgett, to try and get the pickets to cause as much trouble as possible so that Russell agency could keep its men on the job for as long a time as possible. I also was sent by Russell to Marinette to work in .... Lumber Company, I worked in the plant as general handy man around the yard. My particular work was to join the union and watch the men and report any labour agitation or activity.

The CHAIRMAN: The quotations which the hon. member is making dealing with matters arising in a foreign country and with regard to the administration of order there, are hardly relevant to the question which is being discussed in the committee now, namely, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I bow to your decision. I quoted these extracts because American detective firms were being employed in Canada, and I take it that the same methods which they employed in the United States were being employed in Canada. I should like, however, to deal with conditions in Canada. We had a keen industrial dispute several years ago, and we know the part which the Mounted Police took at that time throughout the country. Perhaps, I might be permitted to quote an affidavit produced in Montreal with regard to the type of work which was carried on there in searching houses. This work of searching houses was carried on from coast to coast, and this instance is one, amongst many, which was printed in one of the labor papers:

Province of Quebec,
District of Montreal,
Canada,

I, the undersigned Joseph Schubert, Secretary International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Montreal Locals, being duly sworn, depose and say:

(1) On the morning of July 1st, 1919, between the hours of 12.30 to 1.00 o'clock, 4 men in plain clothes and another in a police uniform visited my house for the purpose of searching same. On my request to let me see the warrant, they refused to put same in my hands, but they permitted me to read same, as it was held by one of them. As I could not see my name mentioned in the warrant, I asked them to show me my name. To this I was answered that my name was not put in the warrant, that the warrant was general, and permitted them to visit and search any house they choose.

(2) The aforesaid men proceeded to search my house. My wife, who was in an advanced state of pregnancy, was ordered out of her bed, as well as my little child, who were frightened by the rough treatment they received by the aforesaid visitors, one of whom was drunk.

(3) After a thorough search, lasting half an hour, which brought particular hardship to my wife, the following books, periodicals and things were removed by the aforesaid men:

The Statesman, a Liberal weekly paper.

A set of reproductions of paintings of Jesus Christ and prayers including "Our Father."

Socialism and the Great State, a book by H. G. Wells.

The Liberator, single copy, a journal purchased at any newstand.

A book by Heinrich Heine.

A book by F. Lasale.

American Labor Year Book.

Three memoirs on the Roumanian Jewish question.

Two personal letters.

Two copies of The I. L. G. W. Trade Journal.

And I have signed,

JOSEPH SCHUBERT.

Sworn before me at Montreal, this 22nd day of July, 1919.

L. TANNENBAUM, J.P.

That is an example of the searching of houses, and I think hon. members can understand the feeling of labour men from coast to coast when they and their wives are subjected to indignities of this character. I would call attention to the case of one man, who is still in the employ of the Mounted Police and who, according to the report has been transferred to Montreal—Corporal Zaneth. We had some knowledge of the kind of work which he did shortly after, or about, the time of the Winnipeg general strike. One paragraph from the report of his cross-examination at that time is as follows. This is a summary; I could give the original, if necessary:

In direct examination, witness told the court that he had joined the police in 1917, enlisting so that he could go overseas with them. Physical disability prevented this, so he was given work in Canada. He was an Italian by birth and was later naturalised as a Canadian citizen. On September 12, 1918, he was detailed to work amongst the miners at Drumheller, Alberta. Shortly after his arrival there he had joined the Socialist Party of Canada. He named the officials of the party in Alberta. So keenly had he worked there that he was elected Vice President of the Federal Labour Workers.

For a considerable period he had distributed literature and also sold some of it at the conventions held in Calgary. This literature he was distributing under instructions from the Socialist Party of Canada.

Cross-examined by Mr. Bonnar, Corporal Zaneth told of his early life, saying that he was born in the northern part of Italy. He had changed his name only once, which was when he was out in Alberta. The name he assumed then was Harry Blask. He had signed an obligation when he joined the Socialist Party of Canada. He admitted that while he was out there, he had told lots of lies as he was only following his instructions.

Mr. Bonnar: Did your Officer Commanding tell you to tell lies?

Witness: No, he did not.

Mr. Bonnar: You weren't following his instructions then?

Witness: I certainly wasn't going to tell those people I was a Mounted Policeman.

Here we have a case in which a corporal of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police became an "agent provacateur," actually selling literature which he knew to be banned. Are we, as a Canadian people, reduced to the position, that we have to adopt the methods of "agents provocateurs?" I should like to assure this House that, in labour circles, when any man stands up in a meeting and begins to talk violence, he is immediately suspected by the labour people of being a spy. That is the kind of thing that is going on, and there are to-day in the ranks of labour, men who are recognized as outstanding radicals who are in close touch with such men as Corporal Zaneth.

The result is that the whole labour movement is permeated by this system of espionage, and also by a sense of suspicion. People are arrested, we do not know why. We cannot tell whether they are simply expressing their radical notions in order to get others into trouble. I should like to read one other passage closely relating to the Winnipeg trials, because it shows that evidence was really purchased at that time. That is going still further than the work of the agent provocateur.

A bench warrant to bring Daskaluk into court was applied for and issued by the judge. The copies of letters filed in court by Mr. Bird are as follows:

I think these letters explain themselves. They are from the relief officials of Winnipeg and Vancouver.

530 Gambie St., VANCOUVER, B.C.
November 4, 1919.

G. B. CLARK, Esq., Secy. Social Service Committee, Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir,—Re Daskaluk, 688 Linden Ave., Winnipeg, Man. This man, his wife and infant child, three weeks old, Ukrainians, are destitute and a public charge in this city. He states he was sent here by the Provincial Government, as his life was in danger in Winnipeg on account of evidence which he gave against Almazoff in recent trials at Winnipeg. Formerly he had been a special agent of the R.N.W.M.P. I have wired Col. Stearns, O.C., R.N.W.M.P. who is said to have paid transportation to this city A former promise of $500.00 and transportation to his own country was not carried out for the alleged pretext that Ukrania was now at war and this man could not enter his country. He states that he has only received $150.00 of the $500.00 promised him. I have read the evidence as contained in the newspapers which he gave and there is absolutely nothing in any of his statements that would endanger his personal safety. I expect the R.N.W.M.P., to provide transportation through their local commanding officer for this man and his wife to return at once to your city, if his statements are correct. Will you be good enough to investigate his statements especially with Col. Stearns, with Mr. Andrews, the prosecutor for the province, and his brother who lives at 256 Austin Street. Thanking you in advance,

Yours sincerely,

GEO. D. IRELAND,
Relief Officer.

To which there came the following reply after investigation.

November 13, 1919.

GEO. D. IRELAND, Esq.,
530 Gambie St.,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sir,—Re H. Daskaluk, 688 Linden Ave., your letter 4th inst. to hand and owing to the writer being sick reply was delayed. I called on Col. Stearns of the Royal North West Mounted Police who told me that this man gave evidence for the crown, and was promised $500, and he states that as soon as the case is finished they will give him the balance. As your letter states, he has received $150 and his transportation to Vancouver. Col. Stearns told me that he wired to the officer commanding the Royal North West Mounted Police in Vancouver to advance Mr. Daskaluk $100. I also called to see Mr. Daskaluk's brother at 256 Austin Street, but was not able to see him as he is working on the railroad, and comes in but once a week, and owing to the big snow storm we have had in Manitoba, all the trains are held up and we do not know when he will be in. I further found that Mr. Daskaluk was never a resident of the city, but of East Kildonan, Man. Trusting this will be satisfactory, I am,

Yours truly,

B. ZEGLINSKI,
Agent, (B.Z.M.H.).

Mr. McMASTER: What do those letters mean?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not sure. This gentleman was the agent of the Social Welfare Department of the city of Winnipeg. Now, in the report of the Northwest Mounted Police a good deal is made of the alleged fact that the good humour and tact of the Mounted Police have done much to avoid friction. Well, I have one other quotation which I want to read in this connection. It will show that, instead of avoiding friction, the presence of these men is often a decided irritant. I read from a copy of the Winnipeg Telegram of June 21, 1919:

Serious Turmoil this Afternoon Almost Certain

"Mounties" Resent Statements That They Are "Yellow Dogs"—Soldier-Strikers Insist They Will Parade This Afternoon and Authorities Are Just as Determined They Will Not.

Five hundred Royal Northwest Mounted Police are under orders to disperse any parades which may attempt to march on the streets of Winnipeg to-day.

Every "Mountie" is a returned soldier. They will be armed with revolvers and swords. They are in an excellent mood to cope with the situa-

tion. Remarks made by strikers at their gatherings to the effect that the "Royal North West Mounted Police" were "Yellow Dogs" has raised the ire of the Mounted Police and they stand doubly determined to take nothing from persons who attempt to break the law this afternoon.

The order for the Royal North West Mounted Police to maintain law and order in Winnipeg came from Hon. N. W. Rowell, President of the Privy Council, to Commissioner Perry.

In a kaleidoscopic change in the strike situation last night confident hopes of an early and peaceful settlement gave way to a condition which to-day heralds a crisis of the first magnitude.

Those of us who were at all closely in touch with the situation at that time know, as can be borne out by the member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson), who was one of those who kept the channels of communication open between the provincial government and the men, that there would in all probability have been a peaceful settlement of the Winnipeg strike had the Mounted Police not been ordered out at that time. Their presence incensed the curious crowd that gathered on the streets and precipitated the trouble. One of the most serious facts in the labour situation is the constant surveillance which labour men, as such, are forced to endure. I should not like to suggest how many thousands of dollars I have cost Canada in having the police trail me around. I want to make that very clear; possibly I was worth watching. But the things I am saying to-day are the very things for which I was trailed, and my fellow-citizens in Winnipeg have very clearly given their verdict as to what they think of this sort of business. I remember a few instances particularly. Before I threw myself into the labour movement I could hardly credit this kind of thing. I remember addressing one night a meeting of labour people, and the next morning an officer of the Mounted Police came to my home and asked me to go to his office. You speak about this as a civil police force. Well, when I entered that office I found everything exactly as though it were a military tribunal. There an effort was made to persuade or intimidate me into either retracting my statements or pledging myself not to make similar statements to the people. I was trying to plead for decency and good order in this country, and to prevent the occasions of strife which are so frequently occurring. I remember speaking at a little town in southern Saskatchewan. The local clergyman was chairman of the meeting, and everything was conducted in perfect good order. But the next day after I left, the local clergyman was subjected to all sorts of indignities at the hands of the local Mounted Police officer. The clergyman happened to have been born in England. We had to tell the Mounted Police officer when he came over to this country, whether he had any connection with the Reds, and Labour, and all the rest of it. A few days later I happened to be addressing a class in political economy in the University of Saskatchewan, and the Mounted Police tried to discover what was going on inside the class room. It was too much for the editor of the local newspaper who reported the address, and he had to reprimand the police and ask what right they had to enter the class rooms of our universities to find out what was being taught. I can remember another occasion at Nanaimo, where a police officer deliberately attempted to draw me into a dispute and to provoke me into saying something that, I presume, he thought would be of service to him.

We have heard about the way in which the Mounted Police have backed up the provincial authorities. I can refer the House to a little industrial dispute in southern Saskatchewan, at Bienfait, where there was next to a clash between the provincial police and the Mounted Police—perhaps I should scarcely go that far, but I know relations were very much strained between the two groups—and the whole country was filled with spies and policemen.

Now, I ask hon. members if we are going to establish good working relations in this country by the presence of a body of men of this character, doing detective work and acting as spies, as agents provocateur,—actually, according to this information, paying for evidence, and on the slightest provocation being ready to "protect" law and order, although, as appeared from the reports, in practice their actions precipitated trouble?

Coming definitely to the question that we have before us, I submit that when reorganization is being discussed we should seriously consider whether we need to continue a force of this character. And I should like to urge what I intend to bring forward a resolution, but as the question has come up I mention it now. I contend that the activities of the Mounted Police should be confined to the unorganized territories, and that each province should be left to administer its own civil affairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have already spoken on the point directly relevant to the resolu-

tion, as to whether the Mounted Police should come under the Militia Department; but, whatever is done with this resolution, it does seem to me that what should be the composition and the extent and scope of the work of the Mounted Police has some pertinence as a matter of administration.

I gather from the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that he feels it was a mistake to extend the work of the Mounted Police beyond the unorganized territories, and particularly to encompass within the same force the Mounted Police and the Dominion Police. If I have rightly interpreted his conclusions, I am sorry that I can not agree with either one. I do not know whether, first of all, the Mounted Police did confine their activities to the unorganized districts. I am quite ready to accept the statement that they were formed for the purpose of taking care of law and order in the large unorganized portion of Canada at that time; but though they may have for the time being confined themselves to those areas, nevertheless their work was continued and even extended after those districts became erected to the full status of provinces. Not only was it continued, but I am confident that no hon. member would say that the Mounted Police should have been retired from Alberta or Saskatchewan or even Manitoba. I think the House will agree with me that we would have been flying in the face of the very plainest conclusions of the history of the last three decades had we effected such a retirement. Every one must also admit that within the last few years there have been reasons for maintaining the Mounted Police in those very provinces; and I would go further—though some might dispute me here—there was reason also for the use of the Mounted Police in the other provinces during the last six years.

The hon. member for Marquette was himself a member of the government when it was decided to incorporate the Mounted Police with the Dominion Police, not because we were anxious to send the Mounted Police anywhere, but because we felt we could not avoid the request of the local authorities, but must answer in the affirmative and add to the strength of the local force for the maintenance of order in great and perilous emergencies. That such emergencies existed in the three prairie provinces at more than one place during the past six years there can be no doubt; that such emergencies existed, indeed, before those years there can be no doubt. For example, such an emergency existed two or three years ago in the city of Winnipeg. I do not want to seriously criticise any one, particularly any one who looks at this matter from a different angle—and there may be one or two hon. members who do—but would any hon. members opposite say that it was the duty of the government, three years ago, to decline the request of the local authorities for help when those authorities felt themselves unequal to the maintenance of law and order in the city of Winnipeg? If there was criticism at the time it would have been appropriate to introduce a resolution then condemning the conduct of the Government in that regard, but no such resolution was introduced, nor was there any serious criticism of the government either in this House or in the country. Consequently I think it will be generally admitted that there has been in highly organized districts—districts organized just as highly as the city of Montreal and the city of Toronto—reason for the co-operation of the federal authorities with the local authorities to overcome emergencies that, fortunately, very rarely arise in this country.

Then the question comes: Is it best in the interests of our country that there should be a federal civilian force applicable to assist the local authorities under conditions when the latter feel themselves unequal to coping with the situation? Now, I agree very firmly with the hon. member for Marquette and with the Minister of Militia, that the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and law is provincial; not only so, but that it should be made fundamentally provincial. And I am against—perhaps more against than some of the acts of the late administration would indicate—the overlapping of activities. I am in favour of leaving the responsibility as the Constitution has left it, in the local authorities, to the utmost possible extent, as regards this and other subjects; and I am in favour of no more police interference than is absolutely essential to the fair and reasonable maintenance of law and order. But is it not true that we can maintain law and order at least expense by the maintenance of a civilian force of this kind—one that can be used anywhere as desired, but that will be sent only when there is a request for it by the local authorities as essential to the preservation of law and order? If not it will then fall upon the provinces not only to maintain such an ordinary force of local police as will take care of all ordin-

ary situations, preserve law and order in the towns and villages and meet all emergencies that might ordinarily be expected but they will have to go further and prepare themselves against almost any contingency that might arise within their borders. There is no need to anticipate that we will need as large a force as in the past, but with a moderate-sized, mobile federal force that could be kept at one or two or three points, and whose services would be at the disposal, when requested, of the local authorities of any province, you could maintain law and order and take care of extraordinary situations much more cheaply than if you put that obligation, not upon one, but upon each and all of the whole nine provinces of Confederation.

Now as to the criticism that an error was made in amalgamating the Dominion Police with the Mounted Police, really I cannot see the force of that argument at all. We have no Dominion Police for the purpose of the general maintenance of law and order. We never had; we have none to-day. But we have always had a Dominion Police. What for? For the protection of our own federal buildings and our own property. The provinces are not obliged to protect our property; we protect our own; that is what the Dominion Police is for. The Dominion Police were, for the purpose of administration, joined to the Mounted Police, and all was described as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and placed under the charge of Mr. Commissioner Perry. What objection can be taken to that, I do not know. I would certainly not be in favour of any extension of the responsibilities of the Dominion Police, nor would I be in favour of any further maintenance of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police than was essential to supplying a sort of civilian police reserve which might co-operate with the local police upon request of the local authorities, rather than that it should be essential to call instead upon the militia for that purpose. I think it is far better that a civilian reserve should be at the disposal upon request of the local authorities. Keep the police out to the last hour; let the police never go in at all, if you can; but it is far better that a civilian force should be at the disposal of the federal authorities available to answer a call locally should unfortunately that call come, and I ask the Government to consider carefully before they put it out of their power to answer any local call by sending a moderate-sized civilian force, and by putting it out of their power, make it essential that the militia in case of any contingency shall be called on to operate instead.

I repeat, inasmuch as we are not now in the period we were in, inasmuch as there is not now as much likelihood of disturbance as there was during the period of the war and the period of demobilization that followed, it is undoubtedly possible that the strength of the force and the cost of operation could be reduced. Let that be done. To that I will offer no objection whatever, but I think there should be very serious consideration given before the operations of the Mounted Police in the organized parts of Canada should be entirely done away with. If you are only going to have the Mounted Police to take care of the needs of law and order in the Northwest Territories, you eliminate the Mounted Police almost altogether. I would not be in favour of that. I would be in favour of such reduction as the Government felt it was possible to make and still maintain a mobile police reserve with the reputation the Mounted Police have, for the purpose of answering these extraordinary contingencies that arise, and that probably will arise in the future as well.

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Chairman, it is pleasant to hear so much said in commendation of the principle of the bill. The only criticism heard, if we can call it criticism, has been of a constructive nature with respect to exempting the Mounted Police from the amalgamation provided by the resolution.

There is one consideration to be added to those suggested by hon. members this afternoon, and it is that under our constitution the question of police is a provincial matter. So far as it is necessary to maintain a police force in an organized territory, I would leave it to the provincial authorities to look after it. So far as unorganized federal territory is concerned, the Mounted Police could be retained. I think everybody will agree with what has been said as to the high standing and fine reputation of the Mounted Police. The right hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Meighen), in speaking of retaining as strong a force of Mounted Police as possible, due regard being had to the exigencies of the service and the exigencies of the financial situation of the country, conveyed the idea that we should maintain the corps, in consideration of its activities in the past and the splendid services it has rendered to the country. I believe that we should maintain no such organization as a decoration, or as a souvenir. I think we should

do away with the force as much as possible. The Mounted Police was organized mainly to maintain law and order in those territories which were not under provincial authority, and to my mind we should limit their activities to that field.

My right hon. friend also intimated that the amalgamation of the Mounted Police with the Department of Defence would lower their standing in the public opinion; I want to say that I am of a different opinion. It is casting a totally uncalled for aspersion on the militia of Canada to say that amalgamation with it will discredit the Mounted Police. The militia of Canada is composed of an army of citizens and I believe that as such it is a credit to the country. Certainly it should be no discredit to the Mounted Police to be amalgamated with it.

There is one other point. When there is a disturbance in any part of this country and the civilian authorities find it necessary to call the militia to their aid, preferably to the Mounted Police, I would call the local regiments of the militia, which are composed of citizens of the locality. They understand the mentality of the people of that community, and would be better able to cope with the situation than a police force from a distant part of the country, almost a stranger to the conditions with which it would have to deal.

I might give an instance in which this principle has found application. I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that when there was a disturbance in Quebec in 1918, and regiments were brought from Toronto, to march through our streets, post their machine guns on different corners and fire at peaceful citizens as they did, which in itself was a provocation to the people of that city, if the local regiments of the militia had been called out instead, as was recommended by General Landry in command of the district, bloodshed would probably have been avoided.

The same thing is likely to happen again whenever, in order to quell a local disturbance you bring regiments from a distant part of the country, be they a Mounted Police force, a regiment of artillery or a battalion of infantry. The feelings of these soldiers are often inflamed before they leave their quarters, and sometimes as they are reported to have said in Hamilton on one occasion, they say: "we will fix bayonets and we will go down to these people." In such cases as that you do not quell the disturbance; you only add fuel to the flames. Therefore, I believe it is a wise thing to bring even the Mounted Police under the Minister of Defence.

In the second place I believe the Mounted Police should be limited to the smallest possible number, so as to avoid expense, and its operations should be limited to the territories that are not under provincial authority. In that way we should avoid expense and also the duplication of authority so far as the police organization is concerned.

May I add another consideration? Why should I of the province of Quebec, or you of the province of Ontario, be obliged to contribute to policing the territory of a distant province? We in Quebec look after the organization of our provincial police, and we pay for it. Why should not other provinces do the same, leaving it to the federal government to provide that small force only which is necessary to look after the unorganized territories which are in its jurisdiction?

May I add a word or two on another question which has been touched on by a few hon. members? Speaking on the principle of the proposed legislation, and particularly in respect of the reduction of the staff of the militia, my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), whom I am sorry not to see in his seat at the present time, has shed a few tears regarding the few generals who have to retire. As to the general character of these officers, the services they have rendered the country, and their high attainments, I do not believe there is any difference of opinion among the members of this House, or among all classes of our population. But I do not think that we should be altogether as sensitive as my hon. friend would like us to be.

There are other people who displayed merit during the war. There are many men who served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force who cannot display their breasts bedecked with medals; they received no titles; they can only show their merits and their claims to consideration by exhibiting an amputated arm or an amputated leg. And yet these brave men when the forces were called back to this country were demobilized and granted a very small pension indeed. Sometimes, forsooth, they were left in a dire condition and face to face with great hardship.

But if these examples are not altogether appropriate when we consider our great

generals at home—and I do not sneer at the officers in question—if these examples are not altogether appropriate to their case, let me cite to them an example that history gives us. There was once a great general in Rome named Cincinnatus. He came out of the ranks of the citizens. He served his country, and when he left the army he returned to the plough. A great number of our generals came from the ranks of the citizens of Canada to serve in a citizen army. They have served their country well; their country is much indebted to them; now that the war is over let them return to the plough; let them return to their daily occupation, let them serve in the large army of the citizens of Canada who are toiling to establish peace and prosperity in this Dominion. If they do this they will not only deserve the commendations of the nation for the services they have rendered under arms, but they will earn the praise of future generations for having done their duty whether under arms or in civilian attire. Mr. Chairman, I believe the proposed legislation deserves the approval of the committee and that the resolution should pass as drafted.

Mr. BOYS: Before the resolution is adopted I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the provisions of section 8. Let me read them:

> That provision be made to vest the powers, duties and functions vested in the Ministers and Deputy Ministers under the various Acts relating to the Naval Service, the Militia, Militia Pensions, the Royal Military College, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Dominion Police, in the Minister of National Defence, and the Deputy Minister of National Defence respectively—

and so on. I take it for granted it is the intention of the minister to include the Canadian Air Force because I observe by section 2 the following language:

> That the Minister shall be charged with all matters relating to Defence, including the Militia the Military, Naval, Air and Police Services of Canada.

It would appear to me under the wording of the section as it stands now, that the powers, duties and functions which are vested in the minister under the provisions of the Air Board Act, 9 and 10 George V, Chapter 11, are entirely omitted. I am personally very much interested in the Air Force and I certainly do not wish to see it omitted. I do not believe it is the intention of the minister to omit the Air Force, but I would like to suggest that the language of section 8 be amended so as to include the provisions of the Air Board Act. It may be there is other legislation dealing with the Air Board, or the Canadian Air Force, with which I am not familiar; but I think that all such provisions should be included in section 8 so that thereby the powers, duties and functions vested in the minister and deputy minister pursuant to the same may also pass to the Minister of National Defence, which evidently is the intention of the section.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Air Force is a little different in its organization; there is no deputy minister in the Air Force.

Mr. BOYS: No, but there is the act.

Mr. GRAHAM: And the Minister of Militia is only chairman of the Air Board.

Mr. BOYS: The language of section 2, if I remember correctly, provides that the minister himself shall be chairman. There is also a vice-chairman provided for, and then there is the provision of the act which gives certain powers which are now being exercised by the Air Board. I presume it is the intention of the minister that all these powers should now be vested, under the proposed bill, in the Minister of National Defence. If it is the intention to include the various statutes relating to the Minister of Militia and Defence it seems to me to be equally necessary to include the statute relating to the Air Board.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask my hon. friend a question? I have not at hand the statute to which he refers but in that act are there powers and duties vested in the minister and deputy minister?

Mr. BOYS: I would say so, certainly, although I have not read it all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think so.

Mr. BOYS: It is provided that the Governor in Council shall appoint a member of the Air Board, who is one of the Ministers of the Crown, to be chairman of the board, and shall appoint one of the other members of the Air Force to be vice- chairman. One member of the Air Board is to be appointed as representative of the Department of Militia and Defence, and one as a representative of the Department of Naval Service. The members of the Air Board are to be appointed for a term of three years and are to be eligible for reappointment. They are to be paid such salaries as the Governor-in-Council may determine. Then follows section 3 dealing with the duties of the Air Board, and section 4 dealing with their powers. It is

under that statute, as far as I know, that the Air Board gets all its powers.

It is manifest to me, from the remarks of the minister, and from the provisions of section 2 of the resolution, that it is his intention to continue the work of the Air Board, perhaps in a lesser degree, because I notice the estimates are cut to some extent, but I think the minister should amend that section to include the Air Board Act to which I have just referred, and perhaps some other legislation.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend will see that there are no such powers vested in the minister or deputy minister under the act from which he has just quoted as there are in the acts cited in this resolution and in the bill that will be founded upon it.

Mr. BOYS: I do not suggest that for a moment, but I say there are powers, and I presume the desire of the minister is to retain those powers, whatever they may be, but I think the motion would have to be amended to accomplish the object.

Mr. GRAHAM: How would you propose to amend it? The object is to give all the authority necessary to the minister and deputy minister of the Department of National Defence for the management of the Air Service. As I understand it, there being no deputy minister, no act and no minister really referring to the Air Service, it was not necessary. The Air Service, as the hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stated was attached to the Militia Department. The minister acted as chairman of the board. As I intimated his duties were most perfunctory. If the lawyers agree that an amendment is necessary, I am willing that it should be inserted. To my mind, it is not necessary, but legally it may be desirable.

Mr. BOYS: I do not profess any special knowledge on the subject at all, but I understand the entire work of the Air Board is carried on under this act, and it is the intention, to some degree at all events, to continue that work under the Minister of National Defence, and where is he going to get power to do it, unless the power under this act is taken by him. as power is taken by other branches of the service.

Mr. MARTELL: I asked what was going to be done with regard to the fisheries protection service, and I have received no answer. I think we should make some provision for that service. We are going to create a department of National Defence,

[Mr. Boys.]

and I suppose that means the appointment of a large number of officials wearing gold braid. But we are leaving the Fishery Department, which is second only to Agriculture, altogether unprotected. I should like some answer as to what is proposed under this bill with reference to the fisheries protection service, which is administered by the Naval Department.

Mr. BOYS: I move that the word "and" as it first appears in the fourth line of paragraph 8 be omitted, and that the words " and the Air Board " be inserted after the words " Dominion Police."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell)? Under the act as it now stands, the fisheries protection service can be transferred from the Naval Department to the Marine Department by Order in Council. This scheme we now have in hand is not workable. I may point out, however, that the British navy undertakes largely, if not altogether, to operate the fishery protection service.

Mr. MARTELL: I know that in days gone by, when the fisheries were placed under the Naval Service Department, it was necessary, on all occasions, for the fisheries branch to apply to the naval service to protect the fishery routes. There was so much red tape and the departments were so jealous of each other, that often the reason for the fishery protection had disappeared before the department authorized the fishery boat to go to the place in question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think there is much in favour of this argument, and some of the officers of the Naval Department say that the protection of fisheries should be under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is a matter which may be adjusted between myself and my hon. friend later on.

Mr. CLARK: Although a new member of the House, and inexperienced in speaking before the committee, I consider that I would not be doing my duty if I did not place myself on record in connection with the resolution now under consideration. I have heard some very extreme views expressed this afternoon, and I feel that some of these views have been expressed by men possibly who have not had the actual experience in the matters on which they have so freely addressed the com-

mittee. I have been privileged to belong to the defence forces of Canada for some twenty years, and during that time it has been my great misfortune to have been called out in civil aid forces. It rather astonished me to hear the great applause which greeted the suggestion that the generals who had won their promotions in the face of the enemy, should now be decapitated, or as one hon. gentleman put it "let them return to the plough." All those of us who had the honour of serving our country, and the distinction, though I cannot say the honour, of fighting for those who so readily applause these extreme measures, will be astonished at the applause which greets the suggestion of doing away with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the dismissal of officers referred to and proposals which are detrimental to the efficiency of our defence forces.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) asked if it was the desire of the late Minister of Militia that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be called out in cases of industrial dispute. I do not know whether that is the leader of the Government's view of what the Mounted Police force exists for or not. That is not my view of the purpose for which they exist, but I shall refer to that later. The view has been expressed that the Mounted Police should become part of the National Defence Force of Canada. My opinion is that it is a dangerous thing to make the Mounted Police part and parcel of the defence force of Canada. The two are entirely distinct. One is for the purpose of defending the country in case of invasion; the other is, in my opinion, for the purpose of assisting in the maintenance of law and order in the country.

I have seen the Mounted Police used on numerous occasions, and I should like to give one instance of how I saw them used. Only two mounted policemen were used in this case, which occurred about a year ago in the town of Merritt, B.C., where a mine foreman had been foully murdered. The whole town was in a state of nervousness; the police of the town had no conception of how to tackle the problem; appeals were made by practically the whole town to bring in the Mounted Police, and a small detachment of two policemen was sent there. The moral effect which the presence of those policemen had in that town justifies the maintenance of such a force for the purpose of its moral effect, if for no other purpose. That, of course, would not justify the maintenance of a very large force, but the maintenance of a force is justified by the moral effect it has upon a community. I have seen the same thing demonstrated in many other towns, and I have given that one community as an illustration. There is a feeling of security in a community where the Mounted Police is established.

There comes, however, in our civil life a more serious phase which has had to be dealt with on many occasions in the history of Canada, and which may have to be dealt with in the future. That is not exactly what the Prime Minister has referred to, but it is something which has arisen out of industrial disputes and other conditions. I think the term "industrial disputes" is too narrow, and I personally would regret having the Mounted Police called into any town or city for the purpose of settling industrial disputes, because that, in my opinion, is not what they are for at all. But when, arising out of industrial disputes or any other conditions, we have anarchy or the danger of anarchy, then there is, in this or any other country, no force more fitted than the Mounted Police to deal with that condition. As one who has served in a civil aid force and one who has been unfortunate enough to be called out in the militia for that purpose, I want to place myself on record to the effect that no greater error can be made than to call the militia out in aid of the civil power. The last hon. member (Mr. Vien) who spoke on this subject, recommended that. If you want to destroy the efficiency of your defence force, that, in my opinion, is the best way to do it, because if we are going to have an effective defence force in this country, it must not be confined to any one particular class in a community. It must be open to all classes. We must encourage men of all classes, labouring men and others alike, to join the force, in order to make it efficient and give it scope to do the work that such a force should do, because, if that force is given the scope that it should be given, it will do more for the patriotism of this country than any other factor we have in Canada.

I am in entire sympathy with the general principle of the resolution. There are, no doubt, some features of it which can be criticized, and I think those points have been fully covered. But my object in speaking this afternoon is to attempt to bring home to the committee and to place before the Minister of Militia

and Defence (Mr. Graham) the great danger of ever placing the military forces of Canada in a position where it will be necessary to call them out in aid of the civil power, execept in the most dangerous and extreme cases. To place the Mounted Police in a position where they are part of the defence force of Canada, and may be called out for the purpose of the defence of this country, will have the same effect on the Mounted Police as the calling out of the militia has on the efficiency of that force.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend knows, of course, that the law, as it stands, gives the civil authorities the right to call out the militia in aid of the civil power.

Mr. CLARK (Burrard): I quite understand that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have listened very attentively to this debate, and the committee will pardon me if I say that I think they have rather ignored the real issue that is raised in this resolution. The real question to be considered in this bill is whether there is to be an instrument of some kind for the federal enforcement of federal law, as is the case in the United States. The President, the Attorney General and all the deputy attorneys general under him, throughout the United States, are to-day so organized as to be able to cope with any emergency that might arise. In the early history of the United States the principle was observed that the local community should be responsible for law and order in its own territory. But after 150 years of experience that principle has been gradually departed from and a great organization now exists on the other side, embracing an immense force, for federally enforcing federal law. They have erected federal courts throughout the United States, and we in Canada are moving in the same direction. We have a Supreme Court, a Court of Exchequer and other federal courts, and possibly later on we may find it advisable to follow in the footsteps of the United States and create a federal organization with comprehensive jurisdiction for the enforcement of federal law. Especially since the enactment of the federal prohibition law in the United States, the organization for enforcing federal law has been greatly increased there. They maintain courts, attorneys, officers of all kinds, a wide secret service, and, generally, thousands of agents. We cannot ignore altogether what they have done, because the time may come when we shall find a similar organization absolutely necessary in Canada.

Some other time I may refer further to this matter, but in the meantime I agree with what was said by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). His suggestion was a wise one, that some kind of civil force ought to be at the disposal of the Government. In my opinion it should be in the special charge of the Prime Minister or of the Minister of Justice. I also agree with what has been said by an hon. member, that in some way the protection of the fisheries should be properly maintained; and this bill could be modified to that end. If we think that the federal authority will not be called on at times to maintain federal law by its own organization, and even go the length of creating federal courts and appointing attorneys to prosecute in those courts, then we are not reading the signs of the times. Some hon. gentlemen contend that the provinces should maintain law and order. The doctrine was preached in Ontario that the local authorities should maintain order in their own localities, but the province is now creating a provincial police force for the purpose of enforcing provincial law where hitherto the local authorities were held responsible.

Mr. MURPHY: Have they not always had a provincial force in Ontario?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes, but the force is being highly organized now, somewhat on the lines of the Mounted Police. I am not advocating any particular action; I am simply pointing out that in the United States the question of federal enforcement of federal law has become so alarming that they have voted immense sums of money to carry on the machinery I have mentioned. It is all very well for us to ignore what they have done in the United States; but peace and order in that country have been maintained in the last twenty-five years only by constitutional subterfuge. They have created institutions for the enforcement of all kinds of law throughout the country by legislation of pretty much the same order as that which gave them control of transportation. There the condition of things is much like ours; there is a distribution of powers between the states and the central government. We may be compelled to maintain some kind of force for the enforcement of federal law in connection with the prohibition laws we have in this country. In view of the fact

that, as I have pointed out, the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and the vast organization which they have created are holding themselves in readiness to meet any emergencies that might arise, I think that we ought at least to be prepared to do something in the same direction. I do not contend that the federal power should be increased, but I do say that we may have to assume such responsibilities as the federal authorities on the other side have had to shoulder. I believe the leader of the Opposition gave a very fair statement of his case, and as near as I can judge he reflected the opinion of Sir John Macdonald on this very question. Sir John inclined to the view that the provincial authorities should as far as possible enforce the law within the provinces. But notwithstanding all that, our Customs and Inland Revenue organization at the start was largely undertaken by the federal authorities, and to-day we have a federal organization for the enforcement of our inland revenue law; so have the United States. In the same way we may have to adopt a similar procedure in the maintenance of peace and order. Ultimately we will pass through the same experiences as the United States, and while I should like to see our local authorities in all cases able to maintain peace and order, they may fall down in that work, and I think we ought to have some little skeleton organization, as the leader of the Opposition termed it, around which could be maintained a force for the maintenance of peace and order. I should like to see such an organization put under the charge of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice. In that way we might avoid mistakes that otherwise will certainly be made if we take the position that the federal authority has no responsibility for the maintenance of peace and order.

Resolution as amended reported and concurred in.

Mr. GRAHAM thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 27 respecting the Department of National Defence.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first and second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Progress reported.

Mr. BOYS: Will the minister at eight o'clock make the somewhat lengthy statement he promised?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am prepared to go right on with the bill to-night, if you choose.

Mr. BOYS: We do not want any mistake.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

CORRECTION—STATEMENT BY Mr. FIELDING

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a personal explanation I desire to make. I notice in the press an item referring to yesterday's proceedings which would convey the impression to those who were not present that our good friend the Assistant Clerk of this House had been rather lacking in courtesy to myself. I desire to say that there is no foundation for it whatever. What happened was exactly in accordance with the understanding, and the Assistant Clerk simply did his duty. Then, as in every other case, he has always been courteous, as he should be, to all the members of the House. For his sake, I regret the comment in the press, because it was entirely unwarranted.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Civil Government—Indian Affairs—salaries, $145,425; contingencies, $19,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister will explain what he is doing with respect to what I might call the extraordinary services of the department, for example, the greater production work.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): During the period when production was very necessary, a scheme of breaking land upon the Indian reservations was undertaken under the supervision of Mr. Graham, who is the official in charge at Regina. He has made a very fair success of the undertakings. Naturally it is not desirable to continue that work, but there is the question of getting the land back into the hands of the Indians who farm the land, and these are invariably students coming out of school. A very large proportion of that land has been given to these young students, and they are now established in farming them. I would have had the figures with me had I

anticipated this matter coming up this evening, but I have not got them here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not expect the minister to furnish them under this item. I would just like a statement of policy as to what he proposes doing.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have discussed this matter with Mr. Graham and the deputy minister, and we have decided that as fast as the Indians are able to take this land and farm it under the supervision of the agents, they will be allowed to do so. In the meantime, a very considerable portion of it will have to be farmed under the supervision of Mr. Graham. There are some four hundred odd acres in the vicinity of Regina, which it is the intention of the department to continue as an experimental and demonstration farm. The rest will be turned over to the Indians as fast as they are able to take the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister mean that this farm near Regina will be retained for experimentation purposes by the Indian Department, or will it be turned over to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The intention is to run it under the control of the Department of Indian Affairs, simply because it is very close to Mr. Graham's office. It will be used for demonstration purposes, the distribution of seed grain, and that sort of thing. We think it will be very beneficial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think probably the minister is right in that. I notice that the salary for the Accountant and Purchasing Agent has been very considerably increased, much beyond the figure, I think, fixed by the classification for an accountant. Why is an exception made here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is absolutely under the control of the Civil Service Commission and I cannot understand how the salary of the accountant in this case could be higher. I understand there are three grades of accountants—at least that is true of the Department of Interior—and different salaries appertain to the different grades.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think in this case the salary is higher than in the case of the accountants that have been re-classified. When I see an extra piece of nomenclature after an officer's title I always become suspicious. That is the plan usually adopted should they want to get in a bigger salary than the classification allows. The official then becomes something exceptional. I notice here the accountant has become a purchasing agent. I think the minister would do well to look into the matter before he brings this estimate down as the proper salary.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can give you a summary of the estimates of the department in so far as civil government is concerned. For the fiscal year 1922-23 these increases were granted for meritorious service: Three increases of $180; 17 of $120; 15 of $60; and 6 of $50. The increase in the salary of the Superintendent of Indian Education, due to change in classification in the schedule, amounts to $335. There is an increase due to an amount being provided for a new position as clerk stenographer, $960, making a total increase in civil government in the department of $5,075. Then there were savings due to no provision being made for two positions. There is the position of chief surveyor, which you will notice is dropped, and that of junior architect. The chief surveyor has $3,240, the junior architect $1,920. As to the savings I am not very clear but I imagine they are because the salaries set forth are the minimum salaries in positions which became vacant during the year. The appointees now start at the minimum; therefore, there is a saving in the salary. As the appointees start at the minimum, you have a saving until the individual who takes the position goes to his maximum. The reductions in salary are: Clerk, $900; chief stenographer, $340; chief clerk, $460; head clerk, $320; architect, $180; junior clerk stenographer, $180; clerk stenographer, $90; and clerk stenographer, $60. This makes a total of $7,690 and the increases are $5,075 representing a net saving of $2,615 for the department this year. There is no special claim made for saving because there are no changes; it is simply the result of the classification in these particular cases. The senior officials have either gone into other positions or have retired from the service, and those filling the positions have begun at the minimum salary.

Mr. JACOBS: Could the minister tell us how many Indians are wards of the Government? I would like to have some idea of the number?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is a most difficult thing to obtain this information at present. If hon. members will confine their questions to estimates on civil government I can furnish them with the

desired information which has been pretty well prepared. If they venture out of that field, however, I shall have to hunt for the details. However I shall be able to give that when the general Estimates are under discussion. All matters appertaining to those estimates will then be the subjects of inquiry. I am perfectly willing if the necessary time is allowed to answer questions outside of civil government, but I may say that it is on that particular subject I have had the information prepared.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I notice that in the Department of Indian Affairs there is a departmental solicitor, and of course a law clerk stenographer to help him out. The solicitor this year receives $3,660. Would the minister give us an idea of what this official's duties are in the department? His name is Williams, I think.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I notice there are legal officials in every one of the departments. I imagine this particular official will have to attend to transfers of property, and leases; there is also other legal business being done by the department. I am not prepared to say just exactly what he does, but I presume he is transacting that sort of legal business for the protection of the department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That touches the point I desire to raise. For many years, I think, the various departments have had solicitors upon their staff. I notice on page 77 of the Estimates that the Department of the Interior has another departmental solicitor drawing a similar salary; and if you turn to page 76 you will find that in the Department of Secretary of State there are two departmental solicitors. There is also one in the Department of External Affairs, and one in the Militia Department; but the latter is Judge Advocate General and deals with military law, because I think the practice in this department in regard to civil law is to refer all questions to the Justice Department. I think there is a solicitor in the Customs Department, another in the Public Works Department, and certainly one in the Department of Railways. Now under our system we have a Department of Justice which is the responsible legal department of the Government. The head of that department is the legal adviser of the Government, and of all the departments of the Government, and in my judgment that department alone should retain the necessary legal assistance and should advise the various public departments. I have heard this matter discussed by the last Minister of Justice the hon. Mr. Doherty, and I remember hearing it discussed during the former Liberal administration. The truth is that under the present system each department is acting for itself in regard to practically all the legal matters, while at the same time the head of the Department of Justice is nominally responsible for the administration of justice and the conduct of legal affairs throughout all the departments of government. I believe that the legal talent in the various departments should be concentrated in a single department. I think there would then be a considerable saving, and even if there were no saving it is proper that it should be done. I believe that in England they have certain law officers of the Crown, as we have here, but they are all in their proper department and advise the various departments of the public service; and if outside advice is sought, or extra work has to be done by solicitors, it is the Justice Department of Great Britain that employs them. They are responsible for every department and I think that system is the one we should work out here. To me it is an anomaly that, for instance, the solicitor of the Customs Department, or the solicitor of the Interior Department should advise that department and carry on legal business in the department, as is done in hundreds of cases, without referring the matter in any way whatsoever to the Department of Justice. During my term in the Department of Justice I saw case after case where there was a variance between the ruling of the Department of Justice and the ruling of the solicitor for the particular department involved. The thing is bound to happen. I know that Mr. Doherty had very serious views on the subject and I believe if the matter were tackled, money could be saved and better administration would result. In addition to that, we would have one single head responsible for the administration of all law in all departments. I would ask the ministers to consider the question, and see if they cannot concentrate and amalgamate in this instance, just as the minister is endeavouring to do in the matter of national defence.

Mr. MARTELL: In reference to the departmental solicitor, while I quite agree with a great deal the hon. ex-minister (Mr. Guthrie) has said, I think it is a matter of great convenience to the departments to have their solicitors in the building where the department is situated. Very often

matters come up which are purely of local interest to the department. They are not establishing any new point of law. For instance in the Department of Marine and Fisheries there are cases where a contract has to be drawn as regards the collection of spawn for salmon breeding purposes, or there are cases where they have to draw a short contract between some people who are collecting the spawn, or short term leases. Probably these contracts will expire in six months or a year, and the deputy minister or the official concerned can go to the solicitor in that particular department, give instructions to him and have him draw the document, whereas if the department had to take these matters to the Department of Justice they would remain there for five or six weeks before any reply would be given, and sometimes the contract would not be entered into because it was too late. Moreover the Department of Justice, if it has not improved very much of late years, has no officer who is fully qualified to deal with particular branches of the law. They may have no officers who are qualified upon the law relating to marine and fisheries. The law official for the Marine and Fisheries Department should be thoroughly conversant with maritime law. I think there have been cases where the decision of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been at variance with the decision of the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice has over-ruled the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The matter has been pressed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries with the result that the Department of Justice has had to admit it was absolutely wrong. I think it is most absurd that a man in the Marine and Fisheries Department who is qualified in regard to maritime law should be compelled to submit his opinion to the Department of Justice perhaps to a man who from the maritime point of view would be termed a "land-lubber." The majority of those in the Department of Justice do not know the stern of a boat from the bow, the keelson from the keel, or larboard from starboard. They are not expected to know, because the majority of them were trained in law schools, or in portions of the country where shipping is not an important thing. I think, therefore, that it is a very good practice to have in the different departments as solicitors men who are well qualified and well acquainted with the branch of the law which is apt to come under the cognizance of that particular department, and I believe that is the reason why the conditions which obtained in the past as regards departmental solicitors still continue. They have obtained for the past twenty years, but if the hon. gentleman's views are to prevail then it should be a condition precedent that the Department of Justice allocate to the different departments men who are thoroughly qualified to deal with the particular phase of law applicable to the department to which they are allocated.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Even on the statement of my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell) an expert in maritime law in the Department of Marine and Fisheries may be a very good lawyer and may advise his minister or his department in a certain way, but the man who is responsible to this House and to the country for all the advice given to this Government is the Minister of Justice, and it frequently happens that he knows nothing whatever of the advice that has been given by a body of solicitors in the various departments. That has happened time and again. The one responsible head has never heard of it, and if it is only a matter of getting experts in the various branches, if they do not have them in the Department of Justice, they can get them; that is where they should be. It would be more convenient, and work could be done more expeditiously if they were there, and it would mean a considerable saving.

Mr. MARTELL: If it is the practice now, I know it was not the practice in days gone by for the departmental solicitor to give advice on any matter that might be regarded as a matter of governmental policy. I understand the practice was that he merely advised on local matters, which were merely of temporary moment, but not of any great importance as affecting the government's policy from the legal standpoint.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They have gone further than that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would appear from the estimates that the architect has died or been retired, and lower amounts have been placed in the estimates, indicating that a new man is coming in. I suggest to the minister that before he takes anybody, either as architect or secretary clerk, but especially the first, he consider the advisability of abolishing the position. I never saw any need of the architect. There

was an architect. I think in the course of nature he now is an officer no longer. It is worth considering whether there should be a successor appointed. As to the secretary clerk, I found the officers of the department faithful and efficient, but I must say that I never was persuaded that they were overworked, and I made up my mind that I would not interfere with the course of Providence, if they were reduced in number.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, it has occurred to me, although I am speaking largely from hearsay, that there is a large number of Indian schools—rightly or wrongly I have been hearing of some of them—that require some attention. It is not absolutely necessary that a man should be an architect to inspect a building, but there is some construction to be done, and undoubtedly there are many architects in other parts of the service of this Government, and there may be no great necessity for this particular official in this department. Indeed I may say, in enlarging upon what my hon. friend has said with respect to solicitors, that there does seem to be overlapping, if one can judge by a simple glance at the Estimates of the Civil Service. I have forty odd surveyors in the Interior Department, I think, in addition to the assistants. True they do a valuable work, and there is provision in this estimate for them. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend in the suggestion that something might be done to prevent overlapping. I am somewhat in agreement with the statement of my hon. friend who has just spoken on behalf of the departmental solicitor. He might very well be an official of the Department of Justice, under the control of that department, and I may say for the benefit of my legal friends that in the small province from which I come we had one department under the control of the Attorney General, and did not have solicitors in any of the other departments, but I am surprised to hear them say that lawyers disagree. They should not, on matters of this character, where no very serious questions are involved. I quite understand the necessity for those particular individuals in those particular departments, but I think they should be under the control of the Department of Justice.

Might I answer the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) as he is desirous of having it upon the record? I have made a rough estimate of the Indian population; I am not sure that I am correct, but I will, with the consent of the Chairman, give it by provinces. The figures are as follows:

Province	Population	Number of reserves
Nova Scotia	2,031	45
New Brunswick	1,846	26
Prince Edward Island	292	2
Ontario	20,969	138
Quebec	13,366	20
Manitoba	11,927	68
Saskatchewan	10,431	89
Alberta	9,332	61
Northwest Territories	3,620	

This statement does not give the number of reserves in the North West Territories.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The population is 20,744. I cannot say whether the Yukon in included in that or not. I have not the figures for the Yukon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The total is, I think, about 91,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I made a rough computation showing it to be a little more.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Mines—salaries and contingencies, $514,862 50.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a substantial increase.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A very considerable increase will be found in the estimates for the Department of Mines. This is one of the departments in the success of which, outside of the Department of Agriculture, I am more interested than in that of any other department of the Government. We are continually speaking about the future of Canada, and I think it is well said that if we are to make a success of Canada, we must make our agriculturists successful; but in the same breath I would say that it is necessary that we carry on legitimate research work in connection with the vast stores of minerals contained within the boundaries of this country, and hand in hand with the development and success of agriculture, should go the success of mineral development in Canada. In the province from which I come, the question of mineral development is a very live one, because a great deal of wealth comes from the products of our mines. One

need only mention that, of the tonnage carried by the railroads of Canada, 44 per cent represents the products of the mines.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that not mostly coal from the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not altogether. A proportion of it is coal from the United States, but the balance is the product of our mines. The products of the mines of the United States travel over short distances in Canada, by rail from Port Arthur to Winnipeg and slightly beyond the latter point, and throughout the province of Ontario. I mention this merely to point out the desirability of proper research work being carried on in this particular department.

I found, on taking charge of this department, that, owing to the very rapid development in Canada during the period of the war, we lost the services of a number of officials of the department, who were very important to its success. We have in the province of Alberta two or three highly skilled men, who should, in my opinion, be in the Mines Department of the Dominion of Canada to-day. One of them is a chemist, who is experimenting in clays with the idea of solving the problem of a mixture of clays that will make a road surface that will stand the weather conditions of our province. He is having splendid success. We have not in that province, as, indeed, in many other parts of Canada, road metal either of gravel or of rock for the purpose of surfacing our roads, and this gentleman is working in the Science Department of the University of Alberta, endeavouring to solve this problem. Alongside of him is Dr. Stansfield, a chemist who is experimenting with the briquetting of lignite coal. He is working there on the problem of the extraction of oil from the tar sands found in the vicinity of Fort McMurray, north of Edmonton, in that province. Speaking of agriculture, I think that, perhaps, no greater benefit has accrued to the Canadian farmer than the development of "Marquis" wheat by Dr. Saunders, and in the same way, I am asking for an appropriation to carry on investigational work in the field of mining, increasing the staff of men who will perform geological field work through this Dominion wherever there appears to be a favourable opportunity. They will map the area and furnish the information to men who are desirous of pursuing the business of mining, in order to attract them to Canada to develop those vast natural resources which we possess. I dwell upon this because I believe it is an important work, and I believe this money that I am asking Parliament to vote will be well spent and will come back a thousand fold to the people of Canada if it is spent in a proper direction. That is the statement which I have to make in this connection. There is an increase of nine officials, principally young men who will go out on investigational field work during the summer months. The rest of the increases, so far as I know, are statutory increases, a matter over which we have little or no control.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In general I agree with the minister as to the value of the department from a practical standpoint, and as to the wisdom of not too strictly confining it in the matter of expenditure. But what he says as to the department can be said with equal force of, I should say, 50 per cent at least of the services of the Government, though with less force as to the rest. This is scarcely a year for expanding the overhead charge of any department. Last year, when there was considerable criticism, there was a reduction in the expenditures from the year before. This year the increase is about $18,500 over last year and about $17,000 over the year before. This is a pretty substantial increase. I would ask the minister to consider if it would not be possible to obtain the services he requires without expanding the vote. I know there is always a tendency on the part of deputies, indeed on the part of good deputies, to increase the number of their officers. I have no fault to find with the Deputy Minister of Mines. Indeed, I think he is an excellent official. As a matter of fact, I selected him myself.

Mr. McMASTER: No higher praise is possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say, he is an excellent official; nevertheless the tendency on the part of the very best men is to seek to expand the number of men around them. It is human nature, and if the minister will look down through the estimates I think he will see a few cases where, at the first opportunity, he might very well effect an economy. For example, it will not decrease the mineral output of the country if we did without an ethnologist. I believe that an ethnologist has been added at $3,300. How will he increase our mineral output? I may be wrong but I understand that this persons studies the remains of prehistoric man. Then, why should there be an ornithologist in the Mines Department? In the

Interior Department the minister will find that there is a Parks Branch under a very competent official who pays particular attention to the bird life of Canada, which he has taken very practical steps to preserve and increase. He has done admirable work, which is of a practical nature. But why should we study ornithology as a scientific pursuit in connection with the Mines Department? I do not see that any practical service could be rendered that branch by the study of ornithology.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He is an addition this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, at least the ethnologist appears to have been added by the minister, that is, if I read the item correctly.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think that either the assistant or the chief ethnologist is an addition. I agree with the leader of the Opposition in his criticism of the gentleman who looks after the birds, but I think that the ethnologist was in the department when the right hon. gentleman was there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister is wrong. I do not see an ethnologist in the list last year, and if he looks at the item he will see that $3,300 is provided for this officer this year. Further down the list an assistant chemist is added, and on the next page there are added a principal account clerk, principal clerk book-keeper, and a senior translator. Really I do not know what need there is for a translator in the Mines Department. There would be need for one in the Indian Branch, because there is a language to translate, but not in the Mines Department.

Mr. JACOBS: They need the translator in studying prehistoric man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That might be so, but I do not think that they often find literature among the remains of prehistoric men. Now, at various points down there have been additions, and almost everywhere increases in salary, varying considerably. It seems to me that if the minister would go over this list with his deputy carefully he could come within last year's figure, and at the same time meet all the really practical requirements of the department.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The translator, I understand, is at work preparing detailed reports of the department in French. The additional clerks are in connection with the Explosives Branch. Perhaps my hon. friend will know more about that branch than I do, but I believe that that branch is a necessary addition to the Mines Department, and they are expanding it this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But why expand it? It has been a part of the Department of Mines for years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It has not been in existence very long—about four years, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Five years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It was established for the purpose of preserving life and property, and I think it is of considerable value. Outside of one or two of the officials mentioned, my hon. friend will find that the nine persons that have been added are largely young men who will go out on field work. I am informed that during the war the department was depleted to a great extent. I think my hon. friend will agree that in pre-war days there was really a larger staff in the department than there is to-day. At least the deputy minister so informs me. The study of the structure of the earth's crust with respect to the location of oil and minerals is a very important work in this country, and I should like this vote to stand for this purpose. It may not be all used; we may not be able to get the men. As a matter of fact, that was one of the difficulties which my hon. friend had to contend with when he was the minister of the department; men could not be secured. More than that, the department could not hold the men at the salaries that were paid. Now, I am very desirous to see economy exercised in every department of the Government, but it must be recognized that we have to pay larger salaries to men who go into this class of work and who make investigational research their life work. No one can estimate the value of this work in dollars and cents, and at this stage of the development of Canada it is important that we attract all the capital possible to this country to develop our resources. That is what I have in mind in increasing research work in the field this year by the addition of a few young men who will spend the summer months in various parts of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a great deal in what the minister says. It is true that during the time I was minister we were

not able to hold the good men, and some perhaps not so good, at the salaries we were paying. At that time owing to the general commercial conditions very high salaries were offered in private service, particularly for expert geologists.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): And for chemists as well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. They were attracted by those offers and accepted them, and had the vacancies been filled immediately we would have had to fill them at a scale that I thought we could not maintain after the war, and certainly we would not be able to reduce it, for that is virtually never done. Therefore it seemed to me that in the public interest it would be better to wait until men could be secured at a more reasonable scale of salaries rather than throw out of line the scale for similar work in all the departments, because if men were brought in at a higher scale in one department that scale would have had to apply throughout the other departments. I see no objection to these positions if properly qualified men can be secured at reasonable salaries to do the work, so long as the offices are for the achievement of practical mineral work. But, for example, if the Vertebrate Palaeontologist has been taken away by the attraction of a high salary from a private company, I do not see that the vacancy should be filled. And my criticism still stands as to the Ethnologist. For the life of me I do not know why that position has been created. Nor would it occur to me that there is any need at all for an extra translator. Very often it happens that each department feels it has to have a translator of its own, and that translator has to have an assistant under him. It seems to me that if the translators on the principle suggested by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) could be brought together to do the translating for the various departments, there could be a very great reduction in their number. Last year we had only one here; this year I notice an extra translator has been added. I have reviewed only a few. It is such positions as those that I should like to see reduced whenever it can be done without breach of contract with any of the men.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with a great deal that has been said with respect to this matter, and as I am in charge of four departments employing a good many civil servants, I want to have an investigation conducted to ascertain whether or not we are now over-lapping in certain directions. If we are, then it is within the power of the minister to reduce the positions. I am not able to say at the moment whether all of those officials are required or not, but I agree with what the right hon. leader of the Opposition has said, that in appointing Mr. Camsell he chose a very efficient official. From the explanations Mr. Camsell has given me I think he is desirous of getting results with the minimum amount of help. But I am pleading for sufficient money to employ those young men who are taking scientific courses in our universities, and during the few months of the summer season to put them out on this investigational work in order to secure results that will be valuable to those who are interested in our mineral development. I agree with my right hon. friend that those who invest money in such development require a very considerable amount of capital for the purpose. Therefore it should be our business to attract to Canada all the capital we can for the development of our mineral resources. I am not able to say at the moment that every one of these positions can be filled, but if they can be, and parties can be put out to gather valuable information for tabulation and use, it will be to the advantage of the country, and that is why I am asking for this vote.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Does the minister know of any member of the government who is going to ask the House to accept lower estimates for the current fiscal year than for the fiscal year just passed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have just finished the estimates of a department that is asking for a smaller vote—the Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am sorry I was not in the House at the time. But with that exception every department has shown an increase in its estimates for the current year.

Mr. BELAND: There was a reduction in my department.

Mr. RYCKMAN: There were several etceteras added to the estimates of the minister's department.

Mr. MURPHY: In my department there are very substantial reductions and no etceteras.

Mr. RYCKMAN: We have not come to that department yet.

Mr. MURPHY: Not yet.

Mr. RYCKMAN: But I ask hon. members who have listened to the proposal put

forward if it is not the fact that upon the right hand side of the Estimates the amount is less than that appearing on the left hand side. In a word, these increased figures are characteristic of the Estimates so far, including what the minister proposes in this instance. The Department of Agriculture, wherein I expected my hon. friends to my left would have sounded the note of economy, has submitted estimates, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act we have found at the foot of the column an addition made for such sums as the minister might seek to add in case of promotion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That is too bad.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been called to account by two ministers, and that is enough. But I should like hon. members opposite to me, hon. members to the right of me, and hon. members to the left of me, to tell me of any single manufacturing concern in Quebec, Ontario, or in the West that within their knowledge has increased the salaries of its staff for the current year. I pause for any hon. member to rise in his place and say if that has been done. But we have had here with depressing uniformity, one case after another of ministers standing up and asking to be accorded the privilege of increasing the salaries of officials in their respective departments. Now, that is wrong. The country, irrespective of parties, is determined that economy shall be practised. A system of rigid economy coupled with intelligent business management, is what the country is looking for, but I submit that we are getting neither economy nor good sound business management.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have gone down the list a little more carefully and would draw the minister's attention to these additions—particularly the office of Ethnologist; I should like him not to forget the office of the Ethnologist. Then I see there is an Associate Vertebrate Palaeontologist. As far as I know that position has nothing to do with mines or mineral development.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Those men are employed in making and arranging collections.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There have been added also two associate mineralogists. I do not say that they are not necessary, but I really do not feel that they are. There is also an associate physical anthropologist. It is some days since I studied anthropology, but I do not think that position is very closely related to mineral development either. On the next page there is a principal account clerk, a principal clerk book-keeper and two engineers, Grade 1, added. I do not know what these engineers drawing a salary of $1,680 are for. I do not know what particular work they have, but I think it is worth inquiring whether they are necessary. The assistant chemist may be passed along with the associate mineralogists. I notice that a translator has also been added. That makes three translators in the Mines Department, where I feel fairly satisfied there is no need of that number. Then there is a stores clerk added, near the bottom of the list—why, I do not know.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are only nine new positions including the young men I have mentioned who are going out into the field. The others are promotions. The titles I do not pretend to understand. Apparently the service generally has gone mad over giving official titles. I will give the list of new positions included for 1922-23 and of the positions dropped which were included in 1921-22:

New Positions Included 1922-23	Positions dropped which are included in 1921-22
1 Ethnologist.	1 Associate Ethnologist.
1 Engineer Grade III.	1 Fuel Efficiency Examiner.
1 Associate Vertebrate Palaeontologist.	1 Vertebrate Palaeontologist.
2 Associate Mineralogists.	2 Assistant Mineralogists.
1 Associate Physical Anthropologist.	
2 Assistant Geologists.	
1 Principal Account Clerk.	1 Senior Account Clerk.
1 Principal Clerk Book-keeper.	1 Senior Clerk Book-keeper.
2 Engineers Grade 1.	
1 Assistant Chemist.	
13	7

New Positions Included 1922-23—*Con.*		Positions dropped which are included in 1921-22.—*Con.*	
Forward	13	Forward	7
1 Junior Research Clerk.		1 Clerk.	
1 Translator.			
1 Senior Laboratory Assistant.			
2 Museum Assistants.			
1 Clerk Book-keeper.			
2 Clerk Stenographers.			
1 File Clerk.			
1 Stores Clerk.			
1 Assistant Photographer.			
2 Junior Clerk Typists.			
2 Junior Clerk Stenographers.			
		2 Associate Geologists.	
		1 Associate Invertebrate Zoologist.	
		1 Technologist.	
		2 Junior Topographical Engineers.	
		1 Junior Geodetic Engineer.	
		1 Research Clerk.	
		2 Map Draftsmen.	
		1 Lapidary.	
Totals	28		19

My hon. friend will see that there are twenty-eight new positions and that nineteen have been dropped, which makes a net addition of nine.

In reply to my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman), who has spoken so heatedly over salary increases, let me say that the members of this Government have little or nothing to do with those increases. It is true that an official may be recommended for promotion by the deputy minister, but it does not follow that the promotion will be approved by the Civil Service Commission. They decide whether the promotion shall go through, and fix the salary.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If the Civil Service Commission fix the salaries, how was it that the Department of Agriculture was provided with a certain appropriation to take care of promotions? If we have a certain sum to take care of promotions, why can we not provide for decreases. That is what troubles me.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If you vote the minimum salary and the individual is promoted, you have no money to pay him, so you must either vote the salary he will receive if the expected promotion goes through, or vote a lump sum to take care of expected promotions. That is what has been done in nearly all these cases, with possibly the single exception I have mentioned where it happened that the two salaries were voted. In the case of the Department of Agriculture a lump sum was voted to take care of expected increases. But the point is that neither the minister nor the deputy minister controls the salary; that is fixed by the Civil Service Commission. We can recommend a promotion, but it does not follow that it will be approved; we do not control promotions.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister says that he cannot control the promotion, yet in the vote that was before this House yesterday a certain sum was provided to take care of promotions.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thought I explained that. I said that in certain departments a lump sum was voted to take care of expected promotions, and that in others the expected salary increase was voted. It would undoubtedly tend to a great deal less confusion if either the one or the other course was followed in all departments, and undoubtedly that will be done next year.

Mr. LEWIS: With respect to the men who are going out to do field work, I notice that opposite these positions are certain salaries. Are these salaries for the year, or are these university students simply paid for the few months they are out in the field?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The salaries are on a yearly basis.

Mr. KNOX: The minister has stated that a number of men will be sent out on field work this year. I should like to know how many of these parties will be sent to northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot say offhand as to Saskatchewan, but I think I am correct in saying that there is an arrangement with British Columbia that certain investigational work will be car-

ried on there each year. I know that in Alberta the local government frequently makes representations to the department, and I believe individuals do also, asking that certain areas be investigated. In the northern part of both these provinces a considerable amount of work has been done. I cannot say at the moment just what territory will be covered by the field parties this year, but I am given to understand that we endeavour to send out parties wherever there are indications that a field requires investigational work.

Item agreed to.

Post Office Department—salaries, $1,118,648; contingencies, $168,000.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General): In connection with this item the committee will observe that there is a decrease in the number of employees as compared with the number last year, and also a decrease in the salaries to be paid. Last year there were 951 employees in the Inside Service; this year there are 806, or a decrease of 145. The explanation regarding these decreases will be found at page 102, at the end of these estimates, under "Civil Government." Forty-seven positions have been abolished. Sixty-seven positions are now in the Outside Service that were previously in the Inside Service and these, I may explain, consist of positions in the branch dead letter offices throughout the country. Then there were six positions not required and which were done away with, and twenty-six unclassified positions not required which were also done away with. Last year, the committee will observe, the salaries amounted to $1,297,146. This year they total $1,118,648 or a decrease of $178,498. In all other respects I may observe that the estimates of this year for civil government for the Post Office Department are substantially the same as those for last year. The committee will further observe, under the head of contingencies, three items, the total of which last year was $156,000; this year the amount is $168,000. Two of the items are identical in amount; the other, that for printing and stationery, shows an increase of $12,000. Last year the amount voted was $63,000. This year the amount asked for is $75,000, and the explanation is the increased cost of supplies and materials. These are the chief features of the estimates for civil government as they appear before the committee.

Mr. HANSON: The minister has stated that the increase of $12,000 in the cost of printing and stationery is due to the enhanced cost of printing material. It would occur to the ordinary mind that the reverse should be the case because the cost of paper, for example, has been very considerably reduced in the last twelve months. If that is not the case in this particular instance I think there must be something wrong with my hon. friend's printing department. I would like to know if the expenditure of $75,000 refers to payments made to friends of the Government, or does it represent payments made to the Printing Bureau? There are various ways of subsidizing the press friendly to the Government. I would like to know therefore if this is some government pap that has been thrown out to friends in the newspaper business or whether it consists of money paid to another department?

Mr. MURPHY: The suggestion contained in the concluding remark of my hon. friend falls on unaccustomed ears: I have no knowledge of any pap thrown out to any supporters of the Government. I may explain for the benefit of my hon. friend, who has asked a very proper question, as well as for the benefit of other members of the committee, that this money is disbursed through the Printing Bureau and not by the Post Office Department. All the supplies are purchased through the Printing Bureau, and the practice followed there will be explained by my colleague in the Government who has charge of that department. As to the other observation of my hon. friend that the amount of this vote should be less this year than last, because of a decrease in the price of paper, might I point out to him that he has not taken into account the ext quantity of material required by reason of the continuous increase in the business of the Post Office Department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the diminution in numbers the minister has stated that sixty-seven represent positions formerly in the inside service that are now in the outside service. So that the reductions appear to be 47, 6 and 26 respectively—positions abolished by Order in Council; positions not required, and unclassified positions not required. Is the minister in a position to tell us the dates when these reductions were made by Order in Council? that is to say the dates of the forty-seven reductions, the six not required, and the twenty-six unclassified not required?

Mr. MURPHY: In reply to my right hon. friend I am informed that these re-

ductions were made by Order in Council between the 15th July last and the 15th January last.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought so. Therefore I will assume that the applause coming from my left was intended for this side of the House. Now I am sure the minister will be frank enough to say, as well, that these reductions followed the re-organization which the late government put into effect for which it got so much abuse from the press of Ottawa, particularly the press of Montreal, and which doubtless was the cause of our losing some seats. However I am quite content that seats should be lost in order that the public interests might be served, and the encomiums of my friends to the left are now sufficient reward for me.

Mr. LEWIS: Instead of there being a decrease in the estimates I think the minister will find, if he will deduct the salaries of all the other positions that have been abolished, that there was an increase in salaries to the amount of $34,554.

Mr. HANSON: Oh, say not so.

Item agreed to.

Department of Public Works—salaries, $583,035; contingencies $94,000.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is this an increase?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a decrease in salary, and a small increase in contingencies, but I do not think the decrease is anything at all—I speak now from memory and subject to correction—comparable to decreases which have been made continuously in that department because of the reduction of the work. That department has become pretty nearly all overhead. It is top-heavy. I know that the minister has been in office for a less period of time than his colleagues, but I am satisfied that there is not a department of the Government in which the minister can, with better advantage, direct his energies towards reorganization than the Department of Public Works. The work of reorganization that we had under way, and which should be continued now beyond all doubt, went through the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, the Post Office, the Printing Bureau and reached the Public Works Department. It was done against great obstacles and in the face of the bitterest possible criticism, because when you start that kind of work you know what criticism is. I suggest that he should apply that reorganization to the Public Works Department, and he will be astonished at the saving he can make for the country. I must admit that he may possibly be a little surprised by the abuse brought upon his own head, but I know that he will be courageous enough to face it.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Hon. J. H. KING (East Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): Just a short explanation of the estimates. There has been a net reduction this year in the amount voted for salaries of $37,465. There will be some thirty-four employees dropped from the department, and we shall carry twenty-three vacancies. Some of those will be filled, and some probably will not be filled. The number of employees in the department has never, since 1913 or 1914, been as low as it is this year. There has been a gradual decrease. This year the total will be 295 as against 325 last year. In the contingency vote, there is a decrease in printing, the vote being $14,000 this year, as against $19,600 last year. In clerical and other assistance, there has been an increase of some thirteen employees who are being carried under the vote this year, but who were placed under other votes last year. There is a reduction in travelling expenses and also a slight increase in sundries, but the net decrease is some $37,000.

Mr. LEWIS: We have become used to hearing about increases in salary, with the statement that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for it. Take the second item, assistant deputy minister, the salary has been decreased $600. Is that the same assistant deputy minister, or is this a new one coming in?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a new one coming in at a lower salary.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is it necessary to have two travelling paymasters, one at $2,700 and one at $2,475, and also filing clerks, one at $2,160 and one at $1,920? I do not think there is a commercial concern in the Dominion of Canada which pays any such price to a file clerk. I think the usual salary is $50 to $75 a month.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These officials travel from one portion of the country to another on a certain work the department is carrying out. The salaries are fixed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HANSON: There is an item here of $48,000 for travelling expenses; can the hon. gentleman tell me how much was expended last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am afraid I have not that information here.

Mr. HANSON: For the benefit of new members, it would be a great convenience if we knew what was the expenditure in the preceding year. We are entirely at a loss—and I am sure the minister is in the same position—to know about what has been spent. I should like to point out to the minister that his department is carrying on practically no new capital expenditure. The only expenditure of any importance on the Island of Vancouver has been stopped altogether for reasons that seem good to the Government, and yet the country is asked to vote a very considerable sum of money for travelling expenses for officials of the head office of this department when there is little or no public work of the character to which it could be applied going on. It occurs to me that this is a large sum of money to vote under that head. I think the minister will agree that I am right in that. Would it be possible for the deputy minister, who is present, to give us the information as to what was spent last year?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not altogether satisfied with the answer regarding the file clerks. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that the salary of those file clerks was fixed at $2,100?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking of paymasters.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I spoke of paymasters and file clerks. There are quite a number at $2,100. Most commercial concerns hire a young boy or girl at $50 or $75 a month to fill similar positions.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The heads of the filing department should and would receive very good salaries. The junior file clerks do not receive large salaries, but the work is important, and the heads, no doubt, would receive very good salaries.

Mr. CAMPBELL: These are evidently not heads. On page 95 there are two file clerks, one at $2,160 and one at $1,920. Then on page 96 seven file clerks ranging from $2,100 down. Further down nine file clerks from $2,100 down. These cannot be all head file clerks.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think, as the hon. gentleman states, they are paid from $2,100 downward according to their grade as fixed by the commission. The salary, I believe, is also fixed by the commission as applying to the departments generally through the whole service.

Mr. CAMPBELL: A salary of $2,100 is too much for a file clerk. No business concern will pay such wages as that. Could the minister tell me what would happen to the working of the Civil Service if the House cut down that item, or the minister himself cut it down?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would hesitate about recommending anything of that kind. I imagine the head filing clerk must be a competent man and one that can be relied upon. The salary proposed is not large for a position of that character and responsibility.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Are these salaries the result of the classification by the Griffenhagens or are they fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand they are the result of the classification made by the Arthur Young Company.

Mr. PARENT: The same thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the same thing at all. The classification work of the Arthur Young Company was done under the Civil Service Commission by men selected by them. The Civil Service Commission made the classification. The reorganization, which resulted in the great reduction in the Post Office Department, was the work of Griffenhagen. I pause, in order that that may sink in. There is no Griffenhagen work in this case and, consequently, we do not see any names at the last omitted from the list of clerks. On the contrary, while, in the civil government estimates, there is a reduction, not a very large one, and one which, I think, should be larger, probably due to retirements and deaths, there is an increase, I notice, in the contingencies, and that increase in the face of the fact that the estimate for Printing and Stationery is very considerably reduced, doubtless because last year's estimate was not all used. The estimate for contingencies is increased from $15,000 last year to $31,000, due to the insertion of an item for clerical and other assistance. That is, it is more than doubled. I submit, right at this point, that the committee is entitled to know now—and I know of no reason why the information is not available—the expenditure for

last year. Perhaps it is a little early to know it right up to date, but certainly the minister should be armed now with information that would enable us to estimate almost exactly the expenditure for last year. Otherwise, how can we know whether these are proper appropriations or not under the heading of contingencies? I venture to suggest that the amount spent last year is, in both cases, less than the amount asked for this year by the minister. I see that several officers are added to the list. For example, why should we need an assistant chemist in this department? It is really strange to me that a chemist should be needed at all; but with an associate chemist provided for, as is shown at the top of page 96, why have an assistant added as an additional officer just a little further down the list? If a chemist is needed in the Public Works Department, one would think the associate chemist would be sufficient without its being necessary to have an assistant chemist. On page 95, there is an item "senior mechanical engineer (heating and ventilating)," at a salary of $2,820, added in a department, the service of which is continually contracting, and is certainly not to be increased this year. Why then create these additional positions? I press chiefly for information as to the amount spent last year, and whether the department intends to apply to the Public Works Department the reorganization work that resulted in the saving in the Post Office Department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my right hon. friend knows that the information is not available. The books of the department have not been closed for the year, and the information cannot be given definitely to-night. I am advised that we have not the information in our notes. It would seem to me that that information could be had at any time in the House, but it is not available in the department at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister's deputy would tell him that. When I spoke, I said that they could not tell exactly. This is only the 4th of April, and the fiscal year ended on the 31st March; but undoubtedly the officials of the department could tell within sufficient limits that this committee would be quite satisfied. Otherwise, how are we to know whether these are right amounts to vote or not? That is the principal element of the information we ought to have in order to decide. It may be all right to give us the information later, but the money will have been voted then.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I regret the informataion is not available to-night, and it would not be advisable to make a guess.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is available in the department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It would be with time and investigation and the accounts for the year closed, but they are not yet closed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister say whether they propose to carry out in the Department of Public Works the reorganization work, to which I have just referred, and to see what can be saved to the country by so doing?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is the purpose of the department and myself to make savings and to cut the service wherever possible. We have already indicated that in the amounts asked for this year, because we show a direct saving of some $37,000. With the statutory increases, which are applicable to various officials of the department and which will be paid this year, we are still able to show that decrease. It is my desire—and I know I shall have the co-operation of the head of the department—to cut the service down as far as it can be, while, at the same time, retaining its efficiency as an organization.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister shows a reduction of staff from 325 last year to 295 this year, or a reduction of thirty. Then, in the contingencies, he shows, under "clerical and other assistance," an increase from $15,000 last year to $31,000 this year. What is the reason of this increase of $16,000, when a general reduction is going on? One thing, which, I think, is known to every member of this committee, is that the work of the Public Works Department has been decreasing very rapidly since the years of the war, and it should be back to pre-war levels and, perhaps, lower. During the war, with very few exceptions, public works were not constructed in Canada, and there has not been a necessity for the tremendous staff that the department has been carrying.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I tried, at first, to make that clear. Some thirteen clerical officials had been transferred from other branches of the service, and they are to-day being carried under the contingency appropriation.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I should like the minister to explain to the committee just exactly what jurisdiction the Civil Service Commission has in connection with fixing salaries. There seems to be a considerable misunderstanding about that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure that I could make an explanation as clear as it would probably be given by another minister. The matter has been referred to before in the committee. As I understand the matter, the Civil Service Commission grades a position, with a minimum and a maximum salary for that position and a clerk entering the service receives the minimum and is increased from year to year until he reaches his maximum.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is it not a fact that these salaries are fixed by statute and not by the Civil Service Commission?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I understand that statutory increases are provided and that the commission merely classifies the employees.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BOYS: I am not satisfied with the answer given to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). He mentioned some of the ideas I had myself, and I had a motion which I intended to move unless the minister could answer the hon. member's questions to my satisfaction. My hon. friend called attention to the fact that we have a reduction of 30 clerks. Last year there were 325 as against 295 this year. It is admitted on all hands that there is a decrease in departmental work, and it seems a most extraordinary thing, under these conditions, that you should have under the heading "Contingencies clerical and other assistance" an increase from $15,000 to $31,000. The explanation given is certainly not satisfactory, and I therefore move, seconded by the member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) that the item of $31,000 appearing on page 97 of the estimates for clerical assistance be reduced to $15,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been a transference of thirteen employees from various branches, and they are now being paid from the contingency vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is that done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Surely my hon. friend is not serious, unless he wishes to wipe out a portion of the service. Thirteen employees who have been previously paid by other departments, mainly in the engineering branch, are now being paid from the contingency vote, which is increased from $15,000 to $31,000. The result of my hon. friend's motion would be to dismiss those officials from the department, because there would be no money to pay them.

Mr. BOYS: If these thirteen employees are not now in the engineering branch, why do not their offices appear in the estimates?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are not permanent appointees.

Mr. BOYS: Is there a corresponding reduction in some other department? From what department or departments have these transfers been made?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are mainly from the engineering branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute the minister's good faith in his answer, but really it makes nothing clear to me at all. The present practice surely is not a proper one. How can the minister justify taking officers of the department out of the regular category, where the salary of each man is laid down, and lumping them all together under contingencies, asking the committee to vote just a lump sum without any particulars whatever? The various offices ought to be designated here. This practice should not be followed at all.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Item 168 on page 42 provides for the salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draughtsmen, clerks and messengers of the outside service. The vote for that service last year was $542,000 as against $500,000 this year, or a reduction of $42,000. Now, the additional $16,000 in the item on page 97 is a part of the saving of $42,000 in the estimate on page 42. Salaries paid under that vote last year have been transferred to the contingencies vote this year.

Mr. HANSON: Were these thirteen men, who are now to be paid out of the contingencies vote, formerly engineers in the outside service?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These officials were employed in Ottawa in the engineering branch, and were later transferred to other branches. They are temporary employees who will receive their salaries from the contingency vote this year.

Mr. BOYS: Is it not possible for the minister to find out how this $31,000 is made up? If there are clerks to be paid

I do not desire to press the motion, but I think we ought to get definite items to show how this increase of $16,000 is made up. That information ought to be available.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will give the names of these employees transferred. They are:

Miss Logan	$ 600
Miss Negall	720
Miss Ruddy	600
Miss Chene	960
Miss Gorman	700
Miss Facto	840
Miss Mooney	600
Miss Cote	1,080
Miss Jette	600
Miss Becker	600
Mrs. Neilson	600
C. S. Boucher	1,320
A. Despatie	960
G. Dudley	900
D. McKell	960
P. McClenahan	960
W. Beckworth	800
G. E. Smith	1,680
A. Bouchard	1,200
P. J. Grace	1,000
W. Stewart	1,000
Miss Fellows	1,380
Miss McKay	1,200
Miss Y. Duhamel	840
Armand Nimeau	1,800
J. O'Halloran	1,020
J. H. Donuody	1,200
H. A. Cross	1,200
M. O. Durant	1,260
J. A. Mineau	2,040

making a total of $30,620 for salaries.

Mr. BOYS: Are they all temporary?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why are they needed with a diminishing department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am informed all the clerical staff are needed in carrying on the work of the department.

Mr. BOYS: Have many of those officials been in the Service for two, three or four years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some have been in the Service for three or four years.

Mr. BOYS: Might they be described as junior file clerks, messengers or assistant accountants, and, if so, why are they not specified in the ordinary way?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As the salaries would indicate, many of them are junior clerks.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Was the vote of last year, $15,000, sufficient to take care of the salaries of these clerks?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that thirteen clerks have been brought in. I am not hard to satisfy, but I really do not want to go away with the answer that those clerks were all needed in the department. That answer does not leave me any the wiser. How is it that a department whose services are contracting, and rightly so, needs those thirteen additional clerks?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They were in the service before, carrying on very much the same work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is the change made?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A matter of book-keeping in the department. They were not detailed before, but last year were carried in a lump sum under engineering and other votes; this year they are carried under the contingencies vote.

Mr. BOYS: The minister gave the total in round figures at $31,000, but I am not sure whether the total number of clerks was thirty or thirty-one.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Thirty in all.

Mr. BOYS: So as a matter of fact if we add the thirty to the two hundred and ninety-five, we find there are just as many clerks to-day as there were last year.

Mr. FIELDING: As the item appeared in the estimates it certainly conveyed the impression that there was an increase which needed explanation. I think the minister's explanation makes everything clear. Many of the clerks are paid out of contingencies. In this case the department, for book-keeping purposes, have transferred from one branch of the service to another these thirteen clerks. If it meant that thirteen additional clerks had been brought into the department at this time it would be a just cause for criticism, but I think the minister has made it clear that they were not brought into the service but were merely transferred from another vote, so that there has been no actual increase.

Mr. BROWN: It would seem that while there was a reduction from three hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and ninety-five, that these thirteen clerks brought in from another department would reduce that reduction of thirty to a net reduction of seventeen?

Mr. FIELDING: They were not brought from another department but were transferred from another branch of the same department.

Mr. BROWN: That means a net reduction of seventeen?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest that on the question of reductions generally I agree with what has been said, that as the work of the Public Works Department is being restricted it certainly should not lead to an increased expenditure. But may I not submit that it is rather unreasonable to expect that a new minister who has only recently taken office would be able to reorganize his department in a few days and determine what reductions should be made? He is bound to take the estimates of last year as his basis. If later on he can reduce the staff, well and good. Take the question of dismissals, the minister may find the number of his officials is greater than is needed, and if a proposal is made to dismiss those men summarily he will find very strong representations made as to the hardship entailed. I submit it is fair and reasonable for the House to expect reductions, but that it is not reasonable to expect them to be made right away. It seems to me that it is not unfair that ministers should ask for their estimates pretty much on the lines of last year, and the House should rely on them, with the money placed at their disposal, to make every reasonable effort during the year to guard against increased expenditure. I do not think the House expects the Minister of Public Works, or any other minister, with the short time at his disposal to be able to reorganize his department at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think any member of the House would say that we have been unmindful of the fact that the Minister of Public Works is new to his office. We have kept that in mind in all our questions and criticisms. We are simply seeking to get at the facts. The minister has made, not boasts, perhaps, but has taken credit for a reduction of thirty persons in the civil government vote. Now will he be good enough to tell us, as did the Postmaster General a few minutes ago, when these thirty reductions were made? I know there have been retirements from the Department of Public Works, especially large numbers of retirements from the engineer's branch.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Seven of the reductions were due to death, seven to resignation, seven to retirement, and there were eleven transfers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When were the seven retired?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Five in July 1921; one in July 1922—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hardly; we are not there yet.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are practically all in July 1921, except one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the retirements were made in July 1921?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did not all the resignations also take place about the same time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The resignations took place in May, July, October and December last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So the retirements and resignations all took place last year, and the rest are due to death, so the entire reduction in staff is due to Providence and the late government. Now we will see to whom the increase in staff is due. I remember quite well that in the engineering branch to which the minister has referred, page 42, very substantial reductions were made in the face of bitter criticism. I would just like to know whether it is to avoid some of those reductions that the thirteen men are brought from that branch now and added to the civil government vote under contingencies.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These thirteen were not concerned in that reduction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are thirteen more not required under the engineering vote, but they are not the thirteen that were retired by the late Government. That is what I understand the minister's answer to be, that these are thirteen not required in that service, but they were not retired by the late government. There were others that were retired, but not these thirteen.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, they were not retired. They have been employed in other branches.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So the method this Government adopts when men are not required in the engineering branch is not the method adopted by the late government of letting them out, but to bring them out of the department into the contingencies vote under civil government.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This year we are carrying some twenty-three vacancies. The late Government carried thirty-three last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated is correct, then, so that whereas Providence

and the late government made the reductions the minister himself is wholly responsible for the increases.

Mr. FIELDING: A very unusual combination.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They often worked together.

Mr. BOYS: I notice that the minister in one of his explanations gave as one of the reasons for the increase, the transfer of thirteen clerks, but what I cannot understand is why these thirteen are brought from one branch of the Department of Public Works into another where there is no work for them to do. If the minister could show that there was work for them to do, I would not be disposed to press my motion. Why are these men needed in the branch to which they have been transferred?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been a decrease in the amount of work in the engineering branch, but in the accounting branch, I am advised, there has been some increase. These people have been transferred to other branches where there has been an increase of work.

Mr. BOYS : How could there be an increase of work in the accounting branch when there is less work going on in the Public Works Department? The Minister of Finance has rather intimated that there was an effort on our part to embarrass the Government.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not say that. It is fair criticism.

Mr. BOYS: I want to assure the committee and the Finance Minister that no such thought is in my mind, and if the minister could give me a satisfactory explanation I would not press the motion, but I do think we ought to be given some better explanation than has been given so far. If the work of the whole department is decreasing, there must be less work to do in the accounting branch, and if these men are not needed there, they might as well stay where they are. It seems to me we have been given no explanation of that whatever, and until we have, I do not see why this money should be voted.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A large number of these persons have been transferred from the engineering branch to other branches of the service where there are vacancies to be filled.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BOYS: It is not a case of vacancies because you would not need the extra money for that. You had $15,000 before, and you are getting $31,000 now. You are increasing the number of clerks in this particular branch where there is less work to do. That is what the minister does not explain.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are not increasing the staff. We are filling vacancies with officials who are not required in other branches of the service. There is no increase. As a matter of fact, there is a decrease in the civil government salaries vote this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On account of reductions and resignations that we effected last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not quite satisfied that this item is right. The minister perhaps is under some disadvantage because he has not yet had sufficient time to familiarize himself with the workings of his department. I think it is only reasonable that he should have more time, but this much has been made clear, and it is some satisfaction to find that it has been made clear, that the whole reduction in this department is due to the action of the late government, that the whole reduction of 145 in the Post Office Department is due to the action of the late government, and that the claim of the Militia Department that 400 were let out on the 1st of April is wholly due to automatic reductions. So that this much applauded action on the part of the Administration in the direction of economy has very little foundation in fact. Only a day or two after these Estimates were brought down I saw some notice in one of the newspapers in the reading room of the number of reductions made in the various departments, but so far as our examination has proceeded, it appears that all these reductions were made under the late government, and so far as any one knows, the present Government has not made any reductions whatever in the Civil Service staff. That much has come out in the discussion, so I think if it has cleared up nothing else, the discussion has been worth while.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Would it be possible for the minister to classify by occupation the thirty officials who are to be paid under this contingencies vote?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would like to know the sex of these engineers who have been transferred from one branch to another of the department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are not engineers, but clerks, stenographers and messengers, some male and some female.

Mr. RYCKMAN: How many of each sex?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are thirteen females, I think, in the list.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Is it not possible to classify them having regard to the occupations that are set out on pages 95 and 96?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I see no reason why they can not be classified. It has not been the custom, however, I understand, to set out the classification in this vote. I understand they were carried under the general vote last year.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I fear I have not made myself clear to the minister. Is it not possible to classify the particular employees under the headings as they appear here in order that we may know to which class they belong? That is to say, there are different classifications of stenographers and filing clerks. Cannot we get the particulars under these headings?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Messrs. Smith, Bouchard, Grace and Stewart are clerks, the rest are clerk-stenographers.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Will the minister then explain why the thirty persons of such occupations as are likely to be employed by the department are not included in the classification on pages 95 and 96?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are not permanent but temporary employees.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No reason has been given yet, and I am quite sure the minister has the information at first hand to show why they should be moved. It is a mystery to me why they should be moved from one branch to the other. It would appear, although I may be wrong, that they are not needed in the engineering branch at all. I know no reason why they should be there, and it would appear that the duty of the department would be to reduce the engineering branch instead of doing what has been done here. The minister may be able to refute that presumption, but I think he should secure the information that would enable him to do so for the committee. Furthermore, we ought to have before we pass these contingencies an estimate, at least as close as possible, of the amount expended last year not only as regards civil government but as regards especially the amount required to provide for new appointments at the bottom of page 96. I would suggest that the committee rise and that the minister be prepared—I know he can be prepared quite readily from his department—when we meet again to give us this information.

Mr. FIELDING: The item might stand until the next meeting of the committee. In the meantime we might proceed with the civil government estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. BOYS: Under the circumstances possibly I might be permitted to withdraw the amendment now, and if the information which the minister submits to the committee at its next meeting is satisfactory it may not need to be moved.

Mr. FIELDING: Let the item stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think both had better stand until the next sitting. I would much prefer that being done and I would object to the amendment being withdrawn now.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Trade and Commerce—salaries, $418,020; contingencies, $22,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I have no desire to enter into a very lengthy discussion of the business of the department under the estimates for civil government, but there are many questions that will arise when the main estimates of the department come up. I would therefore like to ask the minister for a brief statement at this stage, if he would be good enough to make it, in regard to the proposals of the department as to the extension of trade. I put a question on the Order Paper the other day, which I have not under my hand at present, asking particularly regarding the extension of trade to Mexico. The answer was quite satisfactory in a sense—that is it indicated that the minister was alive to the desirability of extending trade, but it was not very definite. There was one point in particular I desired to ask the minister about. That was as to the proposal for establish-

ing steamship connections with Mexico which apparently have a very promising outlook; and if the minister could indicate whether steps are being taken to actually put into effect steamship connections on that route it would be very gratifying to know it. Furthermore, the reason I am pressing this point just at this time is I do not think there should be any longer delay in the matter than is absolutely necessary, and if we wait for information until the main Estimates come along it may involve a delay of a month. I think the steps which have already been begun for that service should be continued, and if the minister is in a position to let us know what has been done the information would be very welcome indeed.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): When the general Estimates are up and we have under consideration the question of the extension of trade I shall be very glad to go fully into the subject of trade with Mexico and other parts of the world. It is only fair to say that my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) initiated an inquiry into the possibility of trade with Mexico; I found the documents which indicate this on file when I assumed the administration of the department. We are making a careful study of the possibilities of trade with that country and also as to the wisdom of encouraging the development of such trade owing to the recent disturbance in Mexico. It is a little premature just now to make a statement as to whether or not the Government will subsidize a line of steamers to Mexico. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that in such a matter it is better to move slowly, and be sure of results, rather than to encourage a trade that might not perhaps prove profitable to the Canadian people. I hope, however, that when the main Estimates come up we will be able to afford information that will not only be satisfactory to my hon. friend but encouraging to the country.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): May I ask the minister to explain why such a large increase has been made in the salary of the director of commercial intelligence, viz., from $6,000 to $6,900? That official is now receiving a larger stipend than the deputy minister?

Mr. ROBB: That is one of the very questions I asked myself when going through the estimates—why it was that the director of commercial intelligence was paid a higher salary than the deputy minister.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: He never was.

Mr. ROBB: He is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, he is now.

Mr. ROBB: I understand this is under the re-arrangement made by the Civil Service Commission and the general statutory allowance made in the regulations provided under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really do not like to doubt the minister.

Mr. ROBB: The Civil Service Commission fixed this salary, and it was submitted to the previous government and they approved the increase authorized by the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From $6,000 to $6,900? Who is the Director of Commercial Intelligence.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Poussette.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Civil Service Commission fixed his salary at $6,900—over a deputy minister?

Mr. ROBB: With the possibility of his going to $7,200, and the government of which my hon. friend was the Prime Minister approved of the regulation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no recollection of it. I would like to be favoured with the papers by the minister. I am sure he has looked it up or he would not make the statement, but I do not think there is any other similar instance in all the civil government estimates.

Mr. ROBB: I quite agree with my hon. friend on that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman explain why there is added to the list a publicity assistant and a junior departmental librarian as well? One would not think it was time to add those officers, and a senior photographer as well. I am told a lantern slide artist has been added also. I would like to hear the minister attempt to load this on the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ROBB: For the information of my hon. friend, I may say to him that I have such confidence in my predecessors that I have accepted these estimates, number of employees and the salaries, plus the usual allowance made under the Civil Service regulations, exactly as I found them when I came into office, and I shall have to look to my hon. friend for an explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will not go down at all. It was the habit, under the old gov-

ernment, for the minister to review the estimates submitted to him by the officers of the department. The time for reviewing estimates had not arrived on the 29th December. The time for reviewing the estimates by the officers came between that time and the time when the hon. minister assumed office. That is the unfortunate thing about it. These estimates would have been reviewed had there not been a change. However, the minister considered it his duty to take whatever was put before him. Really it is just as disgraceful to load it in that way on the late government as it would be to load it on the Civil Service Commission. Has the minister no better explanation as to why these offices were added? I know the numbers are the same as the year before, but if the minister had not created these offices there would be a diminution. These were not here before. The minister can see no provision was made last year for them. These were additions. If they had not been created, then there would have been diminution, but not by any act of the minister. I will venture to suggest that he has not retired one man or one woman from the department.

Mr. ROBB: Or added one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes. How do you account for asking the House to vote $1,320 for a lantern slide artist, when the House did not vote a dollar last year? Then we have the publicity assistant. These were not in last year's estimates at all. The estimates may have been submitted to the minister by his officers, but what I am complaining of is not the work of the officers but the work of the minister. Why are these additions made?

Mr. ROBB: Surely the hon. gentleman would not expect me immediately on coming into office to go through the department and discharge men that his ministers had placed in office, as between the time the Estimates were passed last year and the time I assumed charge of the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister last year could not place anyone in office unless there was a salary for him. There was no salary for him last year. These are salaries to be provided next year.

Mr. ROBB: I found that out when I came into office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How was this lantern slide artist paid? There was no salary for him last year.

Mr. ROBB: He would be paid out of contingencies would he not? However, during the interim, he has been re-classified and given a standing, and I found this condition when I assumed office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister has the same amount for contingencies this year as last year, why does he not reduce his contingencies by this amount?

Mr. ROBB: Would the hon. gentleman recommend that we reduce them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would, yes. I observe that I do not get any favourable response.

Item agreed to.

Secretary of State—salaries, $132,732.50; contingencies, $28,800.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not told in advance what items are going to be taken up. Unlike the last department, this estimate shows a slight decrease, but I have not the slightest doubt that, common with the others, the decrease was made before the hon. gentleman had a chance to change it. The number of officers is 96 as against 105. Will the minister explain how the reduction came about and when?

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I venture to say that the reduction is not really fifteen, because it is a transfer from one classification to another. I think the real reduction is only six.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was that made?

Mr. COPP: Made by the deputy minister before I came in or since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister surely would not suggest that the deputy would dismiss people without his knowledge; so that if he knows of no reduction, these were all made before he came in.

Mr. COPP: These items were given to me by the deputy. I made no reduction myself, but I was glad to see a slight reduction in these estimates, and if there is any credit due to my hon. friend in this respect, I am the last one to attempt to take it away from him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not bothering about that, but I want to know the facts. There is a reduction of six in the number of employees. He says he made no reduction himself. He retired nobody. I do not suppose his staff under him are retiring people without the knowledge of the minister, and consequently all the retirements

were made before he came into office; so that the reduction is entirely due to his predecessor in office. Is that not correct?

Mr. COPP: I do not know when the reduction was made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. minister make it himself?

Mr. COPP: I made no reduction, except that made by the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reductions were probably made before the hon. gentleman came into office.

Mr. COPP: I made no reduction except what was recommended to me by my officials.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell me one single retirement that was recommended to him and that he made?

Mr. COPP: I accepted the statement given to me by my officials when they brought the estimates to me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wonder why the minister is there. We may quite as well have this put before us simply by the deputy. The minister does not answer my question at all. Since he has taken office, has he retired one officer of his department, or has he not? I do not know of any way of answering that question except "yes" or "no".

Mr. COPP: I have not dismissed an official from my department since I came in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So all the retirements were made before the minister took office.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Public Archives—salaries and contingencies, $79,680.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is an increase in salaries.

Mr. COPP: I do not think there are any except statutory increases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister's enthusiasm for economy such that he feels he could make some reduction in the Public Archives? I do not wish to say a word against the retention of the work of the archives; every country must provide for its archives. Still, if the minister is consumed with a passion for economy, the reproductive activities of the country would not be at all impaired if economy was applied to the Department of Public Archives.

Mr. COPP: I think the work of the Archives branch with regard to the affairs of this Dominion should be extended rather than curtailed. We have in the person of Dr. Doughty, deputy minister of this branch, a man who has done splendid service and who has collected a great mass of data regarding matters relating to the whole Dominion. I have had a number of compliments paid to Dr. Doughty through me on the splendid work that he has performed. I have not yet had an opportunity of studying the department myself; but if there is an opportunity of making any reductions or bringing about economy, I would be very glad to assist and co-operate with all hon. members. I feel it would be a splendid thing and an afternoon not lost, if every hon. gentleman would make it a point to visit the Archives branch some afternoon in order to see the splendid work carried on by it. I take no credit for the work myself; but I feel that we have in Dr. Doughty a gentleman who is doing splendid work in this branch. I am sure, if I have the privilege of presiding ever this branch for another year, I shall be able to give more information to the committee in regard to it. If there is any reduction my right hon. friend could suggest that could be made without interfering with the work of the branch, I should be glad to consider it.

Mr. HANSON: The third official in the list is the Assistant Director of War Trophies. These war trophies would, I should think, have been distributed months ago amongst the various municipalities and public bodies to which they were destined. In my province, you will see them dotted all over the landscape, and we are very proud to have them. Is this man to be a permanent employee of the department, and are we to keep him forever at a salary of $3,360? There would seem to be an opportunity for the minister to exercise that disposition of which he has just given verbal testimony.

Mr. COPP: The information I have is that we have a very large number of these war trophies yet on hand for distribution.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice in this list a book binder at $31 a week We had one lone book binder last year. This year we seem to have abolished him. Can the minister tell us why?

Mr. COPP: Economy.

Mr. JACOBS: Are we going to do without any binding? How are we going to preserve these valuable documents unless we have a book binder?

Mr. STEVENS: We replaced him by a high binder.

Mr. JACOBS: A hide-bound Tory? Have we abolished book-binding altogether in the public archives?

Mr. COPP: I cannot give my hon. friend the information. I do not know whether they had a book binder there, or whether his services have been dispensed with or not. The item is a small one, and I fancy the books will be bound whether this official is kept at this wage or not.

Mr. JACOBS: Bound by whom?

Mr. STEVENS: Would it not be likely that, under the efficiency efforts of the late government in the improvement of the Printing Bureau, in the gathering together of a large number of miscellaneous small printing plants under the bureau and the reduction of the cost of that establishment, this work is performed now at the Printing Bureau instead of at the Archives?

Mr. JACOBS: Is that a fact or merely a theory?

Mr. STEVENS: I think it is a fact and a testimony to the efficiency of the late government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And $500,000 a year was saved in the bureau in addition to the fact of our taking care of the extra work.

Mr. JACOBS: How is it then that the hon. gentlemen find themselves on the other side of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because of the failure of my hon. friend and those around him to state these facts to the electorate, and because, where my hon. friend did not have the hardihood to state himself what was in the interest of his party in the way of misrepresentation, there was always around him and through the press an army which was competent to do that.

Mr. JACOBS: Therefore, I conclude the people of Canada were fools.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is not very far wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really thought the hon. member had used the word "fooled." The hon. gentleman is only wrong to this extent, that the "s" should be changed to "ed."

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Wednesday, April 5, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 28, an Act respecting The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 29, an Act respecting The Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I move that the second and third reports of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that no notice has been given of this motion, so that if any discussion takes place upon it, it must be by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the motion is put it must be by unanimous consent, not that no discussion can take place upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion stands.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Is the Government aware that many Boards of Trade and merchants in the province of Quebec are said to have protested against the present Bankruptcy Law?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to repeal the said law during the present session?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. The Government has received some complaints concerning the Bankruptcy Act.

2. It is the intention of the Government to submit amendments to that Act during the present session.

FREE FREIGHT OUTLAY

Mr. IRVINE:

What is the free freight outlay out of Calgary under the car load lot?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: This question has already been answered.

McLACHLAN CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. When the Minister of Labour purported to give to the press the written communications received by him from Mr. J. B. McLachlan, of the United Mine Workers, did he give such communications in full?

2. If not, why, and what is the text of the part omitted?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. and 2. If the communication here in question is that addressed by the Minister of Labour to Mr. J. B. McLachlan under date of March 18, then the reply is that the full text of the message was handed to the representative of the Canadian Press, as was also the text of further telegrams exchanged between the Minister of Labour and Mr. McLachlan. A further communication was mailed to Mr. McLachlan on March 23. A copy of this communication was not handed to the press, but there is no objection whatever to the publication of the same.

MATERIALS FOR OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of the following commodities was imported into Canada and used in the adulteration of butter, to produce what is called oleomargarine, during each of the years ending March 31st, 1920, 1921 and 1922?—Lard compound; oleo oil; cotton oil; cocoanut oil; peanut oil; butter oil, and salt?

2. What amount of duty was collected on the above mentioned imports?

3. What amount, if any, of drawback on duty paid has been refunded to the manufacturers of oleomargarine during each of the years 1920, 1921 and 1922 on the said commodities?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I do not see the hon. member in his seat but the last time this question was called I asked him to amend it so that we would be in a position to give the desired information. In the form in which the question appears on the Order Paper we cannot answer it.

RIGHT HON. C. J. DOHERTY

Mr. HALBERT:

1. Is the Right Honourable C. J. Doherty in the employ of the Government in any capacity at the present time?

2. If so, in what capacity?

3. On what date was he appointed to such position?

[Mr. Gould.]

4. What salary or remuneration is being paid to him?

5. What sum has been paid to him on account of such salary or remuneration up to the present time?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN: By Order in Council dated 25th November, 1921, the Right Honourable C. J. Doherty was named as counsel in the Reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the question as to the location of the Labrador boundary between Canada and Newfoundland. A fee of $10,000 was authorized to compensate for his retainer and his services in the drafting and preparation of the case, and in addition a per diem allowance of $200 per day while engaged upon the hearing. The sum of $5,000 has been paid him up to date.

BROCKVILLE AND WESTPORT RAILWAY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

Is it the intention of the management of the Canadian National railways to re-establish a gasoline car service on the branch line known as the Brockville and Westport railway in the County of Leeds?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: The matter is at present under consideration by the management.

BROCKVILLE LOCOMOTIVE SHOPS

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

Is it the intention of the management of Canadian National railways to extend or improve existing locomotive shops or to construct new shops at Brockville and provide much needed accommodation for locomotives at the said town?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: No.

DOMINION IRON AND STEEL CORPORATION

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. Did the Government enter into a contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation for a supply of steel plates?

2. If so was this contract carried out in its entirety?

3. If not what other arrangements were made?

4. What was the amount of the company's total claim?

5. How much has been paid thereon and on what dates?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Contract was cancelled on February 18, 1921. Matter of damages referred to Exchequer Court.

4. $10,969,482.15.

5. On December 14, 1921, $3,000,000.

TRAFFIC THROUGH CANALS

Mr. BROWN:

1. How many vessels and what tonnage passed through the Rideau canal during each year since 1915?

2. How many vessels and what tonnage passed through the Tay canal during each year since 1915?

3. How many vessels and what tonnage has passed through the St. Andrew's locks since the canal was opened?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1.

Rideau Canal

Year	No.	Vessels Registered Tonnage
1915	2,076	145,373
1916	1,684	118,555
1917	1,520	107,630
1918	1,164	78,803
1919	1,835	122,768
1920	1,718	119,875
1921	1,443	100,036

2. Tay Canal—is a part of the Rideau canal and statistics are not compiled separately for it.

3.

St. Andrew's Canal

Year	No.	Vessels Registered Tonnage
1910	202	44,887
1911	423	111,437
1912	1,260	210,973
1913	988	199,278
1914	334	106,044
1915	1,087	97,710
1916	552	58,934
1917	113	26,093
1918	130	28,062
1919	123	25,499
1920	154	26,367
1921	560*	27,514

*457 small gasoline boats etc. included.

NOTES—GOLD RESERVE

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What was the amount of Dominion notes issued and outstanding on November 30, 1921?

2. What was the amount of gold reserve on the said date?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. $118,089,394 against gold reserve of $81,607,303; and $169,223,332 issued under the provisions of the Finance Act, 1914, and Chapter 4, Acts of 1915, against securities approved by the Treasury Board.

GRAIN INQUIRY

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission?

2. Has provision been made in the Estimates for an appropriation to defray the expense of said commission, or is there any existing appropriation?

3. If the commission is not to be continued, has the Government instructed the Board of Grain Commissioners to investigate certain violations of the Canada Grain Act alleged to have been committed by certain Terminal Elevator Companies and sworn to before the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission?

4. Is the Government aware that the Board of Grain Commissioners can only conduct an investigation when specific charges have been made, and is it the intention of the Government to file such charges against said Terminal Elevators, or their officers, based upon information and evidence revealed before said Royal Grain Inquiry Commission?

5. Will the Government instruct the Justice Department, or the Board of Grain Commissioners, to prosecute persons or corporations, against whom charges have been made before the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, and if so, will steps be taken to prosecute those charged with violation of the law?

6. Is the Government aware that serious charges were made before the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, involving illegal practices resulting in serious losses to those entrusting their grain to the custody of said Terminal Elevators?

7. If no formal or official report has been submitted to the Government, is the Government not aware that wide publicity has been given to said charges, and will the Government (in the possible absence of an official report) immediately institute such inquiries as will secure the necessary information?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Not as at present constituted.

2. There is an appropriation recommended in the Estimates for 1922-23, now before the House.

3. If specific charges of irregularity are made the Government will investigate them.

4. The late Royal Grain Inquiry Commission has made no report to the Government.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Answered by No. 4.

7. Answered by No. 3.

INCOME TAXES

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What was the amount collected as income taxes from each province in the years 1919, 1920, 1921?

2. What were the total amounts paid by taxpayers on incomes to the Federal Government, in the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver, in the years 1919, 1920 and 1921?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1.

	Fiscal Years		
	1919	1920	1921
*Nova Scotia	$ 249,093 24	$ 506,993 06	$ 1,194,345 11
New Brunswick	193,028 91	333,370 98	701,463 53
Quebec	2,543,896 82	7,246,246 21	15,657,974 07
**Ontario	4,459,939 60	8,182,736 93	20,013,796 86
***Manitoba	740,610 77	1,871,387 86	3,962,734 88
Saskatchewan	171,836 81	478,244 38	1,193,536 63
Alberta	457,960 59	636,248 72	1,398,998 32
British Columbia	520,617 52	995,433 92	2,237,711 21
Yukon	6,434 77	13,757,37	21,246 03
Total Income Tax	$ 9,343,419 03	$20,264,419 43	$46,381,806 64
Business Profits War Tax	32,970,061 81	44,145,184 48	40,841,401 25
Total Income and Business Profits Tax	$42,313,480 84	$64,409,603 91	$87,223,207 89

* Includes amounts received from taxpayers resident in the Province of Prince Edward Island.
** Includes amounts received from taxpayers resident in the Province of Quebec west of the County of Argenteuil as the collection in that territory can be more economically and advantageously handled by the District Office at Ottawa.
*** During 1919 and 1920 included amounts received from taxpayers resident in the Province of Ontario west of Algoma.

Statistics showing collections by provinces under The Business Profits War Tax Act have not been compiled.

2. No information available, as statistics are compiled for districts and not municipalities.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. DEMERS:

1. How many persons were made permanent in the Civil Service from the 1st of April, 1920, to the 1st of January, 1922?
2. How many persons were made permanent in the said service from December 7, 1921, to January 6, 1922, inclusive?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Vancouver?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Vancouver during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Victoria?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Victoria during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Prince Rupert?
2. When were they built and put into commission?

[Mr. Hocken.]

3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Prince Rupert during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Halifax?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Halifax during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at St. John?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of St. John during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Quebec?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Quebec during the year 1921?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What dry docks are there located and operated at Montrael?
2. When were they built and put into commission?
3. What are the dimensions?
4. What was the total gross tonnage entering and leaving the Port of Montreal during the year 1921?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. MARTELL:

For a return showing in detail the amount of money paid by the Government of Canada or any department thereof, to barristers and solicitors of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, between the 1st day of October, 1911, and the 30th day of January, 1922, both inclusive, for professional or other services. Also a copy of all bills of costs, expenses and charges of every kind rendered by said barristers and solicitors to the Government, showing the amount or amounts paid in each instance. Also showing the names of barristers and solicitors employed during the aforesaid period, the work performed and the amount paid for every item of said work to each of said barristers and solicitors.

BRITISH PREFERENCE AND CANADIAN SEAPORTS

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the British tariff preference should be confined to goods brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the tariff preference granted by this country on goods of the mother country and most of the dominions was distinctly a family matter. It created a very favorable impression throughout the Empire, and inspired the greatest of all living imperial poets to write those wonderful lines—

A Nation spoke to a Nation,
A Queen sent word to a Throne,
"Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.
The gates are mine to open,
As the gates are mine to close."

I desire, to-day, Mr. Speaker, to advocate that the gates of a foreign country shall be closed to this preference, freely given by the daughter to the mother.

I submit you cannot build a nation upon pure materialism. In order to make a great country, you must create a national spirit. We need, I submit, in Canada, more intense Canadianism. What we lack—and I know not the reason—is that patriotic fervour that is so great an element in the building of national character. I desire to proclaim to the world that Canada is self-reliant and independent of other nations, and I desire, as far as I can, to impress upon certain dealers in goods on the other side of the Atlantic that this country is not bound in fields of ice during four or five months of the year.

A few years ago the British Medical Association met in Toronto. They were sending out some specimens or some articles, required for demonstration. The association meeting was held in August, and on the box containing these articles for demonstration was written in plain English "Please protect from Frost". A merchant in Ottawa ordered certain Christmas goods in London to be delivered via the Canadian Pacific Railway Steamships. He received a letter in the early part of December stating that they regretted very much that they could not get these goods away before the Canadian ports had frozen up, and, therefore, they were sending them via New York. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to declare, to the people of England at any rate, that we have ports in this country, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, which are open the year around.

This policy which I advocate has been proclaimed ever since Confederation, and even before. One of the leading policies of Canada has been that Canadian trade shall be carried through Canadian channels. Why did we build the Canadian Pacific Railway except to create trade east and west and west and east? The Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the National Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern were constructed largely to build up an interprovincial trade in Canada east and west and west and east. Even before Confederation this was a vision of our forefathers. It was eloquently expressed by the fathers of Confederation. The Hon. D'Arcy McGee, the great Irish-Canadian orator and statesman, speaking in the Confederation debate said:

One reason why I, in season, and perhaps out of season, have continued an advocate for an Intercolonial railway has been that first, closest and most lasting connection of these Lower Provinces with the continental trade system, might be established by and through and in union with Canada.

The same policy applied to the building extension and enlargement of the canals of Ontario and Quebec. The advantages of the policy which I advocate would not, by any means, be confined to the Maritime Provinces or to the ports of St. John and Halifax. It would be to the advantage of all ports in Canada. The English fall importation would largely come in through the ports of Quebec and Montreal, and importations from different British possessions, particularly New Zealand, to which the British preference applies, would be brought in via Vancouver and Prince Rupert.

The cost of every carload of freight sent from the maritime provinces or British Columbia is increased because of the car having to be hauled back empty or nearly so. The cost of every shipload of freight from Montreal, Quebec, Halifax or St.

John to the Mother Country, or from New Zealand to British Columbia, is increased on account of the lack of return cargo. I would like to impress upon my colleagues that the lack of a westbound cargo is the weakness of our transportation system with Great Britain. We can send over wheat and lumber, and fill the ships, but they often come back empty, only carrying ballast.

It would create more competition among ocean freight carriers. Vessels sailing to certain ports would charge lower rates if they were assured of a return cargo. If more ships were provided with return cargoes it would mean lessening of freight rates; in other words, if we had competition rates would be lowered in both directions. I have before me a letter from one of the steamship companies in Canada in which I find the following statement:

> From my experience of 25 years I may say that steamers on the westbound trip from Great Britain or Europe are rarely full of cargo the vessels depending almost entirely on the freight from Canada to Great Britain and the continent for their earnings. That sufficient tonnage could not be obtained to carry the traffic is, from my experience, incorrect. The fact of the matter is that all the large lines coming to Canada, if the traffic was obtainable could place a larger number of steamers on the several routes. The lack of business, especially on the westbound voyage makes it unprofitable. In the winter months, when the boats run to both Halifax and St. John if full cargoes were obtainable to Canada we could give lower freight rates on goods carried from Canada than when earning practically nothing westbound, which is pretty much the case at present.

Mr. BAXTER: I should like to suggest to my hon. friend that if he cannot get real sympathy, he might, at least, appeal for the apparent sympathy afforded by silence in this House, so that members who are interested in what he says may have an opportunity of hearing him. It is an impossibility to hear him at present.

Mr. LOGAN: Thank you. Referring to sugar, he said:

> A large amount of the traffic that comes to Canada finds its way via New York and Boston. Nearly all the sugar for the Montreal refineries comes via New York, whereas if the preference was only given to sugar coming direct to Canadian ports it would benefit Halifax and St. John, give employment to an extra number of steamers, give a large extra revenue to our railroads and leave a large amount of money in Halifax and St. John and also Montreal.

The Canadian Pacific, having their steamships on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, would be able to give as cheap a rate of freight from ports in Great Britain as any American steamship line with connecting lines of railway, because of their desire not only to give westbound freight to their ships, but to give westbound freight to their railway system.

Mr. CRERAR: What steamship company is represented in what my hon. friend is quoting from?

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Speaker, I trust I shall make my voice heard in this chamber. I want to ask my hon. friend what steamship company is represented in the quotation which he has just given to the House.

Mr. LOGAN: I would rather not at the present time, disclose the name. I would be very glad to give it privately to my hon. friend.

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. LOGAN: The acoustic properties of this chamber are a tragedy in this $12,000,000 structure, because I can assure you, Sir, that we sit here hour in and hour out and cannot follow speeches made by hon. members sitting only a very short distance away.

But let me continue. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, which to-day is not particularly busy, would have more demands made upon it for freight service, and when that freight is delivered to the railways, no doubt the Canadian Government railways, at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver, or Prince Rupert, would be very glad to secure the added freight to increase their revenues. If, for instance, an importer of goods in Vancouver to-day makes a purchase in London, the goods are very apt to be sent on an American ship via New York. Then, naturally, they will be forwarded on American railways as far west as possible, so that the only part of the freight receipts on that bundle of goods that would go to a Canadian transportation company would be the freight from a junction on the Pacific coast as near as possible to the city of Vancouver.

An objection has been raised to this policy that it might be resented by the people of the United States of America. We heard this same statement made when the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) brought down the preferential tariff in 1897. But I submit that we need not fear this bugaboo, that the bonding privilege is just as important, if not more so, to the United States of America than it is to the Dominion of Canada.

Even if the policy I advocate were an interference with the bonding privilege, we

would only be carrying out the historic policy of the United States of America which, ever since it has become a nation, has put upon its statute books, the very class of legislation for which I am asking to-day. In 1817, 105 years ago, Congress and the Senate passed the following:

> Commerce between the territories shall be regarded as coastwise and shall be confined to vessels built in the United States, officered by the United States citizens, flying the United States flag.

That has been their policy during all these long 105 years since this legislation was placed upon their statute books.

Without, I hope, wearying the House and without quoting too many statutes, let us follow their policy through the years. In 1868, their navigation laws as to transportation of merchandise were extended around Alaska. When they had taken possession of the Hawaiian islands, let us find what legislation they passed in this regard. It will be found in an act which was passed in April, 1900, and which reads:

> The coasting trades between the islands aforesaid and any other portion of the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions applicable to such trade between two great coasting districts.

Let us take Porto Rico. You will find, in an act pertaining to that island, the following:

> The coasting trade between Porto Rico and the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts of the United States.

Not only did they throw their coasting laws around Alaska on this continent; not only did they reach out to Porto Rico; not only did they go to the middle of the Pacific with their coasting laws, to cover the Hawaiian islands; but even to the Antipodes this law follows, and we find, in reference to the Philippine islands, the following statute:

> No merchandise except supplies for the army or navy shall be transported by sea, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine archipelago, directly or via a foreign port or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.
>
> Section 2. That on and after April 11, 1909, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States of America and ports or places in the Philippine archipelago, whether directly or by way of foreign ports under a penalty of $200 for each passenger so transported and landed.

That is a law of the United States of America to-day. Yet, we are to be told that we must not confine the British preference, this family arrangement, as I have stated, to Canadian ports because, forsooth, we might offend the United States of America. If we take that stand, we must admit that we are not independent; that we are not a self-reliant nation; that we cannot depend upon the facilities that are provided in our own country. We cannot maintain the dignity of national citizenship if we adopt such a position and do not declare, by this legislation, our independence of the United States of America.

I shall briefly outline the history of this policy in this House which I am advocating to-day. In 1904 I had the honour to move a similar resolution and in 1907 it was my pleasure to see that resolution incorporated in the Budget of that year; incorporated, however, with a proviso moved by the then Prime Minister that it should come into operation by Order in Council. I propose now to read for the benefit of the House one or two extracts from speeches made by the leading men of this country at that time. An hon. gentleman, whom I am glad to see with us to-day, although we do not agree politically, the Nestor of the House—I refer to the member for South York (Mr. Maclean)—in 1907, speaking on my resolution, used the following language:

> I intend to give this proposal not only my sympathy, which is sometimes of the cold potato nature, but my vote as well. I have no great belief in a measure of trade based on a preference, where the Government offering it asks for nothing in return, and where the Government receiving it does not see the propriety of giving anything in return. On that ground alone I would vote for the proposal.

He goes on:

> The best and only way to improve our Canadian ports is to direct to them all the trade we can control. In the case of the preference, we can more or less control that trade, and if we have confidence in our own ports, and if we are spending millions and millions to develop a national transcontinental system, it is our duty to endeavour to develop these ports on the lines laid down in the resolution.

I am glad to quote another hon. member who is also with us to-day. Let me read from the remarks of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Speaking in 1904 in reference to a similar resolution, he said:

> It is a subject on which there is need of education, not only outside of this House, but possibly inside the House. I am aware that possibly, from some points of view, objections may be raised to the motion of my hon. friend; but, for my own part, I am heartily in favour of it, and if he decides to divide the House upon it I shall have pleasure in giving my vote in sup-

port of the motion. For the purpose of the present budget and the present condition of affairs we cannot deal with it. But I hope there will be such an educational movement on the question that, at no distant day, we may adopt it as part of our practical legislation. If that can be done at no distant day, no one will rejoice more than I shall. I think that the reasons that my hon. friend has given in support of his motion are strong, and I believe that the more the subject is discussed, the more likely we are to reach the conclusion that he has reached after so much consideration.

Let me now quote from one who, in the councils of the nation at that time, was even a higher authority than the present Minister of Finance. Our late lamented chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in 1907, is reported in Hansard (page 4323) as follows:

In view of the different opinions expressed to-day upon this very important question, it ought not to be difficult for the House to come to a unanimous conclusion. Every member who has addressed himself to this question has, with one exception—the exception of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp)—pronounced himself in favour of the principle of this motion. My hon. friend from East Toronto is the only one who has taken exception to the principle itself. But doubt has arisen as to whether, admitting the principle, the time is opportune for declaring such a policy as that embodied in the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). My hon. friend's resolution is quite in keeping with the policy followed by this country for the last fifty years, namely, the developing of Canadian trade within Canadian channels. Everybody in this country for the last fifty years, especially since the inauguration of Confederation, has followed such a policy. Fifty years ago, when we began to build railways, we began to build them north and south, and the objective point of all of them was some American port. The ports of Boston, New York and Portland were the three through which we got our imports in the winter. But after Confederation we began to build up another policy. We began to dispense with American harbours and to bring the trade to our own ports. This policy we have followed to the present day and with a reasonable measure of success. Take our importations from Great Britain; from seventy to seventy-five per cent come through Canadian harbours and only twenty-five to thirty per cent through American ports. The question now is whether or not, following out that policy, we are in a position to adopt the policy proposed by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). He proposes that the benefit of British preference should be given only to such goods as come through Canadian ports.

At page 4326, Sir Wilfrid continues:

But I look upon this motion as a completion of the policy which we inaugurated four years ago when we resolved to construct another transcontinental railway from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean. When this railway is in operation, as by the terms of the contract it must be in operation in the month of December, 1911, then will be a fitting time to adopt this policy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would not be disposed to agree altogether with the motion of my hon.

[Mr. Logan.]

friend if it is intended to apply it in the month of May, 1908; it will, however, fittingly apply in 1911 when the transcontinental railway will be completed. Then we shall have two competing lines from the maritime harbours to the great new centre that is developing west of the great lakes, and then when the people of the Northwest will have two lines in operation to carry their imports and exports, we will be in a position safely to apply the policy indicated in the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland.

Referring to any possibility of the abrogation of the bonding privilege, Sir Wilfrid said:

Now, would the adoption of this policy at the present time have any effect upon the bonding privilege? I do not think so. The bonding privilege merely gives us the privilege of carrying our own goods through their territory, and gives them the privilege of carrying their goods through our territory. But if we choose by domestic arrangement to bring trade into our channels, we do not merely abolish the bonding privilege, we simply become independent of it. Well, Sir, was not one of the objects we had in view when we introduced the policy of building a new transcontinental railway to get rid of our dependence upon the bonding privilege? Our policy is to be free of the need of using American harbours and of the need of a bonding privilege; we desire to be in such a position that at all times we can bring our imports and send our exports through our own channels independently of American harbours and the bonding privilege. Moreover, we are to remember that the benefits of the bonding privilege are reciprocal. The Americans use our territory and we use their territory. But if it should come to this, that the bonding privilege were taken away from us by the United States, we can take away from them the bonding privilege which they enjoy of carrying their goods through our territory, and in that case I think the United States would have more to lose than we would have. However, I would be sorry if it ever came to that; we do not want to have with our American neighbours any but the most friendly relations. I would be sorry if the bonding privilege was interefered with, but if it is ever interfered with at all, I am ready to say that in my humble judgment we have less to lose than our American neighbours, and they would hesitate before interfering with the bonding privilege. They may do so, however. Twice already they have threatened us with the destruction of the bonding privilege, and at that time it would have been a serious blow to us, because we were not equipped then, as we shall be by and by, to be able to do without it. When we have another transcontinental railway in operation I think we shall be absolutely independent of the bonding privilege.

Sir Wilfrid concluded his statement by saying:

The motion of my hon. friend is all right; it is a little premature.

He then moved the following amendment, which was carried unanimously.

That on and after a date to be named by the Governor in Council the British preference shall apply only to goods brought into Canada if shipped through a Canadian seaport.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the time has long gone by when the policy then made a principle of our tariff should have been put into force. At that time, as you know, Sir, we had only one transcontinental railway, and that circumstance constituted an argument against the adoption of this policy, because the people in the West said: You will put us at the mercy of one single line of railway north of lake Superior. That, too, was the objection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But in 1907 he stated that we would have a second transcontinental line, and could in 1911 adopt this policy. Well, today we have three transcontinental railways instead of two; and if we could adopt this policy in 1911, we are in a still better position to adopt it now. Before the time arrived when Sir Wilfrid Laurier promised that this policy would be brought into force a change of government took place, and the matter has been lying dormant ever since. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a policy which should now be incorporated in our tariff when the Budget is brought down this session.

There has been, however, some progress along the lines which I advocated. For instance, I turn to chapter 13 of the statutes of 1921 and I find that the West Indies Trade Agreement, enacted May 3 of that year, contains the following passage:

> The Government of Canada on giving six months' notice may provide that, to be entitled to the concessions granted in Articles II and III, the products of any of the colonies aforesaid shall be conveyed by ship direct without transhipment from the said colony or from one of the other colonies entitled to the advantages of this agreement into a Canadian port.

I find that on the 4th of the following month legislation was passed to further amend the customs tariff, 1907, the act being cited as The Customs Tariff Amendment Act, 1921, and section 2 thereof reads:

> 2. Notwithstanding anything in this Act, goods, other than tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, spirituous or alcoholic liquors and articles specified in Schedule A of The West Indies Trade Agreement Act, the product or manufacture of British Honduras, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Turks and Caicos Islands, the Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands), the Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia), Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, and British Guiana; when imported direct therefrom shall not be subject at any time to more than fifty per centum of the duties imposed on similar goods as set forth in the general tariff under regulations by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue.

So some progress has been made along the lines which I and other members of this House have advocated during a good many years. If "Canada for Canadians" is a good policy, then "Canadian ports for Canadian ships" ought to be equally as good a policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, I may state frankly that I do not intend to press this motion to a final vote, for I do not expect the Government to commit itself and enunciate its tariff policy until the Budget is brought down by the Minister of Finance. But I do expect the Government to enact what Sir Wilfred Laurier promised in 1907 would be put upon our statute books in 1911. I expect the Government to adopt a policy which will be thoroughly Canadian, and to declare to the world that we have well-equipped summer and winter ports. We have spent millions of dollars upon these ports in the last few years. Recently sixteen million dollars have been spent on the great port of Halifax, while millions more have been spent upon the ports of Quebec and Montreal and upon our Pacific ports; and hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended in the building of railroads to carry goods east and west. We have talked about building up a "United Canada". Surely there is no one in this House who would object even if in the beginning the adoption of this policy resulted in an increase of one or two cents a ton on the transportation of our freight, which increase I do not admit. I presume that this matter of freights may be gone into by my hon. friend from St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter), who is to follow me in this debate. But I do desire to point out that even if the putting of this policy into effect did cost us a few cents a ton more on freight, surely it is worth that to be independent of ports of the United States. That country has shown its independence all along the line: its people glory in their ports—and they use them. Let us do the same, so that at this time after the awful cataclysm of war "out from the mists of humanity's sorrows" Canadians may take their stand, certain of their destiny, and with heads erect proudly declare that they will patronize their own seaports on the Atlantic and Pacific—seaports which are open the year round for commerce with the whole world.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) has wandered far afield for argument on this question. I purpose to confine my arguments strictly to the resolution before the House. The British preference was embodied in the Tariff Revision Act of 1897, becoming

a part of the Laurier-Fielding tariff at that time, and it did to some extent lighten the burden which protection had placed on the consumers of this land. I think the preference then on most goods stood at about 33⅓ per cent, but from that time down to the present this preference has always been a bugbear to the protected interests of this country. The Conservative Opposition from 1896 onward never had any policy but that of more protection and less British preference, and it was always ready to endorse any further measure of protection introduced by the Liberal government between 1897 and 1911. So it was at the instigation of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, who objected to British competition, that the revision of 1904 considerably whittled down the British preference. This was done on the eve of a general election. Again in 1907 it was somewhat further curtailed. To-day it stands in our tariff schedule just a little better than the favoured nation treatment or the intermediate tariff. But, after all, the greatest preference to-day is on goods that we do not get from Great Britain. I think that the beneficiaries of protection, realizing that it is not possible to further whittle down the British preference and still recognize it in the tariff schedule, are taking other means now to rid themselves of British competition.

When the Laurier-Fielding tariff was brought down in 1897 not one manufacturer could say that he lost anything from the protection which was afforded him from 1879 onwards. Preference for Great Britain was the only departure from the old National Policy, and advantage accruing to the consumers of this country under this preference was adequately taken care of afterwards by an increase in the general tariff. At all the tariff inquiries since then, in 1905-06 particularly, the farmers of the whole Dominion, as well as importers of textiles in the eastern provinces, commended the British preference and asked for a repeal of the amendment of 1904 which curtailed it. That curtailment was made at the instigation of the protected interests of this country. The farmers particularly commended the preference because it gave some relief from the tariff, and because it served as a tie with the mother country. We realize also that as a result of the good feeling it engendered, a sentimental preference for Canadian agricultural products prevailed in Great Britain. On the other hand, it is on record that the Canadian manufacturers who assailed the British preference at that time spoke of London and Liverpool as "foreign", and referred to any Englishmen who came to this country in the interests of trade as "foreigners". The word "foreign" was particularly noticeable in the petition presented by these gentlemen at Three Rivers in 1906 on behalf of higher duties on British imports. I take it, Sir, that the present resolution, though it may not be proposed by my hon. friend for that purpose, will have the effect of more completely corralling the consumers of this country for the benefit of the already over-protected interests.

4 p.m.

There are four columns, so to speak, in our tariff schedule as it stands to-day. There is the free list, the British preference, the intermediate tariff, and the general tariff. I think, Sir, it would have been more consistent if my hon. friend had advocated that we compel all goods that come in free to come through Canadian ports,—and this would apply also to goods coming in under the intermediate tariff or the favoured nation provisions. But why, oh why, single out goods coming in under the British preference?

My hon. friend completely gave away the argument when he said that the Canadian Pacific railway had been built to keep trade going east and west. That old sentiment of "Canada for the Canadians" is a played out joke so far as Canadian interests are concerned. If the hon. member wanted to keep trade going east and west, it would have been more consistent for him to advocate that our Atlantic ports be thrown open to the free entry of British goods. The resolution is a camouflage of intent to curtail British competition, and I for one am going to oppose it.

Hon. JOHN B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to take this opportunity of demonstrating, in small measure at least, that substantial unity of thought which is characteristic of our people down by the sea,—a line of thought which, I believe, is neither selfish nor un-Canadian; a line of thought which will never express itself in such terms as to give rise to a doubt that we stand for Canada for the Canadians, first, last and always.

It does not seem to be necessary this afternoon, or, perhaps, on any occasion, to discuss very seriously the tariff question from the standpoint of protection. Until this country can find some new, great and

unexpected source of revenue, something upon which the people of Canada will be willing and glad to be taxed, we shall have to depend upon customs duties for a very great part of the revenue necessary to carry on the business of the country. It is idle to talk of throwing away a protective system—or a tariff system, which is practically the same thing—throwing it away, as if Canada could administer its affairs upon wind, pure and simple.

The only argument so far advanced against the reasons stated by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) in support of his resolution is that the proposal is a nefarious attempt to throttle or lessen the effects of the British preference. Now, if we can get somewhere out of the heavens and get down on the plain earth and talk to one another as sensible beings, we will not find any very nefarious plot behind the resolution proposed by my hon. friend, and concurred in, I think, by a good many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It is not necessary to make aspersions upon the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian manufacturers, or anybody else. Despite some things which have occurred since the opening of the session, I still believe that the aim of this Parliament is—as the aim of preceding parliaments has been and of succeeding parliaments will be—to bring about the substantial unity of our Canadian nation. But we cannot obtain that unity unless we have mutual understanding and mutual confidence. It will not do for representatives of any particular section of the country to take the intolerant attitude that some other portion of the country is not entitled to be heard. The views of all must be considered, and when they are fairly considered, when the hearer honestly strives to put himself in the position of the other man, then something practical, something useful, will be secured toward the solution of the questions here proposed to be resolved.

I was sorry, Mr. Speaker—it may have been unintentional—but when my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) was speaking I found it impossible even at this short distance from him to follow his entire speech. Had I been able to hear the whole of his remarks it is quite possible I would have been in substantial accord with all that he said. At the present moment I can only say that I am in accord with the portions of his speech that I did hear. But why did I not hear the whole of my hon. friend's speech? I was as attentive as I could be, but all his utterances failed to reach me. I fear that an unfortunate phrase, uttered by a great Canadian statesman many years ago, has still its unfortunate effect upon the mind of this Chamber, and to some extent upon the mind of the country. We do not forget that a really great man, who occupied a commanding position in the old House of Parliament, and whose name will go down to posterity, unfortunately once said one of those clever things that rankle, and sting, and burn, and do not make for peace and mutual understanding. I refer to the occasion when those unfortunate words were uttered which designated the maritime provinces as "the shreds and patches and ragged remnants of Confederation." In that day, I fear, an attitude of thought was formed which possibly has persisted to the extent that when my hon. friend rises this Chamber says, "Oh, that is simply a matter of those maritime province people and it will keep; we can have a quiet little conversation." Well, if we are to take that attitude toward the maritime provinces, and if we are to take that attitude of at least superficial indifference to the West—unless we are trying to obtain the votes of the West for the moment—we will not solve the problems of Canada.

Now, I shall not occupy much time, but may I plead that the representatives of the other portions of Canada take just a few moments for thought relative to the problem which has been enunciated today. I think they will not find in it any disguised monster which seeks to assassinate our Canadian manhood or our Canadian commonwealth. I think they will find after thorough examination, a simple, plain business proposition that any man can understand, and that a sense of justice will recognize as a thing that is not only fair to certain localities, but is good for this country as a whole.

Now what does this proposition mean? Speaking as a representative from a constituency in which there is one of these ports, the port of St. John, which naturally would be affected, let me take you for a moment or two to that port and ask you to look around. It is a small port but within the circle of it you find construction which has been carried out by the people of St. John at their own expense and what for? Their own benefit you will say, of course. Yes, primarily. They built wharves at their own expense that they might induce the trade of the world to

float through a part of the province of New Brunswick in its entrance to Canada. They demonstrated the value of their port; they begat the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway in that port. As the result of that great experiment the Government of Canada undertook to supplement the expenditure, and have spent millions in that port to promote the handling of Canadian trade through Canadian channels. That principle has been followed, sometimes more and sometimes less closely, without the slightest regard to the succession of governments which we have had in the last twenty-five or thirty years. It has become a national principle, a principle well expressed by that gentleman of whose great statesmanship we all show our appreciation, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. His aim, as he expressed it, was never to be satisfied until every pound of Canadian freight that could possibly be brought through Canadian channels was so brought. I stand here as a Conservative, but that doctrine is good enough for me, and I believe it is good enough for the people of Canada. I have no quarrel with the source from which it came; I only want to see Sir Wilfrid Laurier's desire carried into practical effect for the good of the whole country which he undoubtedly loved.

Now I said that the Government of Canada had spent many millions of dollars in the port of St. John. We have not there a system of control by a harbour commission. I regret that we have not, but it is not a topic of discussion at the present hour. You go to Halifax, the other important port in the maritime provinces, and you find that large amounts of government money have been expended there for the very same purpose, and for a proper purpose—the equipping of a national port. You have not there, I think, a harbour commission either. But go to the port of Quebec; there you have a harbour commission, and you have the credit of this country at the back of the people who administer the affairs of that port and rightly so. You have the same thing at Montreal and you have also at Vancouver. Now you have the people of Canada, as taxpayers, directly interested in the success or failure of the flowing of trade through these ports. I ask you as business men is that worth consideration or is it not? Is it worth doing something that will bring more trade, and will render less probable an avalanche of accumulated debt falling upon this country? Is it better to develop trade through these ports and by the tolls which are collected put beyond possibility any defaulting in the interest upon the bonds and the consequent drain upon the federal exchequer? This is a very simple proposition.

How is the principle embodied in this resolution to be carried out upon the Atlantic seaboard? It is no use for us to simply say that we want people to bring in British goods through Halifax or St. John, or both, and in the summer time through Quebec and Montreal. They will not do it merely because we ask them. Is it possible to lay down such a line of policy that they will find it to their interest to bring their goods into our ports and thereby support those public expenditures by the proper contribution, which contribution otherwise would go to ports in a foreign country? That is simply what it is; that is what we are asking. It does not reduce the tariff preference by one tittle. You will get just as low custom duties if the goods are coming in through Vancouver or through the ports of Montreal or Quebec, or Halifax or St. John.

It has been suggested that there might be something more in the way of railway charges. I am not sure that I am totally in accord with the hon. member who advanced that view. I believe that the principle in railway management is a sound one, that the long haul should be at lower rates than the short haul in order to overcome the natural obstacle of distance which creates so much difficulty in handling the commerce of this long drawn-out country. I believe it would be possible, especially by means of the ownership of the government system of railways in conjunction with the practical control which the Government has over the majority of the ports of this country, to so organize co-operation between the railroads and the ports that the importer in the interior would not pay any more for his freight.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What about the Grand Trunk and the city of Portland?

Mr. BAXTER: Well, if this Government chooses to make Portland a seaport of Canada—

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It already is.

Mr. BAXTER: —if this Government chooses to make Portland a seaport of Canada, it cannot expect support from any one on this side of the House, and I do

not think it will get much support from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MALCOLM How are you going to give public ownership a fair trial if you discriminate against one of the ports of the national railways?

Mr. BAXTER: I do not undertake to discuss that question this afternoon; it is not necessary to discuss it; but I am not at all afraid of the challenge. I do not think it requires any genius or even statesmanship and I do not think it requires more than the most ordinary form of administration, to be able to discard the port of Portland, or, at all events, to put it into such a position that anyone seeking to export or import goods would use the ports within our own territory by preference. Personally, if I were handling the problem, I would tell my hon. friend exactly how I would handle it. I would impose a differential toll against the port of Portland, and make it more expensive to bring goods from that port, or take them out by that port, than by Halifax or St. John. In other words I would shape the railway policy so as to build up this country instead of building up another country, and if my hon. friend is interested in pursuing that branch of the question, I will refer them to the files of the St. John Globe and the St. John Telegraph during the last campaign, where they will find that they were attacking the preceding government because, they claimed, that government was building up Portland, Maine, at the expense of our country, and they were demanding that that should not be done. If my hon. friend will get in line with the St. John Globe and the St. John Telegraph, the exponents of his party, that will be perfectly satisfactory to me, and he will be pursuing a policy exactly on the line that I desire to see pursued. And, had the former government not been defeated, I would have been advocating that policy in its councils. If, however, the hon. gentleman chooses to turn his back upon the organs of his party, if he chooses to stand as an advocate of Portland, Maine, all I can hope is that he will stand alone in this House.

Something has been said with regard to the possibility of retaliation. I think, so far as I could hear, my hon. friend was dealing with that question extensively, and I do not wish to travel over the same ground again, but we might just as well talk of retaliation with regard to any item of the tariff. There is no magic about the British preference, it is nothing more nor less than an item of the tariff, a means of raising revenue, or of protecting the industries of this country. It simply says: We will protect our industries a little less against the manufacturers of Great Britain than we will against the manufacturers of United States or elsewhere. If that is not cause for retaliation in itself, if the United States and other countries do not choose to say: If you do not give us entry into your markets on the same terms as the Mother Country, we will boycott you,—what possible reason can they have for saying it if we draw the line a little further and say: We will only give you the benefit of that tariff when you bring your goods into Canadian seaports. I would like to go one step further and add "and only in British or Canadian-owned bottoms". I believe the Government and the House would do well to think of the possibility of utilizing our Canadian Government Merchant Marine for the importation of goods, with a special preference because they are Canadian bottoms owned by the Canadian Government. I do not care how much you limit it, the goods will get in, but we may just as well foster our own enterprise and look after our own country.

We are perhaps in rather a peculiar position in the ports of Halifax and St. John. Both ports have done much to attract this overseas trade. It has had beneficial results in both localities. It has increased, to some extent, our population. It has certainly increased the population of both cities, but I would like to tell my hon. friends who live inland that in both those cities there is not yet any domination of trade. We have not the wholesalers there who are handling the products of Canada and filling the ships with cargoes themselves. The financial centre, the great trading centres of Canada, are not down by the sea. We have to depend entirely upon other localities to provide our cargoes. The result is that, so far, all that we in the maritime provinces get out of this trade is that we are what I might call hewers of wood and drawers of water. We have added to the labour of our port. We have got also a certain market for supplies to the vessels. All this, manifestly, can be increased, if you will, where possible, bring the trade of Canada through our gateway. More than that, in time, when our ports develop to the proportions we are seeking and hoping, you will eventually find men at those ports who will begin to direct at least a part of the commerce of the

world. Now, is what I am going to propose fair or is it not? Gentlemen come here from the centre of this country and make their feelings manifest through many modes of expression. They say, "Consider our situation, consider the difficulties with which we have to struggle, consider the work we did as pioneers in this country, and give us some relief from customs duties and from this, that and the other thing." I say to you who put forward those propositions: "Look also down by the sea and visualize the difficulties through which our people have gone when we helped to form Confederation and to mould this Dominion of Canada, and will you say to us that we are asking anything unfair if we seek to have the Dominion held together, not merely by the bonds of steel that have been run across it at an expenditure of millions upon millions, but by a bond of sentiment from the Pacific to the Atlantic which will strive to deal justly with all parts of Canada, and which will rejoice in the expansion and development of every part?" If we can get that spirit, my hon. friend's motion is assured of success. I suggest that, instead of withdrawing the motion, the hon. gentleman should slightly modify it. I do not put it as a matter of dictation to the Government, nor do I believe in an hon. member proposing a resolution simply for the purpose of dropping it after discussion. I want to see something real as the product of an hour's discussion, and I would suggest that the hon. member amend it and make it read:

That in the opinion of the House it is desirable the Government should consider carefully the limitation of the British tariff preference to goods brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

In that form it would be a strong expression of opinion that it is desirable the Government should consider. On the other hand, it will not place the Government of the country in a position of having a policy dictated to it in advance of its own consideration. I trust that it may be possible for my suggestion to be accepted.

I apologize for having detained the House at such length but if anything I have said will have the effect of helping to solve, even to a small extent, the problems we have in the maritime provinces, I shall feel that I have not wholly lost the time I have occupied in the House this afternoon.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), and which, I think, I may say, without transgressing the bounds of good taste, has been seconded by the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter), is one that, if it were to receive the serious consideration of this House, would, indeed, be an important resolution. I am reminded, however, that the hon. member for Cumberland stated that he had been preaching this doctrine in this House for twenty-odd years. He does not appear to have made a great deal of progress in that time, and I venture the prediction that he will still be preaching it for another twenty years, without getting very much further on; nor am I convinced that the exhibition we have had this afternoon of a very fine bit of team work between the hon. member for Cumberland and the hon. member for St. John and Albert,—who usually do not see eye to eye on questions before this House—has advanced very much the cause for which this resolution stands. Indeed, I was almost of the opinion, when I listened to the hon. member for Cumberland, that he should be sitting over beside the hon. member for St. John and Albert.

The hon. member for Cumberland argued that this is a necessary measure to provide traffic for our Canadian railways. You, Mr. Speaker, and the House, will observe that, if this resolution were incorporated into the law of Canada, all goods coming from Great Britain to Canada, in order to secure the British preference, would have to come through Canadian ports. That is the whole purpose of the resolution. My hon. friend argues that this would furnish additional business for Canadian railways, and he states that the Canadian railways were built to carry traffic east and west. That is not altogether true of the Canadian Pacific railway, nor is it true of the Intercolonial railway. The Intercolonial railway, as every hon. member, knows, was built as a part of the understanding in connection with Confederation, and the Canadian Pacific railway was built to link up the eastern provinces of that day with the new province of British Columbia that had come into Confederation in 1871. Consequently, these roads were not built primarily for the purpose of carrying traffic east and west. The hon. member for Cumberland also argued—and his contention was supported by the hon. member for St. John and Albert—that the passing of measures of this kind would really result

in lower costs to the Canadian people. They argued that ships carrying goods to Europe had difficulty in getting return cargoes to Canadian ports, and that if this measure were passed and British goods compelled to come in through Canadian ports, that would give these vessels the return cargoes they require and, consequently, bring about a reduction in freight rates. That is the most fallacious argument that could possibly be advanced in support of the resolution, because the facts of the case are precisely the reverse. Why is it that ocean freights from Atlantic ports in the United States to Great Britain are usually more favourable than from Canadian ports? It is due to the fact alone that vessels plying between American ports, such as New York, Baltimore, Newport News, Boston and Philadelphia, and European ports, can get return cargoes from Europe for American ports when they cannot get return cargoes for Canadian ports. Anyone knows that who has had any experience in export business.

Mr. BAXTER: Does this not provide return cargoes to some extent?

Mr. CRERAR: I will deal with that matter just in a moment. I have had some experience in this because for a good many years the company with which I have been and am still identified was a large exporter of grain from America to Europe, and it was invariably found that better conditions governing export, both in the securing of charters and the rates of freight, could be obtained from American ports than from Canadian ports. Why was this the case? Simply because the return traffic from Great Britain and Europe comes in immensely greater volume to United States Atlantic ports than it does to Canadian ports, for the reason that the United States has a population of 108,000,000 or 110,000,000 people against our 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 people, and consequently importations from Europe to supply the needs of that great United States population give the traffic for the west-bound trip. My hon. friends seek to reverse this. By an enactment of the Parliament, they seek to create a condition that will throw trade out of its normal, natural channel into an artificial channel created by this Government. I submit that is not in the interest of the Canadian people as a whole. My hon. friends may argue with considerable force that this may be of some advantage to the ports of St. John and Halifax; but if it be of advantage to those ports, that advantage will hold for only a certain period of the year. As everyone knows, these ports are winter ports. Their harbours are open the year around. The great harbour of Montreal that is, after all, the greatest seaport in Canada by all odds—

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: I note I have some support for that idea. The great harbour of Montreal is open only a portion of the year, and when Montreal is open, St. John and Halifax get practically no business whatever for points west of Montreal. Consequently, this proposal, that by arbitrary legislation of this Parliament we shall create artificial trade routes in order that our Atlantic seaports—and I have no wish whatever to say anything in disparagement of them—may enjoy a more profitable business for a few months in the year, is a proposition that is totally absurd and that should not command the support of this House.

There is another feature of the matter. If the purport of this resolution were incorporated into our Canadian laws and all British goods came in through Canadian ports, what guarantee can my hon friends give that the freight rates on those goods will not increase from Canadian ports to the interior where they are consumed? At the present time, with these goods having the privilege of coming in through United States ports in bond, we have the element of competition in transportation costs. That element would be completely eliminated were the resolution of my hon. friend carried.

We have heard a good deal of talk from my hon. friends about being independent of the United States. Now, Sir, I thought the time had passed when any hon. gentleman in this House was of the opinion that this or any other country, in matters of trade, can live to itself alone. That is simply impossible. In fact, as the years go on the interdependence of nations in matters of trade is growing, and there is an increasing realization of the fact; and to argue that we must be independent of the United States in respect of any matter of that kind is but to make a sort of patriotic appeal that has no basis whatever in real patriotism.

There is another fact in connection with this question which perhaps has a more remote bearing upon it, but which, nevertheless, should not be overlooked. It is a

well-known fact that eastern American cities, particularly the seaboard cities, were among the strongest believers in reciprocity in natural products between Canada and the United States. I think it is of some value to Canada to have that feeling existing in that country. My hon. friends to the right of me, I know, have no faith in the value of reciprocity to Canadian development. I trust that that feeling is not shared by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). If these favourable trade arrangements with the United States are to be secured, they are to be secured, not by our taking any step that would antagonize a body of opinion in that country that is now favourable to the proposal, but by our cultivating that opinion in the hope that eventually a satisfactory arrangement may be brought about.

There is something else, too, that should not be ignored. Within recent years there has been a steady growth in the amount of American business that has been carried through the port of Montreal. Why do nations have their trade carried in this way? Business concerns and individuals, who are buying goods from foreign countries and selling in return, buy and sell those goods along the lines that are most advantageous to them, and if goods are coming through the United States now, what is the explanation of that fact? The reason is simply because the Canadian people and Canadian firms can secure those goods more cheaply in that way than in any other way. And are we to set up an arbitrary provision of this Parliament that will compel the people of Canada to purchase the things they need from Great Britain through an arbitrary channel that will increase the cost to the consumers? That is a point that must not be overlooked in considering the question; and if we undertake to create a discrimination, in the matter of these importations, against the United States seaports, may we not reasonably expect that opinion in the United States—if indeed their government does not—will set up contrary discriminations against our port in Montreal? I am a great believer in the future of the port of Montreal, because the great business that lies away back in the interior can come down to Montreal by boat in the open season of navigation, and be transferred to the ocean liners that carry the goods to their ultimate markets. I trust, therefore, that the Government will not listen to the admonitions of my hon. friends from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and St. John (Mr. Baxter), so far as this question is concerned.

My hon. friend from St. John introduced the tariff, and said that protection was necessary in this country for the purpose of securing a revenue. I do not propose to debate that question to-day, because it is not particularly germane to the resolution under consideration; and I endeavour in this House, I am afraid not always successfully, to confine my remarks to the subject matter under discussion. But I may be permitted to say that if my hon. friend from St. John thinks that a tariff of 30 or 35 per cent, for instance, on woollen goods coming into this country—I take that as an illustration—facilitates the getting of revenue through a customs duty, I think he has something yet to learn. Let me say once more, what I have said in this House before, that a tariff based on the needs of revenue is a totally different thing from a tariff based on the principle of protection. So far, some of my hon. friends have not been able to grasp that fact. I agree with everything that my hon. friend from St. John has said, or anything that any one else can say, in regard to the need and desirability of binding this country together. We know that there are diverse elements in the population of Canada. We have a country that is flung across the American continent for over four thousand miles, and we have a danger of sectional differences. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the possibility of removing these differences is not advanced by any resolution such as is submitted to this House this afternoon by my hon. friend; and on the high ground of Canadian national unity I would appeal to the hon. member to withdraw his motion. Anything in this Dominion of ours that seeks to advance the interests of any single section of the community at the expense of the rest of Canada does not make for national unity. I know that the part of Canada from which I come is sometimes regarded as having a narrow, sectional outlook. I am aware that that view is held; but I have never, at any time or place in this country, discussed our national problems from that angle. We must find common ground on which to appeal to the Canadian people to build up a united Canadian nation, and I submit that the purpose of this resolution, instead of advancing that ideal, as my hon. friend from St. John suggests, would on the contrary retard it. For that reason,

if for no other, I shall oppose the resolution if it goes to a vote.

Mr. MANION: I desire to ask the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) a question, the purpose of which is not in any way to refute any of his arguments. He says that he has declared several times in the House that a revenue tariff is not the same as a protective tariff. I absolutely agree with him, but I should like to have him explain, although perhaps it may not be altogether in order, what he means by this statement.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know whether or not I am in order in answering the question, but the statement I made was that a tariff based on the needs of revenue is a different thing altogether from a tariff based on the principle of protection. No matter what the duties may be, any tariff affords protection incidentally. That is a fact that any one who knows anything about tariffs admits.

Mr. MANION: Not if it is on non-competing articles.

Mr. CRERAR: That is true, but we are discussing all goods coming into the country. A tariff for the purpose of revenue is a different thing from a tariff designed to keep goods out of the country in order that the home manufacturer may benefit.

Mr. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce): I had not intended to speak on this resolution, but I asked a question of the hon. member for St. John, and in reply he referred me to some campaign literature in connection with the election. I was not in the province from which he comes at the time of the election, nor have I seen any of the literature to which he refers. I find myself very much in accord with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), but I should like to point out that there has been a very considerable amount of criticism of the Government's attitude on public ownership of our railways from various members on the other side of the chamber. They have intimated that it is doubtful if the Government will give public ownership a fair trial. But no hon. member can doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway system is to-day a national possession, and that if public management fails in the operation of that system, we will have to seek other means of operating it. However, so long as it is a national asset, it does seem to me that the principal port of the Grand Trunk Railway system, the port of Portland, is being directly discriminated against by this resolution, and I do not understand why it should be discriminated against before the Minister of Railways has had an opportunity of laying his railway policy before the House. I also find myself very much in accord with the hon. member for Marquette as to competitive freight rates. The only point to which he has not referred is that we are receiving package freight in mixed cargoes through American ports; but this is because a solid cargo of mixed merchandise would not be available from Great Britain, France or any other European country, simply because the volume of our imports is limited in comparison with similar imports by the United States. Therefore the Canadian importer gets the benefit of the freight rate from Portland, but if this resolution were adopted he would be discriminated against and, in fact, penalized.

I am just as much in sympathy with the viewpoint of hon. members from the maritime provinces as anyone can possibly be, but it seems to me that it would be a fatal mistake for us to discriminate at this time against the Atlantic port of the Canadian National railways, and therefore I hope that this resolution will not be pressed at least until a time when we will not be so directly interested in Portland as one of our National railway ports.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but it seems to me that the principles of my party would be absolutely ignored if this particular resolution were permitted to pass. We have been told a great deal by some speakers about national unity; but if we are to have national unity we must of necessity get away from sectional interests. While the port of Halifax is not far from the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and the port of St. John is not a great distance away, nevertheless any resolution which would have for its object the forcing of trade to those ports at the expense of cheaper goods to our people I think should not be tolerated.

I believe that the British preference should be increased, and I am one of those bold enough to state that I hope I shall see the day when we shall have absolute free trade with the Motherland. If we pass this resolution to-day to force goods getting the British preference to come through Canadian ports, we are in effect supporting what is practically an argument to bolster up that false principle of protection against which I shall always raise my

voice. If my constituents wish to receive goods, they naturally desire to buy them at the cheapest possible prices. Therefore any resolution which would compel them to pay more for those goods would be inimical to their interests. I care not whence these goods come, I care not through what channels they are introduced into Canada, my object is to see that the people who bear the burden and heat of the day get their goods with the minimum amount of protection and consequently at the cheapest possible cost. Therefore I am not prepared to record my vote in favour of anything which may mean simply a slight advantage probably to one or two localities but must inevitably result in the absolute elimination of cheaper goods for the people at large. I think that the British preference should be gradually increased so that the day may not be far distant when our toilers will be able to buy cheap goods without putting money into the pockets of manufacturers who are being protected to carry on industries that are not indigenous to our soil. I say without fear of contradiction that the principles of Liberalism in which I was raised have always taught me to look forward ultimately to free trade in this Dominion.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I do not see why hon. members from Nova Scotia should feel that they alone are concerned about our coast ports; at any rate, British Columbians always like to have their say when it comes to a discussion of such matters. One interesting feature has been disclosed in this debate. It is not so much a question in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, whether the motion before the House has any merit one way or the other, but this debate, like many others, has disclosed the fact that there are two lines of thought permeating our public men, evidenced more strongly in our Progressive friends than in any other political body. It will be found in the debates—and I do not say it by way of disparagement—that our Progressive friends base public policy essentially upon economics. As between the two great parties it will be found that the outlook in formulating public policy for parliamentary action is not confined to the economic, but takes in the political and national aspect. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) perhaps does not agree with me in this, but I leave it to hon. members generally to confirm my statement that in this discussion, as in many other discussions, his party is mainly influenced by the consideration that a policy is to be measured by its consequences in dollars and cents rather than in its consequences on our nationhood and our national outlook.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the war has taught us one thing—and we can learn much from the war—it has taught us that all these picayune economic advantages which may be gained in a temporary fashion, by legislation or otherwise, fade to nothing when the conflict of arms takes place as it did in the great war; As a result of such conflict one great principle is established, one on which the members of this House are solid—and we have the history of our country to back us—and that is the principle of the necessity of developing an outlook for our nationhood and the maintenance of our national entity, and this you cannot do if you compromise our most vital economic interest by associating with another country from which you cannot be extricated in times of economic difficulties. I see my hon. friend smiling; perhaps he wishes to put a question to me.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member insinuated that we in this part of the chamber were lacking in patriotism. Will he state exactly what we are seeking that we are not willing to extend to all the people of the Dominion?

Mr. LADNER: I did not make the suggestion that my hon. friends were lacking in patriotism. In no part of Canada did the people exhibit a greater sense of responsibility or a more loyal sentiment during the war than the people of the prairie provinces. But what I say is that in connection with matters which have been discussed in this House the economic aspect has been too much emphasized; the question is always asked, what is to be the result in dollars and cents? My point is that we must take a broader view of these matters; we must evidence a spirit of co-operation throughout all parts of the country. It may be necessary for one portion of Canada to give way in some degree as respects their individual interests, for the benefit of the whole country—as has been so well expressed by the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) in connection with Nova Scotia. The purpose of this resolution is a very fair one: it is national in its outlook; it has the national welfare in view. The Liberal-Conservative party has always taken the attitude that in developing our nationhood we should not stress too much the economic aspect; we should, in questions of either

national or international import, consider the political as well as the economic point of view. We must maintain ourselves as a national entity, as other countries are doing, and as was found necessary on the part of the most highly developed form of nationhood during the war. Without that, we might have been submerged; without that, other countries might have been submerged. With that other countries have lived; with that, Canada will live—if we do not think too much of the economic aspect of these questions.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, it was not my thought in the first place to take part in this debate, but the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Ladner) has given me a text. We have heard something from him, as we have from the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter), about national unity; and it was very noticeable that while according to the Rules of the House they addressed Mr. Speaker, both of them directed their remarks toward hon. members in this corner of the Chamber.

The hon. member for St. John and Albert rebuked us for what seemed to him to be our failure to grasp the situation as it related to the Dominion as a whole. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that no one more than I would decry any attempt to set race against race or section against section. But when the hon. member who has just taken his seat tells us that the Conservative party above all other parties is animated by sentimental considerations and that dollars and cents do not enter into its discussion of these matters—well, that is something which up to the present we have not understood.

Let me say this in regard to national unity. As I have said already, certain remarks were directed to our corner of the House, especially, perhaps, to those representing the West. If there is any feeling of resentment—I say, if there is—in the prairie provinces to-day against other portions of the Dominion, it has been brought about by the attitude of ownership that has been assumed by other parts of the Dominion in regard to the West. Has anybody ever heard it stated that the Canadian Pacific railway was built by the prairie provinces and for them alone? Yet I am sure that that attitude of ownership, which, I say, has been taken in the past, will be taken again when the question of the natural resources comes to be discussed. When the plea is made for national unity it must not be forgotten that during the past fifty years the West has had good reason to believe that it has been considered a fair subject for exploitation on the part of those who live in the East and extreme West. So that sometimes when we are asked in the interests of unity to forego certain things or to refrain from seeking certain advantages, we are asked to do what the lamb did—lie down with the lion, but inside.

The economic aspect of the question has been very fairly set forth by our hon. leader (Mr. Crerar). When the people of the West are asked to agree to a proposal of this kind they will need to be shown a good deal. Much has been said in the past about a certain Wood from Missouri. Well, there are a great many people from Missouri in the West, in the sense that they will need to be shown and shown very clearly that a proposal of this kind will not mean the imposition of an additional burden upon them. My experience in the West goes back over forty years. I recall very clearly the difficulties and the hardships of the pioneers who sought to develop our part of the country and make it what it is to-day. The prairie provinces have furnished a great market for the East as well as the West. Without that section of the Dominion, I venture to say, the interests of the East would long ere this have ceased to enjoy the prosperity they are enjoying to-day, and would, perhaps, show a greater tendency than they do now to establish trade lines north and south.

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, the terms of this resolution are based on broad national grounds. In matters relating to Canada as a whole, the various sections of the country must proceed as a unit so that we may have a uniform and satisfactory system throughout. One might suppose, upon hearing the remarks of the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), that this is a local question; that it relates simply to the welfare of St. John and Halifax. I assure hon. members that that is anything but the case. It is true that benefit would result to St. John and Halifax, but there are other ports in the maritime provinces besides those two. Further, I believe that if this proposal were carried out there would be ports in the maritime provinces in the furture that we do not know of to-day. In other words, it would lead to the development of our maritime ports.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Sitting suspended for Royal Assent to bill.

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following bill.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial year ending on 31st, March, 1923.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was urging, when interrupted by the summons to the Senate that this resolution and the principle it embodies should be regarded from a high and broad national standpoint, as a question affecting the interests of Canada as a whole; that the suggestion that it was being brought forward to benefit a few individual points was an incorrect and restricted view; and that if you entertained it, it would weaken the outlook regarding the development of this country, because, Mr. Speaker, this question affects not only the seacoasts and seaports of our Dominion, both on the Atlantic and Pacific, but also the whole maritime position of our country. I wish, therefore, to support this resolution which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) with very much satisfaction.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): I wish to say a few words in regard to this resolution, and I do so with diffidence, besause the hon. gentleman opposite quoted extracts from speeches of such men as Mr. Fielding, Mr. Maclean, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and it would seem presumptuous on my part to differ with these great men. At the same time I feel that every one has a right to his own convictions. I do not believe that you can build up a nation, or develop Canadian sentiment, Canadian spirit, on an artificial restriction. I believe that we must build on some surer foundation than the benefit that will be enjoyed by certain individual people. It seems strange to us to hear people speaking as though we of the Progressive party did not believe in the unity of Canada. I can readily understand that

people from various provinces will have different conceptions with respect to this question but it seems to me that the great benefit from the adoption of this resolution would be enjoyed only by a certain class of people. While the mover of the resolution was speaking I was endeavouring to find out whether his object was, to increase the revenue, or increase Canadian trade in Canadian ports, or on the other hand, to make conditions more difficult for the Canadian consumer. He said that this latter was not the view at all. He camouflaged it by saying that the real object of this resolution was to create a national spirit, and if anything to intensify Canadianism. But if it is possible to intensify Canadianism by bringing all British goods through British ports, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, and hon. gentlemen to my right, are sincere in that desire, then, in order to give further effect to their wishes, I will propose an amendment to the resolution, so as to make it read as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the British tariff preference should be increased 25 per cent on all goods brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

That to me, will show whether there is sincerity in the motion, and whether it will mean greater trade for Canadian ports.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved in amendment by Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Brown;

That in the opinion of this House the British tariff preference should be increased 25 per cent on all goods brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

Mr. LEWIS: If this matter is coming to a vote, and if it is going to be considered when the tariff is under discussion, I will withdraw the amendment at this time.

Mr. FIELDING: That is better.

Mr. BROWN: Did Mr. Speaker read my name as seconding the motion? I do not want to second it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment imposes a tax and cannot be moved by a private member of the House. However, I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I agree with the statement made by the hon. gentleman from St. John and Albert (Mr. MacLaren) that this question should be regarded from a broad national standpoint. And it seems to me if you regard it from that standpoint, the resolution stands condemned. So far as I can see,

national unity can only be established on one basis, and that is the belief and conviction on the part of every section that each is getting a square deal from every other, and I regard this particular resolution as an indication, an evidence, an example, of the desire to exploit some sections for the benefit of others. I wish to oppose the resolution for that reason, and for the reason that I regard Canadian unity as something highly to be desired and sought after.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I shall take up only a short time in discussing this resolution. I dissent somewhat from the statement made this afternoon that an issue must be broad and appeal to many people if it is to be an issue for the purpose of binding the country together and promoting the idea of nationality. I have been in this House for a long time now, and my experience in studying developments that have taken place in the House and in Canada, is best expressed by this little rhyme:

> Little drops of water,
> Little grains of sand,
> Make the mighty ocean,
> And the pleasant land.

Nations sometimes come into being on account of great events, such as the late Great War; but the bulk of our national progress, as I have read history and seen its development in this House, is made little by little, chip by chip. The hon. member (Mr. Logan) who introduced the resolution to-day, did me the honour of quoting something which I said in this House some years ago, and my opinion remains the same. He also quoted the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who was then and is now in the House, in the same direction. He also quoted Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the same direction. Go where you will, you will find, in this country, many people who believe in our nationality, in the future of Canada, and who believe that our success as a nation is to be achieved by one thing at a time, by moving in a certain direction, our progress involving, as all progressive measures do, not so much agreement as concession by one portion of the country to another. If I read history aright, the manner in which we have made headway in this country is by one section being broad enough to recognize the claims of another, and by mutual concessions.

Let us come back to one or two other points that have been brought up this afternoon. Mention has been made of the port of Portland. I am an absolute believer in the future success of our national railways. The appeal made by an hon. gentleman opposite that we might, in some way, hurt our investment, or the future of our Canadian National railways, if we passed an act discriminating against imports coming in by Portland and thence by our railways, and that thus we would be injuring ourselves, has some force in it. But that question came up in regard to our possession of railways in the United States, and it was argued not so long ago that we should not own railways in the United States; that they would resent our owning railways in their country and we would resent their owning railways in Canada. During a certain period in our history, the American government controlled railways in this country, and we are now controlling railways in their country. If the matter comes to the broad issue of national railways, I may say that I am prepared to-morrow to see our Government allow the United States government, if it sees fit, as a national proposition, to take over the Grand Trunk and also the Canadian Pacific in so far as they lie in the state of Maine, that section of the Grand Trunk between Detroit and Chicago, and Canadian Pacific sections that run to Minneapolis and St. Paul. Indeed, I hope they will take over those sections of railway that Canadian railway companies or this Government own in the United States, provided they take them over and consolidate them into a national system owned by the people of the United States. Then, having that control, they will co-operate with us in regard to these two national roads for the development of the commerce of this continent. That is my answer to that proposition.

As to this special proposal to make a discrimination on goods that are routed to this country by Canadian ports, I still believe we can afford to make these concessions. No progress is made simply by benefits secured for everybody; progress is made by concessions that one makes to one's neighbour, by co-operation. Co-operation is the word. We must co-operate in order to build up our ports. Every one knows that the future is not clear to us at present. Let me tell my hon. friends from the West that, if they hope that a people that is wholly pastoral or agricultural, is going to maintain its nationality, they are mistaken because nationality can be maintained only by organizing a country industrially. Some day we shall see the necessity of making these concessions for the benefit

of our ports. It is claimed there is a menace to our country from Asiatic inroads through our ports on the Pacific; but these people may come from a purely national and patriotic point of view to develop those ports, and it is concessions like these and a policy of the character contained in the resolution that, while they may interfere with the interests of the individual or of sections of the country, may benefit the country as a whole.

How are we going to get lower freight rates in this country? I spoke of this matter the other day, and hon. gentlemen must know what is going on in the United States. There is a prospect of securing lower freight rates in this country by the development of the St. Lawrence waterways, and this development will bring seaports into our upper lakes and even up to the waters of the Saskatchewan and the Assiniboine. We want all the sea ports we can get; but we often cannot develop them by a broad policy, and we must do this by making headway a little here and a little there. I read in the press this morning some news which may interest my hon. friends from the West, namely, that the leader of the Imperial Government announced in the British House of Commons that they are prepared to have the question of the British embargo on Canadian cattle come up again in that House, and the announcement goes even further, that the vote will be open and that members of the House will have an opportunity of voting whether or not they are in favour of the removal of the restriction that that Government, in the interest of protecting the British cattle breeder, have insisted on in the past. That may be a small matter to some people; but it is by constant agitation on our part, partly by farmers in the different provinces, that some headway has been made in this regard, and it is by small concessions that these successes are eventually achieved.

It is not by advocating any broad principle of British preference or free trade. We cannot have absolute free trade, but we need protection, because that is the only policy that will develop our industries, make us strong, and provide the sinews that go to make a sturdy nationhood. I have every sympathy with the West and their aspirations, but the national policy of protection—the policy of Sir John Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier—is the one we need in Canada; and possibly the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), when tariff proposals are disclosed, will be persuaded to base his policy on the necessities of the whole country.

I have not heard a single argument to-day that would induce me to abandon the view I stated on the floor of the House in support of a similar resolution some years ago. During my time in this House I have observed that the national progress of the country has been due to legislation of this kind. The reasons for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway were largely embodied in the remarks of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) to-day. The Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental have broadened to meet the requirements of the whole country; and anything that is done to meet the claims of the West must also have regard to Canada at large. For the protection of our own interests, I agree with the member for St. John (Mr. Baxter), we should increase the use of our own ports by our own ships. We have a large fleet of ships now that were built for an emergency. They are not doing much and they ought to be put to use so that we might have lower rates, both in taking our own goods to foreign markets and in bringing cargoes to our own people. I trust that hon. members will not forget the views of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as quoted to-day, in regard to the development of our ports. We cannot depend on American ports; we must have our own. It is absolutely essential for a nation, if it wishes to maintain its integrity, promote its future prosperity, and realize its visions, to be broadly organized in the matter of transportation. It is as much in the interests of the people to develop the country's trade by means of its ports, as it is to have a tariff that will promote industry.

Moved by all these considerations, I still hold that no great mistake would be made by enacting legislation of this kind which proposes to build up our ports and, through them, our railways, and to do so in the light of the experience of the United States. The most highly organized nation in the world to-day is that republic, and its success is founded on a national policy. The greatest producers of food in the world at the present time are those people of the United States who have had the good fortune to control the Mississippi valley, which is rich in corn, coal, cotton, wheat, live stock, and meats of all kinds. The United States has been the most protective nation, and it has had the broadest

national policy of any country in respect of its ports, and all the utilities established for the purpose of developing the trade and commerce of the people. They are so pronounced in this policy that they discriminate against us. The farmers of the United States have a national policy in agriculture, and a bill is now in progress through Congress establishing a high tariff which is backed by the farmers' bloc, with its chief mouthpiece in the farmers' organization.

My hon. friend, the second leader of the House (Mr. Crerar), does not realize how far his arguments are taking him. In Japan they used to have a Mikado and a Tycoon, and perhaps we have them in this House to-day. The hon. member does not realize that the farmers in the United States have a policy which discriminates against us, but which nevertheless is designed to make them the greatest country in the world. There is a diversity of employment in the United States and they have large industries that give employment to many simply because they have pursued a broad national policy and have built up the country at every point. They have highly developed their railways, their industries, and their agriculture, and have made concessions here and there, in all cases from the national rather than the sectional point of view.

Some hon. member has challenged us to give any instance where the Progressive party has advocated any sectional policy in this House. Well, I should not like to see my hon. friends from the West taking any narrow stand, and that is why I say that we should consider this question in a broad spirit. I am very much in sympathy with my hon. friends, and I think I can say that I am more of a democrat in many respects than they are; and I believe I am as progressive as they themselves. But I differ from them in some ways, and if there is one difference in particular between us it is the fact that I like to take the broadest national view of any question that comes up, mainly because Canada is still in the period of its formation. And while there has always been a difference between the public men of the country as to what policy will conduce most to its development, I do not think there is any doubt that the national policy, not only in regard to the tariff, but also in the matter of building up our own ports and railways, is the best.

I will take the view that the Minister of Finance will make no mistake if when he introduces his Budget he recognizes that in some way the development of our ports should be encouraged. I hope hon. members on the other side of the House will not think that I disagree so much with their views as with the relative merits of those views. I believe more and more in the policy of this country being based on the development of our nationhood along the line of having diversity of employment as a result of encouraging all kinds of industry, and of making our ports the complement of our railway system.

Mr. LOGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I stated when I introduced this motion this afternoon, I do not intend to press it to a vote because I do not believe it would be constitutionally right that the Government should be asked to commit itself on a tariff matter in anticipation of the Budget to be brought down by the Minister of Finance. But in withdrawing this motion I am constrained to say, that some of the speeches delivered in the course of this debate have been very disheartening to those of us who desire to build up a great and united Canada. If it has come to this pass, that there is nothing in the cry of "Canada for Canadians", then God help Canada! When we reflect that every day freight given the advantage of the British preference is passing the port of Halifax—probably one of the four best ports in the wide world—to be landed in the port of New York, seven hundred miles further by sea than our port, upon which we have expended sixteen or seventeen million dollars—and for which my hon. friend from Marquette cannot deny responsibility because he was a member of the government that voted millions of dollars for the terminal port facilities in that harbor and the building of grain elevators in St. John and Halifax—we must ask ourselves: What has it all been for if not to create Canadian trade through Canadian channels?

It is unfortunate that in this debate we have heard so many inconsistent statements. Surely my hon. friend from Marquette does not say that if you have a full cargo both east and west you do not secure better rates on your eastbound cargo? He needs no knowledge of ocean freights to appreciate that; his own common sense must force him to that conclusion.

It is unfortunate that whenever we move a resolution in this House it should give rise in the minds of many of my hon. friends to the suspicion that there must be some ulterior motive influencing us and inimical to the interests of agriculture. I

want to assure you, Sir, and this House that behind this motion there is only the desire, to build up a more united and independent Canada to give more business to our ports and railways, and to show the world that we can do business on the northern part of this continent without having to depend on the ports of the United States. If the contrary is true, what did we build the Grand Trunk Pacific for? Why did we spend two or three hundred million dollars in building this transcontinental railway if there is nothing in this proposition of east and west traffic? The attitude of some hon. members seem to be: Let the grass grow on the wharves of Halifax and St. John. What do we care so long as we can get our grain sent across the Atlantic one or two cents a bushel cheaper via Portland, Boston or New York? That attitude is discouraging to a Canadian. And then as if to accentuate the inconsistency, my hon. friend, after making a long speech denouncing this resolution, proposes that we should increase the British preference on British goods coming through canadian ports! "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

I urge upon the Government that they consider this matter very seriously, and I can only hope that when the Budget is brought down the Finance Minister will declare that this preference—which, as I have said, is an arrangement between mother and daughter—shall be confined to goods landed at Canadian ports. We have not had time to discuss this matter at length, but had I the opportunity now I would demonstrate conclusively that the argument advanced by hon. members in opposition to this resolution has been based upon wrong knowledge. I would prove that the freight rate to-day between Liverpool and Winnipeg, via Canadian ports, is not any higher than it is via New York and Boston; in fact, in some cases it is lower.

Mr. CRERAR: If that is the case, might I ask my hon. friend why do these goods not come in through Canadian ports at the present time?

Mr. LOGAN: On account of our not patronizing Canadian liners as we should, we have not the same frequency of service as they have through New York and Boston because we do not give our freighters sufficient eastbound traffic.

The hour for adjournment has almost arrived and the time is too short for me to go into this argument at any greater length; therefore, in accordance with my previously announced intention, I now withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the unanimous consent of the House that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Granted.

Motion withdrawn.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 6, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PENSIONS' COMMITTEE

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George) presented the first report of the special committee appointed by the House to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers and any amendments to the existing laws in relation thereto which may be proposed.

He said: This report recommends that the quorum of the committee be reduced from 15 to 9 members, and your committee recommend that leave be granted them to sit while the House is in session. By special permission of the House, I would move that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Mr. MEIGHEN: Notice was given yesterday of a motion to concur in the second and third reports of the Committee on Agriculture. If action is to be taken on this matter—and some action should be taken, yea or nay—there should certainly be no delay.

Mr. KAY: If the right hon. gentleman will look at the Votes and Proceedings of to-day he will see that notice of this motion has been given for to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the unanimous wish of the House, the motion which has been fixed for to-morrow can be debated to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: Who blocked it yesterday? I understand this resolution was blocked yesterday by the right hon. leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite correct. The motion for concurrence came up yesterday, and it could only be adopted by consent. We had not known that there was to be a motion to concur. I certainly wanted to con-

sider it. For me, twenty-four hours is sufficient for consideration. I am prepared to wait twenty-four hours more if it is desired by any hon. member of this House but I think it my duty to say that the sooner we dispose of this matter the better, because very much hangs on our disposition of it.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand the right hon. gentleman insisted on the rule being followed, and it is being followed. Now he wants to break the rule, or make an exception by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPEAKER: It could only be proceeded with to-day by unanimous consent. So, it will stand.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to request the Civil Service Commission to resume the publication of the Civil Service List?
2. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The last edition of the Civil Service List was published in the fall of 1918, bringing the data contained therein up to 1st April preceding. Early in the fall of 1918 the classification of the personnel of the Service was commenced, and has been in progress since. As soon as the classification is completed, and this is anticipated in the near future, the Commission will submit to the Government a proposal that a new edition of the Civil Service List be prepared and published, and the matter will then be considered.

2. Answered by No. 1.

EGG INSPECTORS

Mr. SPENCE:

1. How many egg inspectors have been employed by the Government since the regulations came into effect in 1918, each year up to the end of 1921?
2. How much has been paid in salaries to the said inspectors during the years 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921?
3. How much has been paid for travelling and other expenses of the said inspectors during each of the above mentioned years?
4. What has been the total amount of salaries and other expenses during each of the said years, of the officials and employees at Ottawa, who supervise the work of the egg inspectors?
5. What number of cars have been inspected in each province during the years 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921?
6. What number of cars were inspected for export during each of the said years?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. In 1918, nine; 1919, twelve, seven of whom worked the full year; three appointed in September, 1919, and two in October, 1919; 1920, eleven, nine of whom worked the full year, one resigned on March 31, and one resigned on July 31; 1921, thirteen, nine of whom worked the full year and four were appointed in May, 1921.

2. In 1918, $8,365.18; 1919, $12,326.21; 1920, $15,110.06; 1921, $18,305.82. These inspectors are engaged in work other than egg inspection for a large percentage of the time. The amount chargeable to egg inspection is as follows:

1918 ..	45%	which amounts to		$3,764 33
1919 ..	35%	"	"	4,314 17
1920 ..	40%	"	"	6,044 02
1921 ..	30%	"	"	5,491 74

3. In 1918, $7,364.18; 1919, $11,442.15; 1920, $13,823.74; 1921, $13,337.27. These inspectors are engaged in work other than egg inspection for a large percentage of the time. The amount chargeable to egg inspection is as follows:

1918 ..	45%	which amounts to		$3,313 88
1919 ..	35%	"	"	4,004 75
1920 ..	40%	"	"	5,529 49
1921 ..	30%	"	"	4,001 18

4. In 1918, $3,336.51; 1919, $3,845.00; 1920, $3,007.20; 1921, $3,171.30.

5.	1918	1919	1920	1921
Ontario..	96	416	522	386
Quebec..	6	68	93	58
Prince Edward Island.. .. .	29	28	74	69
Nova Scotia..	....	1	2	1
Manitoba..	89	112	123	86
Saskatchewan.. .	47	167	112	105
Alberta..	20	21	19	8
British Columbia.	1	2	10	6
	288	815	955	719

6. In 1918, 41; 1919, 415; 1920, 469; 1921, 312; total, 1237.

MATERIALS FOR OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of the following commodities was imported into Canada and used in the adulteration of butter, to produce what is called oleomargarine, during each of the years ending March 31st, 1920, 1921 and 1922?—Lard compound; oleo oil; cotton oil; cocoanut oil; peanut oil; butter oil; and salt?
2. What amount of duty was collected on the above mentioned imports?
3. What amount, if any, of drawback on duty paid has been refunded to the manufacturers of oleomargarine during each of the years 1920, 1921 and 1922 on the said commodities?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1.

Commodity	Period June 6, 1919 to March 31, 1920	Period April 1, 1920 to March 31, 1921	Period April 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922	Totals
	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	lbs.
Lard Compound	105,687	27,647	335,161	468,495
Oleo. Oil	605,736	1,714,562	1,731,005	4,051,303
Cotton Seed Oil	527,058	89,208	348,583	964,849
Cocoanut Oil	154,589	701,995	219,132	1,075,716
Peanut Oil	49,203	22,646	125,889	197,738
Corn Oil	.....	9,234	.....	9,234
Butter Oil	.....	154,730	823,558	978,288
Nucoline	.....	25,300	.....	25,300
Stearine	.....	5,970	.....	5,970
Salt	.....	103,258	279,634	382,892
Beef Fats	56,556	25,800	.....	82,356
Totals	1,498,829	2,880,350	3,862,962	8,242,141

2. Duty collected, period June 6, 1919, to March 31, 1920, $69,730.55; period April 1, 1920, to March 31, 1921, $139,765; period April 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922, $182,772.66; totals, $392,345.53.

3. Drawback refunded, period June 6, 1919, to March 31, 1920, $69,033.25; period April 1, 1920, to March 31, 1921, $138,367.34; period April 1, 1921, to March 31, 1922, $180,944.94; totals, $388,345.53.

I asked the hon. gentleman to amend his question the other day, and I have answered it as if he had amended it. I can give him no further information. Answered for the time being.

ALUMINUM ELECTRIC COMPANY

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Does the Aluminum Electric Company of Massena, New York, pay any duty or tax to the Canadian Government for the sixty-five thousand horse-power they get from Cedar Rapids for electric energy?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. W. R. BOON

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What position, if any, did W. R. Boon hold with the Canadian National Railways from April 1st, 1919, to June 26th, 1920?

2. What is the position of the said W. R. Boon at the present time?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Bridge and Building Supervisor, Montreal Division.

2. Bridge and Building Supervisor, Montreal Division.

FUEL OIL, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. NEILL:

1. What is the amount and value of the fuel oil imported into British Columbia in each of the years from 1915 to 1921 inclusive?

2. What is the amount and value of coal produced in British Columbia in each of the above-mentioned years?

3. What royalties were paid on the said coal?

[Mr. Sutherland.]

4. What duty was paid on the above fuel oil?

5. What number of persons are employed in British Columbia, in and about coal mines?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1.

Fiscal year	Item	Gallons	Value
			$
1915	Petroleum, crude, fuel and gas oils, (·8235 specific gravity or heavier) at 60 degrees temperature	110,611,379	2,171,970
1916	do do	102,007,687	2,072,078
1917	Petroleum (not including crude petroleum imported to be refined, or illuminating or lubricating oils) ·8235 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature	95,090,675	2,711,823
1918	do do	100,338,591	3,809,360
1919	do do	88,540,378	4,044,482
1920	do do	95,407,034	4,395,933
1921	do do	90,813,225	5,136,265

2.

Calendar Year	Long Tons	Short Tons	Value
			$
1915	1,844,297	2,065,613	6,455,041
1916	2,307,197	2,584,061	8,075,190
1917	2,173,114	2,433,888	8,235,716
1918	2,293,383	2,568,589	11,494,681
1919	2,174,940	2,435,933	12,420,445
1920	2,552,569	2,858,877	16,726,950
1921	.....	2,601,727	15,262,527

3. Royalties and tax on coal (provincial public accounts), 1915, $158,867.25; 1916, $173,261.75; 1917, $194,536.62; 1918, $1,919,928.33; 1919, $196,657.21; 1920, $195,657.21.

4. 1915, Free; 1916, $58,521.75; dutiable from Feb. 16, 1916; 1917, $475,453.36; 1918, $501,692.46; 1919, $442,701.84; 1920, $477,035.17; 1921, $454,066.13.

5. Number of employees: 1915, 4,957; 1916, 4,949; 1917, 5,126; 1918, 4,982; 1919, 5,813; 1920, 6,152; 1921, 6,594.

GRAND TRUNK—SALARIES OF OFFICIALS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What salary is paid Howard G. Kelley for his services as President of, or in any other capacity in connection with, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific?

2. What connection has the said Howard G. Kelley with, and what offices does he hold in, and what salary is he paid by, other companies connected with, controlled or operated by, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and what is the total amount that is paid the said Kelley by such companies, or by the Grand Trunk for such services?

3. What salaries are paid Frank Scott, W. H. Biggar, W. D. Robb, J. E. Dalrymple and R. S. Logan for their services in any capacity in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Grand Trunk Pacific?

4. What connection have the said Scott, Biggar, Robb, Dalrymple and Logan with, and what offices do they hold in, other companies connected with, controlled or operated by, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and what is the total amount that is paid to each by such companies or by the Grand Trunk for such services?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Salary: $50,000 per annum, all chargeable to Grand Trunk Railway System, i.e., Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and subsidiary companies within the system. No portion of the amount is chargeable to the Grand Trunk Pacific properties, and Mr. Kelley receives nothing whatever from or on behalf of those properties at the present time.

Director's fee, Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, $2,000 per annum.

2.

Howard G. Kelley holds office in following companies as shown:—

Grand Trunk Company of Canada, Director and President.

Atlantic & St. Lawrence Railroad Co., Director and President.

Portland Elevator Co., Director and President.

New England Elevator Co., Director and President.

The Champlain & St. Lawrence Railroad Co., Director and President.

The United States & Canada Railroad Co., Director and President.

Vermont & Province Line Railroad Co., Director and President.

International Bridge Co., Director and President.

St. Clair Tunnel Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Co., Director and President.

The Grand Trunk Junction Railway Co., Director and President.

The Chicago & Kalamazoo Terminal Railroad Co., Director and President.

The Pontiac Oxford & Northern Railroad Co., Director and President.

The Detroit & Huron Railway Co., Director and President.

Detroit Grand Haven & Milwaukee Railway Co., Director and President.

Grand Rapids Terminal Railroad Co., Director and President.

Toledo, Saginaw & Muskegon Railroad Co., Director and President.

Chicago, Detroit & Canada Grand Trunk Junction R.R. Co., Director and President.

Michigan Air Line Railway, Director and President.

Bay City Terminal Railway Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk-Milwaukee Car Ferry Co., Director and President.

The Detroit & Toledo Shore Line Railroad Co., Director and Vice-President.

Detroit Terminal Railroad Co., Director.

The Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, Director.

Chicago & Western Indians Railroad Co., Director.

Central Vermont Railway Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Central Vermont Transportation Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Southern New England Railroad Corporation, Director and Chairman of the Board.

Southern New England Railway Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Bethel, Granite Railway Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Southern Vermont Railway Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Montreal & Vermont Junction Railroad Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Montreal & Province Line Railway Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Stanstead Shefford & Chambly R.R. Co., Director and Chairman of the Board.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co., Director and President.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co., of United States, Director and President.

Erie, London & Tillsonburg Railway Co., Director and President.

Pembroke Southern Railway Co., Director and President.

Toronto Belt Line Railway Co., Director and President.

Maganetawan River Railway Co., Director and President.

Ottawa Terminals Railway Co., Director and President.

Canadian Express Co., Director.

Canadian National Express Co., Director.

Whipple Car Co., Director and President.

Montreal & Southern Counties Railway Co., Director and President.

Montreal Warehousing Co., Director and President.

Ontario Car Ferry Co., Director and President.

Toronto Terminals Railway Co., Director and President.

Lachine Jacques Cartier & Maisonneuve Railway Co., Director and President.

The Hon. the Minister of Railways, receiver—

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Saskatchewan Railway Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Development Co., Ltd., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Coast Steamship Co., Ltd., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Dock Co. of Seattle, Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co., Director and President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Terminals Elevator Co., Ltd., Director and President.

The only company from or on behalf of which Mr. Kelley receives a salary—apart from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—is the Detroit & Toledo Shore Line Railroad Company. From this company he receives a salary as Vice-President of $2,500 per annum, but this he in return remits to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. He receives a fee of $10 and in one or two instances $20 from a few of the companies named above for their infrequent Directors' meetings. In the majority of cases however no salary or fee of any kind is received.

3. Mr. Frank Scott, $18,000 per annum; Mr. W. H. Biggar, $20,000 per annum; Mr. W. D. Robb, $19,000 per annum; Mr. J. E. Dalrymple, $18,000 per annum; Mr. R. S. Logan, $14,000 per annum. These amounts are all chargeable to Grand Trunk Railway System, i.e., the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and component companies in the System. No portion whatever of these salaries is charged to the Grand Trunk Pacific properties.

4.

Frank Scott holds office in following companies, as shown:

Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Canada, Vice-President and Treasurer.

Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railroad Co., Director and Treasurer.

Portland Elevator Co., Director, Treasurer and Assistant Clerk.

New England Elevator Co., Director, Treasurer and Assistant Clerk.

The Champlain and St. Lawrence Rd. Co., Secretary and Treasurer.

The United States and Canada Rd. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Vermont and Province Line Railroad Co., Director, Assistant Clerk and Treasurer.

International Bridge Co., Director and Treasurer.

St. Clair Tunnel Co., Director and Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Co., Director and Vice-President and Treasurer.

The Grand Trunk Junction Railway Co., Director and Treasurer.

The Chicago and Kalamazoo Terminal Railway Co., Director and Treasurer.

The Pontiac, Oxford and Northern Rd. Co., Director and Treasurer.

The Detroit and Huron Railway Co., Treasurer.

Detroit, Grand Haven and Milwaukee Railway Co., Director, Vice-President and Treasurer.

Grand Rapids Terminal R.R. Co., Director and Treasurer.

Toledo, Saginaw and Muskegon Railway Co., Director and Treasurer.

Chicago, Detroit and Canada G. T. Jct. R.R. Co., Director and Treasurer.

Michigan Air Line Railway, Director and Treasurer.

Bay City Terminal Railway Co., Director and Treasurer.

Detroit Terminal Railway Co., Director.

Grand Trunk Milwaukee Car Ferry Co., Director.

Central Vermont Railway Co., Director and Vice-President.

Bethel Granite Railway Co., Director and Vice-President.

Central Vermont Transportation Co., Director and Vice-President.

Southern New England Railway Co., Director.

Southern New England R.R. Corporation, Director.

Southern Vermont Railway Co., Director.

Montreal and Vermont Jct. Railroad Co., Director.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co., Director and Secretary-Treasurer.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co. of United States, Director, Treasurer and Asst.

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Pembroke Southern Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Toronto Belt Line Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Maganetawan River Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Ottawa, Terminals Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Canadian Express Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Whipple Car Co., Director, Vice-President and Treasurer.

Montreal Stock Yards Co., Director.

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co., Director, Vice-President and Treasurer.

Montreal Warehousing Co., Director.

Ontario Car Ferry Co., Secretary-Treasurer.

Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co., Director, Secretary and Treasurer.

Rail and River Coal Co., Director and Vice-President.

The hon. the Minister of Railways, receiver—

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Co., Director and Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Pacific Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Director and Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Pacific Development Co., Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Pacific Steamship Co., Director and Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Co., Treasurer.

Grand Trunk Pacific Terminal Elevator Company, Ltd., Director.

Also Director of all of the above-mentioned G.T.P. Companies of which Minister of Railways now receiver.

W. H. Biggar holds office in following companies, as shown:

Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Canada, Vice-President and General Counsel.

Central Vermont Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Montreal Stock Yards Co., Director.

Rail and River Coal Co., Director.

W. D. Robb holds office in following companies, as shown:

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada, Vice-President.

Portland Elevator Co., Director and Vice-President.

New England Elevator Co., Director and Vice-President.

The Champlain and St. Lawrence Rd. Co., Vice-President.

The United States and Canada R.R. Co., Director and Vice-President.

International Bridge Co., Director and Vice-President.

St. Clair Tunnel Co., Director and Vice-President.

Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

The Grand Trunk Jct. Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

The Chicago and Kalamazoo Terminal R.R. Co., Director and Vice-President.

The Pontiac, Oxford and Northern Rd. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Detroit and Huron Ry. Co., Vice-President.

Detroit, Grand Haven and Milwaukee Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Grand Rapids Terminal Rd. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Toledo, Saginaw and Muskegon Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Chicago, Detroit and Canada G.T. Jct. R.R. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Michigan Air Line Ry., Director and Vice-President.

Grand Trunk, Milwaukee Car Ferry Co., Vice-President.

Bay City Terminal Ry. Co., Vice-President.

The Detroit and Toledo Shore Line Rd. Co., Director.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co., Vice-President.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co. of U.S., Director and Vice-President.

Toronto Belt Line Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Maganetawan River Ry. Co., Vice-President.

Erie, London and Tillsonburg Ry. Co., Vice-President.

Pembroke Southern Ry. Co., Vice-President.

Canadian Express Co., Director.

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Montreal Warehousing Co., Director and Vice-President.

Ontario Car Ferry Co., Director.

J. E. Dalrymple holds office in following companies, as shown:

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada, Vice-President.

Portland Elevator Co., Director.

New England Elevator Co., Director.

United States and Canada R.R. Co., Director.

Chicago, New York and Boston Refrig. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Central Vermont Ry. Co., Vice-President.

Minister of Railways, receiver—

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Director and Vice-President.

Grand Trunk Pacific, Sask. Ry. Co., Director.

Grand Trunk Pacific Terminals Elevator Co., Director.

Canada Atlantic Transit Co., Director.

Canadian Express Co., Director.

Montreal Stock Yards Co., Director.

Montreal Warehousing Co., Director.

Ontario Car Ferry Co., Director.

Oshawa Railway Co., Director and President.

Thousand Islands Ry. Co., Director and President.

R. S. Logan holds office in following companies, as shown:

Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Canada, Vice-President.

Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry., Director and Vice-President.

Apart from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, no salary is paid Messrs. Scott, Biggar, Robb, Dalrymple and Logan by or on behalf of any of the companies mentioned above. Directors' fees amounting principally to $10 are paid by a few of the companies named for their infrequent directors' meetings.

MENNONITE EMIGRATION

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is the Government aware that a large number of Mennonites who settled in Western Canada are moving as a colony to Mexico?
2. If so, what disposition have they made of the lands which they secured from the Dominion Government?
3. Have these lands been secured by an organization who intend to settle them with immigrants from Poland and other districts of Central Europe?
4. Are the immigration authorities negotiating with or co-operating with agencies, individuals or organizations in Canada and in Europe for the purpose of bringing to Canada settlers from Poland or other Central Europe countries?
5. If so, with whom are these negotiations being carried on?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.
2. No information.
3. No information.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

ASIATIC IMMIGRATION

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. What treaties or agreements are in force dealing with, or directly or indirectly affecting Chinese or Japanese immigration, or the rights and privileges of Chinese or Japanese in Canada?
2. What are the details of any such existing treaties or agreements?
3. When do such treaties or agreements expire, or when may same be abrogated, and in what manner?
4. What is the Chinese and Japanese population in Canada, male and female, in the various Provinces of the Dominion?
5. What occupations are generally followed by Chinese and Japanese in Canada, and, approximately, how many are engaged in each occupation?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. There is no Treaty or Agreement in force affecting Chinese. There is an understanding in effect dealing with the immigration to Canada of Japanese; this understanding is of a confidential character.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. See answer to No. 1.
4 and 5. It is understood that these questions will be dealt with by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

INGLIS BOILER WORKS

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. Did the Department of Public Works, in the years 1920 or 1921, award a contract to the Inglis Boiler Works, Toronto, Ontario?
2. If so, what firms tendered on the said contract and what were the respective amounts of tenders?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. No.
2. Answered by answer to question No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. McTAGGART:

1. What was the total area in acres in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan sold to settlers as Pre-emptions, as provided by Dominion Lands Act, 1908?
2. What area of said Pre-emptions has been patented?
3. What was the total revenue received from: (a) Pre-emptions for which patent has been issued, (b) Pre-emptions which have not been patented?
4. What amount remains unpaid on all pre-empted lands in said area?
5. What revenue was received from pre-empted lands in said area in the years 1920 and 1921?
6. How much land in said area was sold as purchased homestead since 1908, and what revenue was received therefrom?
7. What amount remains unpaid on said purchased homesteads?
8. How much land was pre-empted south of Weyburn-Lethbridge railway since 1908?
9. How much revenue was received therefrom?
10. How much was received in the year 1920 and 1921?

REDISTRIBUTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I beg to put to the Government a question of which I gave notice, as to whether they proposed bringing down, at this session, a measure providing for redistribution.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Government has no desire to delay the bringing down of such a measure, but the Government does not wish to proceed with undue haste in the matter. As my right hon. friend knows, a measure of redistribution is one that is likely to occupy a considerable share of the time of the House, both in committee and in subsequent discussion in the chamber; and as it is not anticipated that there is any desire for a general election between now and the end of the year, the Government has felt that redistribution might well stand until the next session of Parliament.

LIQUOR IMPORTATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): I should like to ask the Government a question in reference to a despatch which I saw in the press this morning and which refers to an interview given by Mr. Manson, Attorney General of British Columbia, in which, according to the despatch, he states there is to be introduced into this House by the Government during this session, certain important legislation which will serve to restrict the importation of liquor into provinces in which liquor is sold only by the governments of such provinces. Is such legislation coming down? And, if so, would it not have been better if the Government had taken the House into its confidence, the Prime Minister having frequently stated that to be his doctrine, than to have this announcement made to the public press?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am unable to speak for any person other than myself. The subject which my hon. friend has just discussed is under consideration at the present time, and the House will be informed as soon as it is definitely decided whether legislation will be brought down or not. I think I shall be able very shortly to inform my hon. friend as to what will be done in the matter.

Mr. STEVENS: No decision has been reached in the matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There has been no final decision.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Has the Government come to any decision in reference to the Civil Service Bonus?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): This matter also is under consideration.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 27, respecting the Department of National Defence, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM: We discussed this matter the other day in Committee of the Whole on the resolution. I do not know that I can add anything to what I said the other day concerning the contents of the bill.

On section 4—services included:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit that important clauses of this bill should be read out to the committee, so that members may have a better understanding of them.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was a good deal of discussion the other day on this clause, which relates to the inclusion of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. There was, of course, a difference of opinion as to whether this force should be included or not. Almost every member of the House had a good word to say for the force, but they differed somewhat on the advisability of maintaining the force at its full strength. There seemed to be a general consensus of opinion that perhaps it would not be wise to include in the Defence Department the control of the mounted police, the argument being that this force was created as a civil and not a military force and should remain such. I do not feel like combatting that view to any extent, as undoubtedly the facts stated are correct. This much, however, the committee will bear in mind, that, in taking this step, we shall be unable to carry on the economies that were expected to be effected by the combination of executive staffs of these two branches. As was stated the other afternoon, it was thought that the civil staff of the mounted police could, in a large measure, outside of temporary employees, be worked into the new department without hardship to any person and with increased efficiency of the combined

Department of Defence. If we accept the proposal that the police branch be not attached to the Department of Defence, we shall not be able to do that. I think it is fair to say to the committee—I forgot to mention this the other afternoon—that for the last couple of months the Minister of Militia has been administering the Mounted Police. It was in the Justice Department when the Government came into power, and it was transferred or attached to the outside, without giving authority to the minister.

I believe it is the opinion of the committee generally that the Mounted Police might be greatly reduced in numbers. Of course, if we intend to restrict the activities of the force to the unorganized territories the force will be very small. There will always be work in connection with the Mounted Police in the city of Ottawa and vicinity. I would not say that the work of the force ought to be restricted altogether to the unorganized territories. I have communicated with the several provincial premiers, and while I have not heard from all, the correspondence that I have so far received leads me to think that perhaps it would not be wise, all at once, to withdraw all the forces from the provinces. As our object is not so much to stand on technical differences as to protect the people where we can, I want the committee to consider what the various premiers have said. I will not encumber Hansard with all the letters but will give a synopsis of the reply from each province. Ontario thinks that the Canadian Mounted Police would be of material assistance in the enforcement of law and order if proper co-operation between the Dominion and the province could be established. The Prime Minister of Quebec thinks that some use might be made of the Mounted Police in Ungava and the northern portions of that province, but so far as the older and settled parts are concerned he does not think that it is wise to continue their services.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: The province of Nova Scotia thinks that some advantage might be gained if it were able to call upon a federal police at any time. As regards Saskatchewan, Premier Martin thinks that some arrangement should be made such as existed prior to 1917, by which the Mounted Police should have charge of the enforcement of criminal law. The province of New Brunswick was somewhat canny; it has not so far replied. Its premier thinks that the maintenance of a force there might cost the province something, and the matter has not yet been decided because it would depend on the services that could be rendered. In some cases it might be well to ask the provinces assisted to help in some of the expense. No replies have been received from British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta and Prince Edward Island. Under the present circumstances I think it is impossible for us to come to any fast and firm decision as to what we should do, but I take it as the view of the committee that, whether or not the Mounted Police be included in the new Defence Department, the number of men in that force could be materially reduced. As I pointed out, I do not strongly hold the view that it ought to be brought into the Department of Defence, for the reason adduced by hon. gentlemen, that it is a civil force; and as the estimated economy to be effected by the amalgamation of the two executives cannot be expected if the police be not taken absolutely into the Defence Department, it will not make any material difference as to the authority of the Government to reduce the police force to any size it may think wise. To meet the wishes of the committee I move that in line 3 of the section the words "Air and Police" be struck out and the words "and Air" be substituted therefor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I highly commend the minister for his decision. It is true, it robs the bill of about its only radical feature, but it is a wise move to leave the Mounted Police out. The Police, as has been stated, is a civil force. I do not see, however, that the minister's point, that he is going to be disarmed from effecting economies, has any force. If the Mounted Police are left in the Militia, then the officers of that department will be in control of the force. As minister of that department my hon. friend will be requisitioned for the services of the Mounted Police, and gradually in the public mind the opinion will grow that the force are a part of the military organization of Canada. Now, they are no part of the defence of the country; they are a part of the force for the maintenance of law and order, which is not a function of the Militia or the Defence Department. It is far more a function of the Justice Department, and previously the Dominion Police were under that department. When the Mounted Police came in they remained under that department for a time, and then both went under the department

that had controlled the Mounted Police before. While the Department of Justice is not responsible for the maintenance of law and order, nevertheless its functions are closely related thereto, and by placing the police under that department and utilizing its officers, economy can be effected in that way, just as well as in the Militia Department, if it is really desired to eliminate high-paid officers. I was glad to hear the minister's remarks about the reduction of the Mounted Police. I do not doubt that a reduction could now be effected; but if I measure the opinion of the minister aright it does not differ very much from my own, that anything in the nature of reckless or wanton reduction now would be very poor economy, and instead of meeting public opinion would go in defiance thereof. I hope the force will be reduced to the utmost extent possible, consistent with serving the purposes of the Mounted Police, but no further. The minister in his communications with the premiers of the provinces has so far received the replies which I should have expected. I do not like to prophesy, but I think that when he hears from the other premiers in the West they will give very much the same judgment as that of the premier of Saskatchewan. By the way, I observed applause when the minister stated that the police would not be required in the older parts of the province of Quebec, but might be used in the district of Ungava. Why the distinction? If the maintenance of law and order is wholly a provincial function, and if we are not justified in assuming any part of it, we have no more right to go into Ungava than into the older parts of Quebec. They might be able to use the police more in Ungava, it is true, but the principle of the division of constitutional jurisdiction applies just as much to Ungava as to the city of Montreal. It is a question of expense, that is all; and the force may be needed as much in Quebec as in any other province. If we are to maintain a fluid reserve force for the purposes for which the police are established, it is hard to justify saying to three, or four or five provinces: "We will maintain a force at your disposal, subject to your requisition," and to three or four other provinces: "The force shall not be subject to your requisition at all." I do not know how that stand could be justified, and consequently the minister's present state of mind is about the right one —to reduce where he can. We are getting further from war conditions and some reduction may be possible, but the main purpose of the Mounted Police will not permit of any wanton or reckless reduction of the force, or the contraction of its utility from the purpose which it is now constituted to fulfil.

Mr. BAXTER: The section refers to the "Militia," the "Military, the Naval," and other forces. Is there any possible distinction between the "Military" and the "Militia" forces? In other words, is there any military in Canada which is not militia, either active or passive?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: That is part of the active militia of Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: I may not get the military terms right, but we generally refer to the volunteer force as the militia, and it is so described in the British North America Act.

Mr. HANSON: So far as I am aware there are no Mounted Police in New Brunswick, nor were any ever brought in except under requisition. There is a detachment in Halifax. Are the provincial authorities bound to pay for the services of the Mounted Police when they are requisitioned for local duty?

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, under the statute the Mounted Police are not requisitioned, but the militia; and under the same law the local authority is supposed to pay the expenses incurred.

Mr. HANSON: That is under the Militia Act?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. I suppose the same principle would apply if the municipality requisitioned the services of the Mounted Police, although the law makes provision only for the militia to be sent in answer to a requisition from the local authorities.

Mr. HANSON: About a year ago there was trouble down east and the municipal authorities, through the Attorney General, as I understand, requisitioned the Mounted Police. Would the expenses incurred be payable by the municipality?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot answer that offhand, but I imagine the municipal authorities would have to bear the expense. It is merely a matter of opinion. There is an account, if I remember rightly, between a municipality and one of the departments for something, but I would not like to say whether it relates to the requisitioning of the Mounted Police or not.

Mr. HANSON: For a great many years Fredericton, which is in my constituency,

was the headquarters of a detachment of the Royal Canadian Regiment, and the Government acquired considerable property there. For the most part that property is situated on one side of the principal street, and since the termination of the war it has not been utilized by the Militia Department. At the moment the buildings are being occupied temporarily by the New Brunswick Liquor Commission under a terminable lease. Is it the intention to re-establish at Fredericton any portion of the permanent forces? If not, would the minister consider the sale of any portion of that property? I think the citizens would like to see the military school re-opened and a portion of the regiment again quartered at Fredericton. If on the score of economy that cannot be entertained—as to which I express no opinion—I would point out that this very valuable property in the heart of the city might very well be placed upon the market. I know at least that one of the local banks would like to purchase a portion of it as a site for a bank building. This would relieve the situation so far as available business lots there are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. This discussion is scarcely relevant to the particular clause under consideration, but perhaps the minister is willing to answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. HANSON: I was almost through, and perhaps I may be permitted to finish my remarks.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps it would be better, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member should be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to transgress the rules of the House. This is an important matter, and my only excuse for dealing with it now is that I may not have an opportunity to speak to it again. I should like the minister to consider the advisability of putting that property on the market. The suggestion was made when the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was Minister of Militia, but no decision was ever reached. I hope the minister will take the matter into consideration so the people down there may know what, if anything, is to be done.

Mr. GRAHAM: I realize that we are both out of order, Mr. Chairman, but if you will permit me I will deal with the hon. member's question. I would not like

[Mr. Hanson.]

to give him any encouragement respecting the re-establishment of a militia unit at Fredericton, because we are trying not to increase the expenditure of the Militia Department. The Government, through the Militia Department, owns a great deal of property throughout the Dominion, and if I thought this a good time to put it on the market I would do so, but I am inclined to think that we would not be able to realize what we paid for these properties if we attempted to sell them now. However, if the city or the bank has any offer to make to the department it will be considered.

Mr. BAXTER: There has been some employment of the Mounted Police in St. John in connection with immigration. A detachment of about six men go there each winter for that purpose. Of course, that is not a municipal expense in any way.

Amendment (Mr. Graham) agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On Section 5, sub-section (2)—Officials:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This does not imply that even nominally there is any presumption that they are not still officers? Would it not be better to read—

Mr. GRAHAM: When the Governor General signs this bill and it becomes law, there is a new department created, but the old departments that become the new have passed out of existence. Under this act it may be presumed that all these appointments that we have in the departments now will be nullified. It might be presumed that their classification would be nullified—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is just the point.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and the object of this section is to enable us to carry into the new department the employees of the old departments without having to go through all the formality of having the Civil Service Commission appoint them. In other words, their services would be continued, but any deviation from the principle of simply transferring a clerk from one department to the other at the same salary and under the same classification will have to receive the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would hardly go far enough. Do I understand the minister to say that so far as the exercise of this power does not consist in merely transferring an officer to a position of the same rank in the new department the Civil Service Commission will have jurisdiction just

the same as in the case of a new appointment or promotion?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. No power is given to the minister to place anyone in a new position without the consent of the Civil Service Commission. An example of a deviation from the principle which I have referred to would be this: an office might be abolished and the employee transferred to a position of similar status and the same salary. We would ask the Civil Service Commission for authority to do anything of that kind.

Subsection (2) of section 5 agreed to.

On subsection (3)—appointment of officer to exercise powers of the deputy:

Mr. MARTELL: Is it intended that the official here referred to shall receive, in addition to the salary of a deputy head of a department, extra remuneration as a member of the Defence Council?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all. The Naval Service is peculiar in itself, as those who have administered that department know, and, for the present at least, the Government is desirous of retaining the services of the present Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, who understands the work of that department better than any one else, even the Deputy Minister of the Defence Department. In the Naval Service Department there are many technical branches, such as hydrographic surveys, radiotelegraphic service, and that kind of thing. I take the House into my confidence and say I want the authority to retain Mr. Desbarats, the present occupant of the office, as deputy to manage that part of the service, for a time, at least. He will receive no additional salary as a member of the Defence Council.

Mr. MARTELL: His salary as deputy is $6,000 a year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: I have been told that the object of this provision is to give him $3,000 in addition, which would be unfair to the other deputies.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, not at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If you are going to have two deputy heads you will not accomplish what the bill sets out to attain. It is true that there are many branches of the Naval Service Department, but when they are all added together, the department is really an exceedingly small one. The proposal here is merely to change the title of the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service and take him into the Defence Council. He will get the same salary; he will rank as deputy head; to all intents and purposes he will occupy the same position that he occupies to-day. That is not an amalgamation at all. The late government brought together the Inland Revenue and the Customs Departments. In each of these departments there had been a deputy minister, but we let one go and brought the two services together under a single deputy head. I am satisfied that there is in the Department of Militia a deputy minister who can take care of the whole amalgamated service—a man of long experience, of great intelligence and capacity for work. It looks to me as if this proposal was put forth merely for the purpose of including somebody whom the Government did not want to displace and to continue him in the same rank and at the same salary. I would like to know more of the reasons for retaining Mr. Desbarats, or anybody else, in the rank of deputy head. The work can all be done by a single deputy minister. You can save $6,000 a year by striking out this subsection; I certainly am opposed to it.

Mr. MEWBURN: A few days ago I commended the minister for his efforts in bringing these departments together, his aim being, as I believed, to bring about greater efficiency and economy. But I cannot see where the economy will come in so far as this particular appointment goes. In bringing the two departments together there should be only one deputy minister. Of course, there would be at the head of the military branch the Chief of the General Staff, and at the head of the naval branch a technical officer whose advice could be sought in matters pertaining to that part of the service. But if the two departments are to be merged to have only one deputy head will result in greater economy and efficiency.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yesterday my hon. friends were warning me very strongly against depriving any official of his position; they seem to have changed their attitude since then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: However, that is only on the side. Besides, I would not expect the hon. gentlemen to admit it so soon. My hon. friends who have presided over the Militia Department have never had the

Naval Service under their jurisdiction, so I warn the committee—

Mr. MEWBURN: I had it for six months, with militia as well.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, that was temporary. No one has a higher opinion of the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence than I have. I have known him for a great many years; he is a man who has given great service to this country, particularly during the last few years,—service which, perhaps, we did not appreciate during the busy period of the war. But as I have said, the Naval Service is of a peculiar character, and the Deputy Minister of Militia, for a year at least, will have all he can do to work out the other branches. I do not agree with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that we cannot bring about any economy. Although the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, for the present at least, will be responsible for that branch we do propose to amalgamate the accounting staffs, the buying and selling staffs, and so on, and have the work done, as far as possible, in one office only.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whom will that staff be under as a deputy head?

Mr. GRAHAM: That will be by agreement, but largely, if not altogether, I think, under the Deputy Minister of the Defence Department. These economies can be effected without abolishing the position of Deputy Minister of the Naval Service. I have studied this thing for the last two months and I want to assure the House that the practical way of effecting this amalgamation is to allow us to retain the Deputy Minister of Naval Service to look after that branch of the department for a year at least, until we get the other branches thoroughly absorbed. I would not propose this if I did not think it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is practically the organization we have now. We have a Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries now, Mr. Johnston, a Deputy Minister of Naval Service, Mr. Desbarats, and a Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, Sir Eugene Fiset; and the only change you propose is to take the Naval Service into the other department under the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, retaining the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, Mr. Desbarats, but calling him something else. That is not a consolidation or amalgamation, to my way of thinking. I feel sure that you could drop Mr. Desbarats and carry out your scheme without him, saving the country $6,000 per annum. You would depend then for your guidance in regard to matters pertaining to the Naval Service upon an expert in that department. By the present scheme you are just continuing another deputy head, without giving him that name, saving the position perhaps for—what shall I say?—a friend, political or otherwise.

Mr. GRAHAM: It makes a difference to my hon. friend, I suppose, who is being hit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not simply a matter of saving $6,000, but once you retain the deputy head of that department, he is going to concentrate his energies upon holding the whole department. He will consider every time he gives up a man that he has made a surrender to the other deputy, and the other deputy in turn will consider that everything he does in the way of compromise is a surrender. In a word, the minister is maintaining an organization that will prevent him from accomplishing anything in the way of the object he has in mind. Perhaps not wholly prevent him, but it will prevent him to such an extent that he will never get very far. He is putting obstacles in his own way that he will find it very difficult to surmount. Why could not the same thing be done in this case as was done when the Inland Revenue Department was amalgamated with the Customs Department? Where are the different circumstances? The Inland Revenue Department had been wholly distinct from the Customs; the officers were distinct; the deputy head was distinct; the work was wholly distinct, just as distinct in every particular as is the work of the Naval Service from the work of the Militia Department to-day. But we let go Mr. Vincent, the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, and placed the two departments under the Deputy Minister of Customs. It is true we were not at all harsh with Mr. Vincent. He got a year's salary, perhaps a little more, and I would have no objection to Mr. Desbarats being treated the same. But when you maintain the deputy head, you maintain the department, and there is no consolidation; you may call it consolidation, but it is not consolidation at all. The minister in the first ten minutes this afternoon, wisely, I think, dropped about half of this bill. If he insists on holding this clause, I think he is dropping the other half.

4 p.m.

Mr. STEVENS: I am somewhat surprised at the apparent indifference of the minister to this point. As I understand the minister's attitude, it amounts to this really—that the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs is so well posted in his duties that the minister desires to retain his services, changing his title, but paying him the same salary and allowing him to maintain virtually the same authority. For the clause provides that he shall "exercise and perform all the powers, duties and functions vested in or exerciseable by the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service." Could a more complete definition of a deputy minister's functions be given than that? If he is to perform these functions it is not changing the status of the gentleman at all; but that is not what I rose to observe.

My hon. friend says that he is desirous of bringing these two departments together under one head. He admits that in the Deputy Minister of Militia he has an excellent officer who can handle the whole business. I am going to tell the minister and the House my frank and blunt opinion of the other gentleman, whom the minister appears to be anxious to retain. I have during the past eleven years gone to the Naval Service Department on many occasions, and whether it was through purposeful stupidity or absolute incompetence, I do not know, but I never could get from the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs any satisfaction at all, and he is the only civil servant of standing in Ottawa I would say that about. But I did and have got the information I desired through assistants of his,—I could name two or three but I shall not do so—the chief officers of his staff, not naval officers, but civil servants in that department. They have been able to give me all the information I desired, and that courteous treatment which is due to any person in Canada from a civil servant; and they have exhibited a competence and a knowledge of the business of the department which transcended that of the deputy minister by a great deal.

Now if the minister desires to co-ordinate these two services, he has at his disposal excellent sub-officials capable of taking the lead as branch heads, without maintaining the two departments distinct and separate, as will certainly be the case if this clause carries. I hesitate to offer a resolution on the spur of the moment, but I think the minister would be well advised to consider the replacing of this official provided for in sub-clause 3 by a branch head, just as we have in a dozen different departments; —in the Interior, for instance, where you have several branch heads but only one deputy minister who is supreme over all the branches. I certainly think the minister ought to give a little more consideration to this than apparently he is doing. He is a very good-natured gentleman, but we want something more than mere courteous treatment. I think if he would let the clause stand and at another sitting of the House give us the result of his mature consideration, it would be better. Otherwise I think it would be desirable to take some action now in having the clause struck from the bill, but I do not wish to do that.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is immaterial to me.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister should assume that attitude. I am not approaching this matter with any desire to destroy the value of the minister's effort. I approach it with a desire to assist the minister in obtaining what, I think, the House desires to obtain, namely, the amalgamation of the two departments.

Mr. GRAHAM: I only rise to point out to the House that this is the first time I have ever heard of Mr. Desbarats being anything but capable and courteous. I know him well; I have known him for years before I came here. Sometimes of course in our enthusiasm even a member of the House will ask a deputy for things which he ought to ask from the minister, because the minister only has authority to do these things; some of them a deputy should not do. My hon. friend suggested, rather sneeringly, that I should give this matter consideration. I can assure him that I have given it consideration every day for the last six weeks, and I think I can arrive at a conclusion that will satisfy myself after six weeks study of a matter that he can dispose of in half an hour. I want to give the committee all the information possible. My judgment and the judgment of the Government, after fully considering this question of retaining the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, is that the only satisfactory way, under the conditions, to bring about this amalgamation, which must come about gradually and cannot be the work of a moment, is that the able deputy minister should be retained for the time being in his present position as head of the Naval Service branch..

Mr. CRERAR: It does not seem to me that any very serious objection can be taken to the proposal of the minister in this respect. I have no desire to enter

into any discussion of the merits or demerits of Mr. Desbarats. I have always understood he was a highly efficient officer, but, as I understand it, what the minister is proposing is that the services of Mr. Desbarats may be available for a period until the organization is complete, and he has given some reasons for that course. The clause authorizes the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the minister, to appoint this officer. It is merely a permissive authority. I quite agree that a good deal of exception might be taken to having a department with two gentlemen in the capacity of deputy ministers, and I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of Major General Fiset. As far as I know, these gentlemen are both very capable men. It seems to me, however, that we should give some latitude to the minister in carrying on the reorganization, and my hon. friends to my right are scarcely quite consistent in the position they have taken on this question; because, if I recall aright, when this matter was first under consideration a few days ago, both my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who was the Minister of Militia in the late government, and his predecessor, my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), took the position quite strongly that officers in the Militia Department should be looked after. I believe that latitude should be given to the minister to carry on this re-organization in the way he thinks best for the service. If there are two deputy ministers next year, or the following year, and this Parliament is asked to vote their salaries, the question then can very well come up for reconsideration. We are not passing legislation that will put this matter away beyond our control. The principle is sound, and once the principle of a bill is sound —and I think the minister's explanations are fairly reasonable in respect to carrying it out—then I think he should give the minister the necessary latitude to carry it into effect.

Mr. DUFF: I think, perhaps, nobody in this House or outside of it has criticised the Naval estimates more than I have. I am opposed to the present so-called Canadian navy, for the simple reason that it is no navy, and never will be any navy, and is only a waste of money. But I agree with the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) when he says the minister should be given a chance to re-organize his department, and should have the advice, for a short time, of the gentleman who has been deputy head of naval affairs. I do not see how the re-organization is going to take place, in view of the fact that we now have only one cruiser and two destroyers, to protect the Atlantic coast from the people who may come down from Greenland some night and destroy all our cities, or to protect the Pacific coast from some other enemy who may come from Alaska. And this cruiser and these two torpedo boats, I may say, have been hibernating in the West Indies for the last six months. I say we have no navy, and the quicker we get clear of these boats the better, and the quicker we clean up the $215,000 voted last year for overhead expenses in Ottawa, in regard to the navy, which would be voted this year, the better. I say that the Minister of Militia should have a chance to keep Mr. Desbarats for one or two years, until the mess is cleaned up. I cannot agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that Major General Fiset can do the work in connection with the Naval Department. Would the hon. gentleman say, if something happened Major General Fiset, and he resigned, that Mr. Desbarats could do his work in the Militia Department? Of course he could not. Neither could Major General Fiset, good a man as we all know he is, do the work which Mr. Desbarats does in regard to naval affairs. I say, certainly, let us have economy, not only in this department but in other departments, but for the present, much as I am opposed to the so-called Canadian navy, and much as I would like to see the whole thing wiped out, I agree with the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) that for the present Mr. Desbarats' services should be retained.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I understand the proposal, it is not merely for the present time, or in the nature of a temporary proposal at all. The hon. gentleman from Marquette intimated that during the process of reorganization it would be well to retain Mr. Desbarats. This is a permanent arrangement, not for the process of reorganization at all. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) says that it is necessary to retain the services of Mr. Desbarats for a year or two years, and let us do it. If that were his suggestion, it would alter the situation very much.

Mr. DUFF: Could we not amend the act next year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We can amend any act of this Parliament whenever we like, but

we must go on the assumption that this is a permanent arrangement and not a temporary one. That is what the bill says, and it says nothing about a temporary arrangement, so that we must assume and presume that it is the ordinary permanent appointment. I draw a strong distinction between a person in the position of Mr. Desbarats and a person in the position of one of the higher offices of that department, to whom I referred a few days ago. I thought I made myself clear on that occasion; if not, I shall try to do so now or later on during the discussion of this bill. I say that we should retain as far as possible the services of those men who, through their ability and experience, and through gallantry in the field of action, have risen to high command and high military positions. That is a principle, I submit, that we should maintain.

Subsection 3 of section 5 agreed to.

On subsection 4—Controller:

Mr. CARROLL: I ask the Minister of Militia, have they a purchasing commission connected with the department, or is it just one officer in the department?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have a purchasing department, but it has no connection with the Purchasing Commission. I pointed that out the other night that two or three of the gentlemen in this department are doing the work of clerk. They were on the list of the Civil Service Commission. They were given the title of "assisting purchasing agent," and they are doing the work in the department. And this department, and all departments, whether they purchase through the Purchasing Commission or not, are responsible for their requisitions, and the details afterwards pass through the Purchasing Commission for confirmation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I understand aright, the position of controller, to be created under this section, is largely that of a chief accountant or a paymaster-general or something of that kind. He is not a purchasing agent in any sense of the word. He is in the nature of a chief accountant in the department.

Mr. GRAHAM: I tell the House frankly I have not seen the man, and have not appointed him at all, and possibly I may transfer some one in the department, but with my casual observation in a large department of this kind I think the financial end could be managed more successfully if they have a shrewd financial man to oversee all the expenditure of money in the department particularly as the other branches also are being brought in. I was calling him "financial comptroller," and my object was to get a good, able business man, whom I could consult in connection with all expenditures of every branch of the department, a man who would be responsible to myself and the deputy head for every dollar expended.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this the creation of a new position?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: How was the financial end of the department handled before?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have an accounting branch, an audit branch, and a paymaster's branch, and it maybe that I may take one of the men in charge of these branches. I admit I had in mind doing something else. If we were running a business of this magnitude as a private concern, we would have some man of the description I have given, and he could possibly save his salary in a month. If, in the department, there is a man of that capacity that I could appoint to this position, it would be my object to do so; but if I did not find such a man, I wanted to feel free to go into the business world to find one.

Mr. MEWBURN: The minister is on absolutely sound lines. I know, from my short experience while I was in charge of the Militia Department, there was sadly needed a capable business man to oversee the finances of the organization.

Sub-section 4 of section 5 agreed to.

On sub-section 5—holder of any position abolished may be appointed to another position:

Mr. MARTELL: Is there in the Militia Department a practice whereby a man who occupies a certain position under which the department should have all his time, is given some other work to do which he should do in his time, but for doing this work, he is given another salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know of a case except that of a deputy minister in several departments, who have a combination of salaries. As to the ordinary civil servant, I do not know of a case. I have been asked that question several times in communications, and I asked my department to make investigation, but up to date, I have not found such a case.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the minister not think it would be fair to the House and to

the country to give a deputy minister a straight salary without giving him so much for this and so much for that? In that way, the people would know exactly what salary he was receiving.

Mr. GRAHAM: The salary of my deputy minister has been explained in this House several times. I shall be glad to explain it again, but I think the question is hardly germane to this discussion.

Mr. CHURCH: I hope the minister will not overlook the importance of retaining those high officials of the Militia Department, men like Sir Henry Burstall and Major-General MacBrien. It has cost a great deal to produce military experts like those men, and their services are necessary. While the principle of the bill, which is to effect co-ordination of and economy in the various branches of the service which have to do with the defence of the country, may be all right, I am of opinion that if these military experts were retained, perhaps in another sphere of activity under this clause of the bill, they could effect a great deal of economy. I do not think the country expects very much curtailment in military expenditures; you may spend a great deal of the nation's money and not get very much for it. The question is not the amount of money which is spent, but how it is spent. I hope the minister will not overlook the fact that highly trained officials like these can save the country many millions of dollars, not only in the Department of Militia, but in other affairs. Officers whom I have consulted in No. 2 Military District, the Toronto District, are of the opinion that it is a retrograde step for the Militia Department to lose the services of these high experts at such a critical stage in the history of this country, just after the war and begin everything over again. At such a time as this we need the services of these trained men and we should retain them. I feel that an economy will be effected by retaining their services, and I hope the minister will consider the suggestion which I have very humbly made.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister tell the committee which of the principal officers are likely to lose their positions in the service by reason of this amalgamation? In the papers we have seen that Major-General Sir Henry Burstall and Major-General Gwatkin are both to be allowed to retire. Are any of the other chief officers to be retired likewise?

[M. Martell.]

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to be held as making a pledge, because conditions might change, but there is no need for alarm. The suggestion of dispensing with the services of any of these officers has not been considered at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The point is simply this that the minister is dispensing, or has dispensed, with the services of one of the most experienced and one of the highest in rank of the officers in Canada. I think the retirement of Major-General Sir Henry Burstall has already taken place officially. As I understand the matter, he is now out of the service, and so, I believe, is Major-General Gwatkin. In the case of the latter, the facts are not quite the same as they are in regard to Sir Henry Burstall. Major-General Gwatkin is a very able Imperial officer, who came to Canada shortly before or during the war, who has remained in Canada since and whose services were of the greatest value to Canada during the war. I understand that Major-General Gwatkin is entitled to an Imperial pension. At the conclusion of the war, he was virtually retired or retiring from the service, and his services were enlisted by the Canadian Air Board. For the past year and a half or two years he has been in charge of the Canadian Air Service, and it may well be, in his case, that retirement is proper. I know that he has no very great desire to continue in the service, and he rather helped us out in a situation which we had on hand a year or two ago. His services to Canada, however, have been of the highest. He is a very able and tried experienced officer, a man who made his mark in the Imperial service long before he came to Canada.

The case of Major-General Sir Henry Burstall is a litle different. That officer is a Canadian, a man now of military age, I believe only 51 or 52 years old, a man who joined the Canadian service as a provisional lieutenant away back in 1888 or 1889, a graduate of our Royal Military College, a Staff College man—for he went to England and took there, at the expense of this country the course which many of our leading officers have received. He there obtained that special and particular knowledge which is so hard to acquire, namely, the knowledge that is necessary for a staff officer. The hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn) a day or two ago mentioned in the House that staff officers were, perhaps, not as highly appreciated by ordinary individuals as they

should be. But there is no question about the fact that the greatest difficulty in time of trouble is to secure competent staff officers. It is not a hard thing to get an ordinary officer. He can be trained easily and without much loss of time. The staff is a very different thing. It requires a long course of training, and for that reason we in Canada for many years back have been accustomed to send a number of our most prominent and most promising officers to the Staff College at Camberley to take the necessary course. Only a few days ago General Sir Arthur Currie discussed the question with the newspapers in Montreal. He strongly objects to any proposal to retire Major General Sir Henry Burstall from the service. He points out that you cannot easily get men to fill positions like his. We want in the service men who have the qualifications and experience. We have trained such men and paid the expenses for that training, and these men, who have acquitted themselves well, have now the advantage of four or five years' experience of actual warfare. They are thoroughly competent and in every way equipped, by education and otherwise; and now because there is a re-organization of the Militia you let out one of the most effective and useful of officers. Is there not in this re-organization some place where a man like Sir Henry Burstall can be utilized? Can he not be put in charge of some necessary and suitable work in order that the valuable services of which he is capable may be retained? Surely his experiences and his ability are worth a lot to the country. Why dispense with him? That is the point I want to have cleared up. I sincerely trust that all these officers on the headquarters staff who have had experience are going to be retained. The minister does not want to bind himself in respect of them, but here is a specific case where a man has already been retired. Again I ask, is it not possible in the Militia of this country to maintain the services of a man who has done such excellent work and acquitted himself so admirably, and who should be a very valuable officer in the department?

Mr. MANION: As one of those who served at the front, I may say that General Burstall, who was a staff officer over there—

Mr. GRAHAM: He was more than a staff officer.

Mr. MANION: Yes, he was in charge of the Second Division, and I met him in the lines on many occasions. There was no man I know who served over there, with the possible exception, of Sir Arthur Currie, who had a higher standing with the men of all ranks than General Burstall. I desire to do him that justice. I am aware that the minister himself spoke highly of him the other day, but it has been a puzzle to me, since reading in the press that he is to be retired, with a pension, I believe, to understand, on what grounds he is being dispensed with. As the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) has said, no man in Canada has a better standing in military matters than General Burstall.

Mr. CARROLL: If the stand taken by the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) were to be taken as a sound basis for the department to go upon, then I should think that care would have necessarily to be taken of every man who made a splendid record at the front in the war. I have no doubt that the gentleman in question not only made a splendid name for himself, but also enhanced the reputation of the Canadian soldiers. We must remember, however, that thousands of other men did exactly the same thing, though perhaps they did not all win so brilliant a name.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But I have referred to men of the permanent force who in their boyhood agreed to serve the Government of Canada in that force, and have done so ever since. Now the Government is turning them out.

Mr CARROLL: My hon. friend is now, of course, on safer ground. But we are coming to the time when we shall have to reduce the expenditures of the Militia Department, in common with all the other departments of Government, and it is essential that we make a beginning. And because a man has given the best in him to the service of the permanent force of Canada is, I submit, no reason why he should be retained if he is not required. Not only that, but an hon. member tells me that this gentleman is getting a pension, which I hope is a reasonable pension for one in his position. I do not think that that is an unreasonable ground to take in a matter of this kind. Personally, I hope that the time will soon come when we shall be able materially to reduce the burden of the Militia Department, and I trust that the minister in the next few years will be able to rid his department, always under fair and reasonable terms, of very many of those who are now employed in it, and

who are not actually giving, in the present condition of the country, services commensurate with the salaries they are receiving.

Mr. MEWBURN: I do not wish to weary the House with any long quotations, but I read a few days ago a speech made by General Sir Douglas Haig, who, as we know, was in command of the British army in France. In unveiling a memorial at Camberley Staff College, which I think is recognized as the greatest staff college in the world, General Haig said:

> In the desire to retrench, and especially to economise on defence forces, there is a great danger that governments may go too far. The staff has always been a favorite target for those who do not understand either it or its functions.

Further on he says:

> A nation industrially efficient and with a sound national character can improvise much in war, as our history in the war has shown; but principles are things that cannot readily be improvised. They have to be evolved by deep study and clear thinking through many years, tested often by the touchstone of experience. Our two staff colleges and the "p.s.c." officer gave us the sound military principles on which the war was fought and won.

He goes on to speak of the work of staff officers in France and also of the necessity for ensuring that future generations shall reap the benefit of their experience. I quote further:

> Whatever a nation may do, it is a mistake to imagine that an army can muddle through a great war and reach victory at the end against an efficient and highly trained enemy. The handicap we started with from the smallness of our military forces could never have been overtaken if the pre-war training of our regular army, the military education of its officers, and its system of organization and command, had not been all on the right lines. It is no small consolation on such an occasion as this to feel and know that the work done in those old pre-war days has been amply vindicated. * * * Let those who write ignorantly of the safe and easy life of the regular staff officer come and study this memorial, and remember that this is not the full tale of officers who held staff appointments and gave their lives in the war—

And so on. Whatever the minister has in mind regarding any reduction in the staff, I do hope that the country will not lose the services of those officers who made good in the war, who distinguished themselves, and who are now able to impart their knowledge to the generation that succeed them. I sincerely trust that other officers to come will have the privilege of acquiring some of the knowledge and experience which these others have gained.

[Mr. Carroll.]

Mr. CLARK: There is an impression in the House which I desire to correct to some extent, namely, that these officers who are now in the permanent force are there of their own desire. To my knowledge a great many of the senior officers are men upon whom great pressure was brought to bear to remain in the service after the war. Most of the others were already in the permanent forces. By far the majority of both senior and junior officers retired and went back to their civilian occupations when the war was over. As one hon. member put it the other day, those officers returned to the plow, and returned gladly, and to-day they are doing their duty as citizens. But certain officers and non-commissioned officers who devoted themselves exclusively to the service before the war and won the seniority in the field, have remained in the service under pressure, brought to bear by the Department of Militia when the war was over. Those are the men, I think, whom the country wants to see retained, the men who know, and those are the men who, if we are ever again faced with war, will be responsible for organizing our military force on a basis which will enable it to be administered efficiently, and so save the lives of thousands of men who might otherwise be sacrificed. Had Canada been equipped with the officers who to-day are in the Militia Department, I have no hesitation whatever in saying that thousands of our soldiers would not have been sacrificed as they were. The same condition applied to the British army and to every other army in the late war. Has it ever occurred to hon. members why Germany was able to withstand the onslaught of so many other nations? Mr. Chairman, it was because at the outset she had the benefit of a thoroughly trained and organized army. If we cast aside the men who have the knowledge and the training, we are, so to speak, cutting our own throats, and if another war should occur the absence of these trained men may mean the sacrifice of our sons to no purpose.

Subsection 5 of section 5 agreed to.

On subsection 6—provision for retirement, etc.:

Mr. GRAHAM: If economies are to be effected it is possible that the services of some of the minor officers may have to be dispensed with on account of the work being diminished. Such a case as this might arise: an officer at the time his services were dispensed with might be

within one year of the conclusion of the term which would entitle him to a pension. Under this subsection I want to make it possible for him to qualify for his pension. I have been considering it for the last day or two, and I think we would be sufficiently generous if we changed the three years to two.

In reply to my hon. friend in reference to the gentlemen he has named, I fully agree with everything that he has said regarding their qualifications both as gentlemen and officers. I do not like to discuss in Parliament the names of such distinguished men. I might say, however, that Sir Henry Burstall had attained the highest position possible in the militia, what we call the blue ribbon—he had become Inspector General. I think I was not ungenerous in my recommendation, for he was entitled to a pension. I repeat, I do not like to discuss these gentlemen in public, because certainly it is no fault of theirs in the way of lack of qualification or ability that they are being retired. The record of Sir Henry Burstall and of General Gwatkin is well known to all of us and will bear comparison with the record of the most distinguished military men in any country.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think there is a serious principle involved in this clause. Having been a member of the Pensions Committee of this House for two years past, if this clause carries I do not see why the returned soldiers should not ask that their disabilities be considered, although they occur two years after their discharge from service. I think you are establishing a very dangerous precedent in passing this clause, and so far as I am personally concerned I do not think it is wise to entertain it. I am again a member of that committee this year, and I feel that the idea of adding two or three years to the length of service in order to grant a man a pension is absolutely unsound. I know of many cases of real hardship under the provision of our Pensions Act, that if a soldier's disability occurs after a certain limited time after his discharge he is not entitled to a pension. But if this consideration is to be extended to the men affected by this bill, I think the Pensions Committee will approach their duties next week with a very different idea as to what is just and right in regard to pensions for disabled men.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is in error and is apparently confusing entirely different classes of pensions. This has nothing to do with the Pension Board.

Mr. CALDWELL: I understand that. This is a Civil Service pension.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are several acts involved in this clause, but it does not give a pension to any person—

Mr. MEWBURN: It is not a disability pension at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is it.

Mr. CALDWELL: I understand that.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not give a pension to any person who is not entitled to one; but it does put us in a position to deal a little more generously with officers or civil servants who have to be retired. It does not deal with pensions for disability due to war service; it applies to another act altogether.

Mr. CALDWELL: I thoroughly understand that, but I cannot help thinking that the minister is confusing the point. This man would not be entitled to a pension unless he had one, two or three years' more service than he actually had to his credit at the time of his retirement. Therefore by giving the Governor in Council authority to add from one to three years to this man's service he is entitled to a pension which he would not otherwise be qualified for. I understand that it is not a disability pension, but a civil service pension. I have no great quarrel with civil service pensions, although there is a considerable body of opinion that holds the principle to be rather unjust, for people in all walks of life do not get pensions when they become too old to work. Personally, I think civil servants should be paid salaries sufficient to enable them to accumulate enough during their official life to provide for their old age. If they are to be given a pension, I think they should contribute as those do who receive the benefit, for instance, of an old age pension fund.

Mr. MEWBURN: Of course, other pension acts are involved here—what is known as the Calder Act, and any other Civil Service pension law that may be in force. But under the Military Pensions Act the contributions of the members of the permanent force made the fund absolutely self-sustaining. That condition, of course, could not prevail during the war, when the casualties became increased beyond anything we had ever experienced.

Mr. CALDWELL: That puts a different aspect on it. I had understood that the Government contributed large sums toward these civil service pensions.

Mr. MEWBURN: This is a military service pension, not a civil service pension.

Mr. CALDWELL: I still contend, however, that this clause is unsound. I am sure that hon. members have been disappointed in the minister's civil government estimates, as, indeed they have been with nearly all civil government estimates so far brought down. The Finance Minister made it plain the other day that the Government had not said they would practise economy this year. I was a little disappointed in that.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. CALDWELL: Well, that they had not made any statement with regard to economy; I do not want to misquote the minister. We certainly expected a saving in the Militia Department by the co-ordination of these different arms of the service. We all feel that in the years to come, expenditure for military purposes should be reduced, and I see no reason for increased expenditure now under the head of civil government in connection with the administration of this branch of the service. I do not approve of this clause, and I do not think it should carry.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move that subsection 6 be amended by striking out the word "three" in line 26 and substituting therefor the word "two."

Amendment agreed to, and subsection as amended agreed to.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

On section 6—regulations:

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the meaning of the words "such regulations as are deemed necessary or advisable?" Would not "necessary" be sufficient?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the usual wording, I suppose; I am not accustomed to the intricacies of legal phraseology. Certain regulations which might not be absolutely necessary might be advisable for the purposes of economy or for other reasons connected with the proper carrying on of the work of the new department. All the regulations which have been promulgated in connection with these different branches will have to be revised, and the new regulations will embody all the necessary features of the old ones.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—powers vested in ministers and deputy ministers under various acts, to be vested in Minister and Deputy Minister of National Defence:

Mr. GRAHAM: I move to strike out on page 2 all the words from and including the words "'the Royal Canadian" in line 38 to and including the words "Revised Statutes" in line 41. The purpose of this amendment is to strike out all the words relating to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—functions of Defence Council:

Mr. GRAHAM: I move that the words "Air and Police" in line 33 be struck out and that the words "and Air" be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported.

SALARIES ACT, AND THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT, AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. George P. Graham (Minister of Militia and Defence) Bill No. 14, to amend the Salaries Act and the Senate and House of Commons Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1:

Mr. GRAHAM: The object of this bill is to make it possible to pay the head of the new Defence Department, whose title is being changed by the bill we have just reported.

Bill reported.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE ADDRESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a message from His Excellency the Governor

General, signed by his own hand, reading as follows:

I have received with great pleasure the address you have voted in reply to my Speech at the opening of Parliament, and thank you for it sincerely.

BYNG OF VIMY,
Government House, Ottawa.

SUPPLY

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Civil Government—Public Works—salaries, $583,035; contingencies, $94,000.

Hon. J. H. KING (East Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): When these estimates were under discussion on Tuesday evening last, there was a desire expressed by some of the members of the committee for a fuller explanation with regard to the transfer of certain employees from the engineering branch, outside service, to other branches of the service. At that time I stated that these officials were not permanent officials, had not been classified and admitted into the service as permanent employees, and that being temporaries, they would naturally come under the contingencies vote. I find that that statement is confirmed by a letter written in October of last year, when the chief accountant advised the Auditor General that it would be necessary on account of these transfers being of temporary officials to have them put under the contingencies vote instead of the outside vote. I think that explains the situation satisfactorily. It was also suggested that I should give the committee the total expenditure last year under the civil government vote. I find that the expenditure last year amounted to $557,545.52. It was also suggested that I should explain the item at the bottom of page 96 of the Estimates, "To provide for new appointments if required, $5,000." That item is to provide for unforeseen expenditures. It may become necessary to make one or two new appointments this year, and it is for that reason this item has been put in.

5 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Should that really not be counted as a contingency? Is it customary—as far as my knowledge goes it is not—to put an item under details of civil government such as appears at the bottom of page 96, "To provide for new appointments if required, $5,000"? I would think that was a contingency if ever there was one, and that if a new appointment is necessary or desirable during the year it would be charged to your contingencies vote. In the minister's statement, it will be noticed the total expenditure under contingent account in this department was $557,545.52, while the estimate last year was $620,000. Therefore, there was a saving of about $63,000 in the estimate of last year. That makes a pretty favourable showing for last year. Then during the present year the estimate is $583,000 plus $94,000 of contingencies, being far in excess of all that was spent last year, and in addition, I point out, referring to the last line on page 96, they propose to take power to spend $5,000, without knowing what they want it for. I submit that this $5,000 should be struck out, and that the expense, if incurred at all, should be charged to contingencies. If the Government knew what they intended the money for, or what work had not been done that they wished to provide for, I could understand the item, but at present I think it should be struck out.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend realizes, I think, that the same item was carried last year in the Estimates, and it was for a very good purpose, because the private secretary's allowance was paid from that item last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why should it not be paid out of contingencies?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Under the act I am advised the Auditor General would not allow it.

Mr. HOCKEN: Under contingencies, there is an item "Clerical and other assistance, $31,000." Would not that cover any possible new appointments that might be required for which you put in the $5,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised that it would not carry a permanent official, a private secretary, or officials of that character, but that it would carry temporary employees.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Permanent officials, of course, should be named. Their offices should appear in the item. That is the reason the Auditor General would not allow it to be charged there. They should appear among the officers, detailed, one by one. Why provide a salary for the employment of officers that this House knows nothing about?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the right hon. gentleman realizes that in a de-

partment spending some $15,000,000, cases might occur where a new official would be required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He could be taken on temporarily.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It occurred last year when the same vote was shown in the Estimates and it became necessary for the minister to charge under that vote the payment of his private secretary, and the amount is not an unusual one. You find it in other departments, and it is placed there for the purpose of meeting any unforeseen condition that might arise.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the minister not think the principle is wrong? I assume we did it last year. I do not know whether we did it or not, but the minister states that we did, and we will assume we did. Is it not a wrong principle to have a vote in contingencies for clerical and other assistance of $31,000 and then, in addition to that, to vote $5,000 to provide for another contingency? If any extra assistance is required during the present year, is it not possible and proper to pay, out of the contingency vote, for clerical and other assistance? If you charge it to that account, will the Auditor General not pay it? I can understand that if you were making a permanent appointment the Auditor General might say "I cannot charge that to contingency account." But as my right hon. friend and leader has pointed out a permanent appointment should be specified directly in the Estimates. What I object to is carrying a contingent vote for clerical assistance of $31,000 on one page of the Estimates, and another contingency vote, of $5,000 blank, at the bottom of page 96 of your Estimates. You have really two contingency accounts and I think one of them should be stricken out. I appeal to the minister's own judgment. Is it not fair and proper that the $5,000 item should come out, and if the minister will suggest it, I think the committee will act upon it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I can assure my hon. friend that, as far as I am personally concerned this item in the estimates is there if necessity requires. I trust it will not be required or used. But these items were presented to me on the basis on which they were made out last year. You accepted that estimate last year and thought it was a proper one, and I, in the short time I have been in office, am not disposed to disturb that estimate, but if it is not required it will not be used.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not the principle upon which we vote money in this House. The minister must show to the House in some reasonable manner that the money is going to be used. We do not give a blank cheque. We do not say "We will vote you $50,000, and if you do not use it, well and good". Some scheme must be laid before the committee on which they can act. My hon. friend comes before parliament and says this was there last year, and it is there this year. Well, if it was wrong last year, I suppose it is wrong this year. Unless there is some reasonable explanation of why that $5,000 appears in the estimates, I think it should be struck out. If the contingent vote for clerical assistance is too small, it should have been made $36,000 instead of $31,000. Does not that suggestion appeal to the common sense of the committee? Why have two contingency votes in the estimates of one department. If they want more than $31,000, make it $36,000. I think that $5,000 item can be eliminated.

Mr. HOCKEN: I sympathise with the minister. We all know he has been thrown suddenly into something with which he is not familiar, but I draw attention to the fact that last year the amount for clerical and other assistance was placed at $15,000, and this year it is $31,000. There is an increase of $16,000, or, if you take the whole item, you find an increase of $7,600. Now, surely, if you are going to add $7,600 to contingencies, you do not want the $5,000 to which reference has been made. If you strike out the $5,000, you still have $2,600 more for contingencies than you had last year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend must understand there are two contingency votes here, apparently. This $5,000 I tried to explain was the contingency vote for the permanent service and may not be required. It might not have been required last year, but experience did show it was required last year to pay the minister's secretary, and as far as an increase of $16,000 under contingencies is concerned, I took occasion the other night to point out that last year, under the general vote in the engineer's department, these officials had been carried, but that this year some thirteen of them were being transferred. They would be paid this year from the contingency vote, having been transferred from the engineers' vote of last year. I do not think I can make that any more definite or clear.

There is a certain amount required for the payment of a number of civil servants. Last year they were paid from the engineering vote. This year they are going to be paid from contingencies.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is the engineering appropriation reduced?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Why is the average salary in this department nearly $400 higher than the average salary in the Department of Agriculture? Is this department more important to the country than the Department of Agriculture, to justify this condition?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would think, perhaps, the explanation would be that, in the Public Works Department, you would have a larger technical staff, men drawing, probably, larger salaries.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): The average salary is about $400 higher in the Department of Public Works than in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): More technical, I think would be the explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that is partly the explanation and also this, that the Department of Agriculture has been expanding more rapidly than has the Public Works Department. The officers in the latter department, as a consequence, are older and have been in the service longer, and, as a result of that, they, perhaps, enjoy a little higher classification. The more recent the appointment of officers, the lower would be the average salary.

I quite admit that the minister's explanation as regards the $5,000 item is clear; there is nothing in the way of ambiguity about it. I know what he is saying; I know what he means; but the comment I make is that it has no force. The minister simply says, as to this $5,000: "It was there last year."

Mr. KING: And used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. Possibly last year there was no provision, in the usual way, for the private secretary, and the minister made provision in this way instead. That explanation may have been given—I do not know. But the minister knows whether he needs this for his private secretary or not; and if he does not need it, why have this special appropriation? I have looked through about one-half of the Estimates; I have not had time yet to go through them all; but so far as my information goes, I cannot find such a vote anywhere else. The minister's reasoning would be just as good if he said: "The appropriation last year for clerical assistance was $15,000; that was right, so I will take it this year." He does not say that; he says: "I want $16,000 more," and the only reason given is that he is taking in thirteen men from the engineering branch. Does he need them in this service? If he does not, why does he not let them out of the engineering branch, as last year we let out numerous employees. What does he need the $5,000 for? Where is the work? What does he require the extra $16,000 for? Where is the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As regards the thirteen men to whom the right hon. gentleman refers, these have been in the service for many years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have not been in this service; they have been in the engineering service. Does the minister need them in this service? What is the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of these people have been in their present positions for a number of months, one from August, 1, 1921, another from October, 20, others from January, 22, March, 20, July, 19 and so on. They are gradually being placed in vacancies that occur from time to time in other branches.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is in the engineering branch?

Mr. KING (Kootenay) No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what the minister has been saying. They have been in the engineering branch and paid under that vote.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They have been in other branches of the service, but heretofore they have been paid out of the estimate for the engineering branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand the minister to say that their duties are not being changed at all; that they are doing just what they were doing before?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then what is the explanation of the change in the Estimates?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was last year a memorandum to the Auditor General from the Chief Accountant advising a change in payment in this way. It was suggested that owing to their being temporary employees and not permanent, they should be paid from contingencies. That

is a matter of record. The memorandum states that these men were employed for a number of years prior to 1919 in the engineering branch, their appointments having been made on the order of the then Minister of Public Works without reference to the Civil Service Commission, and without any certificates being issued by the commission in any of these cases. It further states that their positions have been classified by the commission; that recently, owing to the shortening of the staff in the engineering branch, these men have been transferred to other branches to fill vacancies as they occur; that they are doing purely civil government work, but that as they have never received certificates of permanent appointment, it is impossible to charge their salaries to the appropriation for civil government salaries. That is I imagine, the reason why the change was made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to say that some time ago, owing to the contraction of the other branch and their being required in civil government work here, they were transferred but continued to be paid in the engineering branch. That is the explanation.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has some force with me, but now the minister is back on his $5,000 estimate. What of it?

Mr. FIELDING: The minister, finding that appropriation last year, might be pardoned for copying it and considering that it was required. I think, in the matter of preparing estimates, it would have been better, if, as in other departments, an amount had been inserted for the private secretary. If, however, the item was in the Estimates a year ago, I do not think we can blame the minister for continuing it. If he has the private secretary to pay out of the vote, clearly he will have only a small amount left.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister would say that it is required for the private secretary, then he would be giving an explanation that the committee could consider. He has not said that, and I presume the private secretary is provided for.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are carrying the proper allowance for the private secretary over and above this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the explanation, so far, shows that this is not required.

[Mr. J. W. King.]

Mr. GOULD: Possibly the minister would answer a question that would apply to every other department of government. Who are the minister's advisers who compile these lists?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The heads of the various branches of the departments are the advisers. This item of $5,000 is immaterial to me and it may be dropped. It is put in there by the officials of the department, and it very distinctly says what it is for—perhaps not an unwise provision —to provide for new appointments, if required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a wrong principle, one that I cannot find elsewhere. I accept with pleasure the minister's suggestion that it be dropped.

Mr. GOULD: There is, as has been shown by an hon. member, an average difference of $400 between the salaries paid in this department and in the Department of Agriculture. I understand the reply to be that a greater degree of technical knowledge is required in this department. When the Minister of Agriculture had his estimates before the House a few nights ago it was distinctly shown that that department was in dire need of experts. The minister even declared that he was unable to secure enough money to obtain the experts in the entomological, research, and other branches necessary to combat the various pest nuisances which agriculture has to contend with. Now it appears that this department can and does afford to pay an average of $400 more in salaries to its officers than the Department of Agriculture can pay to their men. I have persistently contended for the past two years in this House that the Department of Agriculture has the right to pay the same salaries to its officials and technical men as this or any other department pays. The Department of Agriculture, I hold, should be put on the same basis as this department in the matter of salaries paid to expert men.

Mr. CALDWELL: It was shown the other night that the Department of Agriculture had lost two of its most valuable men because their salaries were not sufficient. They had better offers abroad which they accepted. I do not think that that department should be discriminated against in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. King (Kootenay) that

the item be reduced by $5,000. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

Governor General's Secretary's Office: Salaries, including Governor General's Secretary, addition to salary authorized by R. S. c. 4, $3,600.

Contingencies, including allowance of $600 to A. F. Sladen, Private Secretary, $66,600.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): There is absolutely no change from last year; the totals are the same. The salary of the Governor General's secretary is paid in part by vote of Parliament and in part by statute.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the full salary of the Governor General's secretary?

Mr. FIELDING: Parliament votes $3,600 and $2,400 is provided for in the Revised Statutes. That has been the practice for many years.

Item agreed to.

Finance—salaries, including the Deputy Minister of Finance at $10,000, and the Librarian at $2,000, $413,545; contingencies, $50,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Thsse estimates follow closely the estimates of a year ago. The number of officials is substantially the same, and in the total amount there is a small reduction. There are two special increases to which I shall refer in a moment. Apart from this, whatever changes are proposed are due to the classification and the usual statutory allowances. There is one item which at first sight appears to be a new one: accountant, grade 6, at $4,020. There is no corresponding sum in that estimate a year ago. There is, however, really no change, the gentleman being already in the service. He is merely put into another grade. He begins now at the salary he has hitherto enjoyed, but in his new grade he will have an opportunity of climbing up. There is an increase in connection with the librarian. That is a special recognition to an old gentleman who is now considering an early retirement. The effect will be to add a little to his slender retiring allowance, and I think that in consideration of the circumstances the committee will hardly take exception. The larger and important increase is that given to the deputy minister. I find that several of the deputies are receiving $10,000 a year. I think it will be admitted that the Department of Finance is as important as any other department of the Government. As a matter of fact, I know, and my predecessors no doubt know, that in more than one instance we have lost capable men from the department because of the insufficiency of salaries. It will be agreed, I believe, that if $10,000 is a fair salary for a deputy minister in any other department, the like salary ought to be paid the deputy minister of the Department of Finance, whose position is certainly not less important than others. I ask the committee to vote this sum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true that the Deputy Minister of Justice receives $10,000, but I am not aware at the moment of any other deputy that gets this salary.

Mr. FIELDING: There are others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that the Deputy Minister of Militia, being a member of the council in some way, gets that salary, but he does not receive the extra amount as deputy minister of the department. If I remember rightly, he draws just $6,000 as deputy. If there are any others who get a higher salary I have never known the fact. I do not dispute that, to get the right man to fill the responsible position of Deputy Minister of Finance, it is necessary to pay the salary proposed, but I fear that unless resistance is shown this practice will spread rapidly. In the Department of Justice, it must be admitted, to get a man of the capacity requisite for the position of deputy minister, you cannot pay less than is given to-day, and the country would lose infinitely more in a week by having a deputy minister of inferior ability than it would lose in a year by giving the additional pay. It is a position requiring a professional man of the very highest order. In this department the reason for the increase can be differentiated, but I hope these increases will not proceed further, because if we have just one more instance I am afraid a similar increase will go all through the list. While I am on my feet may I ask, is the report correct that to make room for the Minister of Public Works another officer was added to this department, namely, the elected member for the constituency now represented by the minister; and, if so, is that reflected in this vote?

Mr. FIELDING: It is not touched by this vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be in another vote.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. HOCKEN: The minister gives two contradictory reasons for making these increases. He first increases a man because he is inefficient or has reached an age when he ought to retire. He has increased the salary of the librarian because he is going to retire, and I presume if he were an efficient officer he would be retained. Then the minister increases the salary of another officer on the ground of efficiency. I would point out that if the House adopts this increase, next year you will have to pay the Deputy Minister of Public Works $10,000, and that will carry from him to the Deputy Minister of the Interior and the Deputy Minister of Railways, and so on to all the other departments.

It will be observed that the deputy ministers' salaries have been fixed generally at $6,000. Now you fix one of them at $10,000, and naturally and inevitably every deputy minister will want to be placed on a par with that increase—he will feel he has a right to it. I doubt very much whether the Deputy Minister of Finance has any heavier responsibilities than the Deputy Minister of Public Works. The Public Works Department requires a permanent head with a great deal of experience and ability and, sometimes, resistance, and so far as the actual work and worries of office are concerned I think the Deputy Minister of Public Works should get more salary—if there is going to be any difference at all—than the Deputy Minister of Finance.

My argument is this, Mr. Chairman, we fixed $6,000 as the salary of deputy ministers; that was an increase of $1,000 on the old scale. Now, that strikes me as being a pretty good salary. We will say that these men are capable and efficient; I believe they are. But the $6,000 that they earn is as much remuneration as they could command in private employment if you take into account that when they retire from the public service they get a retiring allowance. Let a man go into private employment at a salary of $8,000, or possibly $10,000—a substantial increase, it may be said, upon the government scale; but it must be remembered that when the private employee ceases to be able to work he has to fall back upon his own reserves, while a man occupying the position of a deputy minister falls back upon the pension list and continues to live at the expense of the country when he retires. I submit therefore that if you take that into account and a good many other things also, a deputy minister is much better off. For instance, a man in private employment has to make good in everything—he has to show results or he loses his job. On the contrary, a man in the public service is not required to make good in the same way, and that is an important consideration when you are fixing salaries. Take that into account as well as his pension, his short hours of work, and all the other advantages and perquisites of his office, and I submit that $6,000 is good pay for a deputy minister.

These deputies were satisfied to accept $5,000 until a couple of sessions ago, when the salary was raised to $6,000. This looks to me, Mr. Chairman, like the beginning of an agitation within the service to boost the salaries of deputy ministers, and they have selected my hon. friend's department as the place of attack. I would warn the House that if this increase is granted we may expect every session to be met with demands from deputy ministers for a similar increase. It does not seem to me that this is the time to add $4,000 to the salary of a public official. If $6,000 was enough during 1921, it is surely enough now, and it is going to be worth a good deal more as time goes on. Conditions are stabilizing in this country—they must if we are going to carry on—the cost of living is coming down, but the rate of salaries is going up, and not going up by small increases, but by chunks of $4,000.

I think this proposition is simply outrageous, and I am surprised that my hon. friend, who has preached economy so effectively all through the country, should be the first to propose a sixty-six per cent increase to one official in his department, knowing as he must, with his long experience in this House, that every deputy minister will be clamouring for similar treatment. I am sure he is putting upon his colleagues a load of responsibility from which they should shrink, and which should have led them to say to him: "No we won't make this increase this year." I submit that this $4,000 should be struck out. I notice all the way down that there are increases. I presume that these other increases are made in accordance with the Civil Service rates, and are statutory—I do not know whether I am right or not—but certainly we should not add four-sixths to the salary of one official

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, it is quite refreshing to find ourselves now in an absolutely different position to any we have heretofore been in when considering the estimates of a minister who knows very well exactly what ought to be done in his department, and who, besides that, is very deeply concerned in all matters of economy. In the first instance I would point out that we find ourselves in this happy position, that at least so far as one department is concerned we have in charge an authority who knows exactly what ought to be done, and he admits that that department was economically and properly administered by his predecessors. I also wish to point out to my hon. friends to the left that so economically was that department administered that the average salary there is only $1,124.

Mr. CRERAR: That may not be an evidence of economy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it is.

Mr. MURPHY: Is my hon. friend taking into account the defalcations?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am glad to say that those defalcations do not amount to very much. Certainly there never should be defalcations, and the late government did everything it could to discover just what they were and to punish the defaulters. But I am not taking that into consideration, nor was my hon. friend when he was considering salaries. Another time perhaps we might say something further about that matter, but this is not an appropriate occasion.

As I say, the average salary of that department amounts to only $1,124 a year. Now there is a slight increase in numbers, so it cannot be said that we had too many employees there. As to the duties of the office, I do not think that hon. members really appreciate the weight of responsibility that does rest upon the officials of that office. At one time the finances of the country were of a very different character to what they are to-day. To look after the national debt alone imposes a tremendous responsibility upon the Deputy Minister of Finance. What the minister has said in connection with the difficulty of keeping men in that position who can do the work is perfectly true. I know what the troubles have been in the past, and I appreciate my hon. friend's troubles now. I am convinced that the work is cheaply paid for at $10,000 a year. I endorse very thoroughly what my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) said, that this vote ought not to be made use of for the purpose of increasing other salaries generally. I would like to ask the minister whether or not the auditors who have been going through the department are proceeding with their work and whether it is his hope, as it was mine, that we shall be able to get as a result of this examination such a system of pre-audit as will make impossible any further defalcations. We have to-day accountants and book-keepers in every department. My idea is that that is an entirely unnecessary expense; we ought to have everything of this kind brought into the Finance Department. The Minister of Finance should have proper control over the country's finances, something which he has not at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING: I thank my hon. friend for his explanations and comments. The auditors to whom he refers are still engaged in the work, and I have every reason to believe that they are doing it efficiently. No doubt good results will ensue.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the age of the deputy minister?

Mr. FIELDING: The age of the present deputy minister is fifty-nine. The minister himself does not confess to any such age.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister is still a very young man. It was the deputy minister, not the minister, about whose age I was inquiring.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is this 66⅔ per cent increase for the deputy minister fixed by the minister of the department, or by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. FIELDING: The Civil Service Commission have nothing to do with fixing that salary. The deputy minister is not subject to Civil Service rules.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: For how many years is this 66⅔ per cent increase to be continued?

Mr. FIELDING: From year to year, as it pleases Parliament. The vote comes before Parliament every year. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) was slightly mistaken in several respects. In the first place, I regret that his watchful eye did not perceive this thing at an earlier period; the attack which he says is being made might have been made some years ago. There have evidently been allowances to deputies that he has not been

aware of. Several deputies receive $10,000 a year; as a matter of fact there is one other official in the Finance Department who receives that sum. There has been much talk about the lower officials not being well paid. I think if there is any room for criticism it is that the higher officials and technical officers who have large responsibility are not sufficiently paid. We must pay these men enough if we are to keep them. With reference to the remark of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), I may say that the Deputy Minister of Finance has been nearly forty years in the service, but in asking this increase I am thinking not only of the man, but of the office. The time is not far distant when the deputy minister will wish to retire, and I think we ought to provide for this office a salary which will attract a good man. I am persuaded that in this case it is not wise to have an underpaid man.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Immigration and Colonization—salaries and contingencies, $263,265.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): Last year the vote for salaries was $193,257.50; this year it is $213,265, an increase of $20,007.50.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much of the $193,257.50 was spent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All of it. The annual statutory allowances approved by the Civil Service Commission are, for the lower grades. $60 per annum; for the intermediate grades, $120, for the higher grades, $180. These amount to $7,932.50. The increase in rates of salaries of officials reclassified during the fiscal year amounts to $5,685, making a total of $13,675.50. There were but two actual increases in staff, occasioned by the appointment of a secretary to the deputy minister at $1,500 and a female investigating officer at $1,230. Six officials included in the civil government contingencies this year, and accounting for an increase in that vote of $10,000, were paid out of the general contingencies vote last year, and were therefore not charged against civil government contingencies in 1921-22.

Mr. CALDWELL: You mean, they were paid out of the vote for the outside service?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Exactly. There was one male investigating officer, grade 1; one female investigating officer, grade 1; one clerk-stenographer, one accounts-stenographer and two junior clerk-typists at $600 each.

[Mr. Fielding.]

The contingency vote is based on the actual amount expended last year, and includes the necessary funds to meet the travelling expenses of our head office officials, printing, stationery, temporary clerical assistance, and sundry expenses. The amount of $40,000 voted for 1921-22 has been found insufficient to meet these expenses up to March 31, 1922, and the department has been obliged to obtain a Governor General's warrant for $12,000, which amount will be included in the supplementary estimates for 1921-22. The accountant tells me that $2,000 of that $12,000 is unexpended, and although the books are not actually closed for the year, it is expected that only $10,000 of that Governor General's warrant will be spent. Hence we are asking that $10,000, the amount expended under Governor General's warrant last year, be added to the contingency vote for the coming year.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS: I was attending the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture before six o'clock and, therefore, I was not in touch with what immediately preceded the rising of the committee at six o'clock. I wish to ask the minister in regard to Mr. Duncan Marshall, to whom reference was made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). The minister will remember that when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were before the House, we queried him regarding the payment of this gentleman and the purposes of the trip he was undertaking to Florida. The Minister of Agriculture, I thought rather unkindly, turned the responsibility over to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). As a matter of fact, I think it is a little unkind on my part to press for information from him, because I think he is wholly innocent of offence in this regard, and has been perhaps the victim of one of the mysterious temptations which we understand are now current in this Green Chamber. But we were told by the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Duncan Marshall had been sort of wrested from him by the Minister of the Interior. He said that frequently there was a sort of exchange made between ministers regarding officials of the depart-

ments, and the Minister of the Interior had pressed very earnestly for the loan of this brand new $6,000 official. The Minister of Agriculture also said that Mr. Marshall had been sent by the Government to Florida on a mission in connection with immigration. I should like to ask the minister (Mr. Stewart) to tell the House very frankly exactly what Mr. Duncan Marshall's mission to Florida was, and I desire to say to him, so that he will not be taken by surprise later, that I am frightfully sceptical of the strict accuracy of the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture that his mission was in any way closely identified with a necessary public service, and I think we might as well know frankly what Mr. Marshall is doing in Florida, why he is down there, and why the public money is being spent in that way.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall be very glad indeed to answer the hon. gentleman. I have never been in Florida and cannot speak with authority with respect to the advantages of sending one of our officials down there. However, Mr. Marshall is not an official of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Tolmie, who is in charge of the exhibits of the Department of the Interior, went to the Tampa Fair and put on an exhibit largely because, I am informed, it is the rendezvous of a very large number of Americans from the central states, who go down there and spend the winter months. He asked that a lecturer might be sent down to address a gathering on one of the days designated as Canada's day. Mr. Marshall was here and available and was sent down to deliver one address on a day specially dedicated by that fair to Canada. He made the trip, was gone one week, and for that time the department had not the services of Mr. Marshall.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister not think that is some distance to send a man to make one address before the class of people who would be assembled at Tampa, Florida, for the exhibition of the wares of Florida? What object could be gained for the country is a mystery to me. If there is one part of the world from which we expect no immigration, it is the sands of Florida, where they grow oranges and pineapples, and where people go to sit by the fireside and to spend their time keeping alight the last flickering tapers of their lives. That is what they go from the central states for.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. It is not the old people who go there from the central states. There is a large temporary population, who remain there for several weeks, and a number of families from Iowa go there, if my information is correct. I am aware of the fact that it is a winter resort, and a great many people from Canada and the northern states go down there. I quite agree that they would not be induced to come to Canada, and I do not want to be dragged into a discussion of what is going to happen in the central states, as far as immigration is concerned, but there is not any doubt that we are going to get a considerable number of people from the central states, if information coming to hand is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last people we would get would be people from the central states who go down to the Tampa exhibition. They are well-off people who have time to spare, and who are in the evening of their days.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend is wrong again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, I have been down there myself, but only for about three or four days, and it would take the minister a lot more time than this evening, and tomorrow evening, and all this session, to convince me that there was any bona fide purpose of getting immigration, or interesting people in immigration, by the visit of Mr. Marshall to Tampa, Florida.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps the whole question of the Canadian exhibit, so far as the Department of the Interior was concerned, was a mistake. However, I found him down there on an expedition which must undoubtedly have cost a considerable sum of money, and I am informed by Mr. Tolmie, who is in charge of the work, that it was a considerable advantage to Canada. I cannot speak authoritatively. I am only voicing the opinions of the officials.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many others were there?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think two others, in addition to Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Four altogether?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The cost would run into many thousands of dollars.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot say. I have no information.

Mr. MACLAREN: I notice the appointment of three new officials as immigration investigating officers. What duties do these three new officials perform?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are not three new officials; they are promotions. I explained that before the House rose at six o'clock. There is an addition of two, one being secretary to the deputy minister, the other being a female investigating officer. Those are the only additions to the staff. They may have different titles, but they are officials who were in the department.

Mr. MACLAREN: What does the female investigating officer do?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): She might perform any number of duties.

Mr. MACLAREN: I asked what duties she performed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Naturally, she would be carrying on investigations in connection with female immigrants who come to our ports. She might be investigating the question of females who were subject to being deported. She is simply an addition to the woman's organization of the department.

Mr. MANION: There is, throughout the country to-day, a widespread feeling that one of the very important necessities of Canada is a proper immigration policy. I should like the minister, if he can find it convenient at this time, to tell the House and the country something of the plans which he intends to put into operation to bring to Canada greater immigration than occurred during the years of the war.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would ask my hon. friend to delay that request until the general estimates are taken up. Before they are passed, I intend to take some time in explaining to the House some things that we propose to do in the way of securing immigration. Frankly, I am not in a position at present to go into the matter. There are still pending some questions that I would like to have settled. I think it is known that I am getting assistance from the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Low), the hon. senator Dandurand and the hon. senator Bostock. We have some matters on which we have not definitely made up our minds, and in regard to which we are desirous of recommending some changes. I am not, at this time prepared to speak upon those matters, and I would prefer to cover the whole field when we take up the immigration vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a fact, is it not, that, notwithstanding the war, which, of course, stopped all immigration and, indeed, caused emigration for war purposes, there was more immigration to Canada in the last decennial period prior to the census than in the ten years preceding?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not speak authoritatively with regard to that. I have not made an examination of the reports for the years mentioned by my right hon friend. Perhaps that information is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find it in the census statistics. I was struck by the fact that it was so much out of harmony with speeches made in the late campaign by the minister and his colleagues.

Mr. MANION: What are the figures of the immigration into Canada from 1915 on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The figures are:

1915	144,789
1916	48,537
1917	75,374
1918	79,074
1919	57,702
1920	117,336
1921	148,477

Mr. MEIGHEN: 1913?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): 402,432.

Mr. MANION: I knew these figures roughly myself because I had seen them a short time ago; but the reason I asked for them was that I wanted the minister to point out to the committee what is really a fact and something the people will be pleased to hear. While an immigration of 48,537, in 1916, was the lowest figure reached by this country in many years, even before the late Government went out of power, immigration had got back to 148,477. Therefore, the country, it seems to me, may feel well assured that immigration into Canada is coming back to what it was before the war; that is, so far as we wish it to come back. I shall be very much interested when the minister makes the statement he speaks of. I hope, when his estimates come up, he will be able to give the House a complete statement of what plans the Government proposes to carry out.

Mr. HOEY: How many native-born Canadians left this country for the United States during the past decade? I have in my possession an announcement that re-

minds me that a million and a half native-born Canadians have left Canada for the United States since 1911. I think the country should know that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I doubt if I could give the number of native-born Canadians who have left Canada, although the census figures will show it, in comparison with those who came to Canada as well as the birth rate. To say just what proportion of those who left were native-born Canadians, would be rather difficult.

Mr. HOEY: That statement has been given wide publicity. It was published recently in Maclean's magazine. From personal observation, and from looking at the matter from the viewpoint of a detached and disinterested student, I believe the statement to be absolutely true. Some one said that, in the old days, the test before you could get into the asylum for the insane, was a water test; that is to say, a water barrel without a bottom, was placed in a certain position. There was not, I am told, even a false bottom in it. The man who was seeking admission was asked to carry water and to put it into this bottomless barrel. If he continued to carry the water without protest, he was considered a fit subject to enter. If he refused, why he was turned out. It seems to me that we might seriously consider the advisability of stopping the leak.

Mr. MANION: While I cannot contradict the figure given by my hon. friend, I should very much doubt if any such number as one and a half millions left Canada for the United States in the last ten years, and I do not think any such statement can be proved. The minister should, at the very earliest opportunity, give the exact figure if it is possible to obtain it. I believe a figure has been given, but that included, not only native-born Canadians, but any others who might have come to this country from any of the countries of Europe.

Mr. HOEY: Admitting that, does the hon. member not think that a tragic situation in view of the fact that we ought to have better opportunities in this young nation for men to make a living, and that we would have, were it not for the economic policies that have been followed ever since Confederation by both historic parties in this country?

Mr. MANION: Can the hon. member tell me why so many people are emigrating from free trade England?

Mr. HOEY: Does the hon. member think that the comparison is fair, as between Great Britain and Canada at this stage in the development of both countries?

Mr. MANION: Well, we might compare Great Britain with Germany. Before the war the protectionist policy of Germany was increasing the population, and the movement was into that country and not away from it.

Mr. MORRISON: That was during the last two years before the war, when they were preparing for the fight.

Mr. THURSTON: What extra travelling does the minister propose for his officials this year, and for which he wants this additional $10,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The estimate for the past year was $40,000. In addition, an Order in Council was passed granting $12,000 to meet expenditures for the year 1922. That does not appear in the Estimates; they did not spend the full $12,000, having still $2,000 on hand. We are simply asking for the actual amount spent last year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is there more business in the department than previously? There is practically no immigration to-day, and I think that we might do without the vote entirely.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): There is a vote of $6,000 for a deputy minister. How long has the deputy been in the department? Was he in the service and in this particular department before he was made deputy?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The appointment was made either at the end of September or about the 1st of October.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): How long had the department been without a deputy before he was appointed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the first deputy.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Does the minister consider the work of the department sufficient to warrant this new appointment? Although a vote went through last year for the same amount, the minister says that the appointment was made in the fall of the year. Does he intend to keep this official?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My experience with the department is brief, but I

have some important things to say about the Department of Immigration. I do not agree with the hon. member who said that we should wipe out the whole vote, because I think that if the department were utilized in the way it should be, very substantial results could be obtained. I do not desire to be in the slightest way understood as reflecting on the work of the department in the past, because I know nothing about what it has done. I do know, however, that once you place the agriculturists of Canada in the position in which they should be, you will have a field for immigration into Canada. When you have done that you will need a Department of Immigration, and having charge of four departments, I think that if there is work enough for a minister in this department there should certainly be work for a deputy.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am glad to hear the minister say this, because it is evident that the Government intends to make agricultural conditions such as to encourage immigration into Canada—something that, I think, is sadly needed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be still more interesting if the minister would tell us what means he hopes to adopt.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The minister is asking for $4,500 for a commissioner of United States immigration. Has this official to do with immigrants coming from the United States exclusively?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Will the minister give, roughly, some comparative figures to show the immigration from the United States as compared with other countries, so that we may judge whether this official is warranted.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The following are the figures showing the immigration from the United States:

1915	59,779
1916	36,937
1917	61,389
1918	71,314
1919	40,715
1920	49,656
1921	48,059

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): What was the immigration from other countries in 1921?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All the other countries are apparently grouped together, Great Britain and the United States being separate. The immigration from Great Britain, during the years I have given, was:

1915	43,276
1916	8,664
1917	8,282
1918	3,178
1919	9,914
1920	59,603
1921	74,262

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Apparently there are more immigrants coming from Great Britain than from the United States. At least, there were in the last two years of the period. Now what are the duties of this Commissioner of United States Immigration? I suppose he must have a special office with some assistants, whereas the immigration from Great Britain does not seem to require a special official.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are nineteen offices in the United States at which immigration agents are stationed. I cannot give their names and locations, but that will come up in the general vote. Mr. White, who is in charge, is an officer of considerable experience in American immigration. Since taking charge of the department I have frequently consulted him. He is here at my request as I am anxious to get the views of the man on the ground. He visits the various offices scattered throughout the United States from the Pacific as far east as Chicago. He supervises the work and generally keeps in touch with the activities of the various agencies that seek through advertising and other methods to obtain suitable immigration.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): This work is all under his supervision.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: Have we any proper method of determining the number of people who leave Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give a very definite answer with respect to that, but offhand, I think it would be difficult to arrive at the correct figures. Of course, the census returns would give some indication.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me it is just like keeping your accounts on one side of the ledger only, if you count the people coming in and do not count the people going out. As most people travel by rail, and as our immigration officers are on all the trains, I think these officials might as well count the people going south and those

going north. We cannot have any real knowledge on which to base a proper immigration policy unless we have all the facts, and I would urge upon the minister to take counsel with the able men of his department in order to devise some method of obtaining these facts. I think they can be obtained.

Let me add, that while we are passing estimates it is the most tiresome thing in the world if members will not speak out—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER:—It is annoying not to hear the question as well as the answer. The acoustic properties of this Chamber are excellent if members will only speak in something higher than a conversational tone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. McMASTER: If you talk as if conversing to a friend in a small room, you cannot expect to be heard in a chamber of these dimensions.

Mr. HOEY: I would suggest that our immigration agents in the United States be instructed to receive native-born Canadians when they arrive there and help them to get comfortably settled; also to keep a record of the total number who go over there every year.

Mr. EVANS: Does number five on the list, Chief Inspector of Immigration, mean a medical inspector?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The inspector in question is Mr. Percy Reid, who has charge of the western section. Mr. Little has charge of the eastern section.

Mr. EVANS: As to medical inspection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, no.

Mr. EVANS: How is this medical inspection carried out? It seems to me that some of the present regulations dealing with the inspection of immigrants on the other side of the Atlantic are decidely obnoxious. I am advised that this medical inspection is conducted in a most unscientific and unsanitary manner. An old friend of mine coming across not very long ago told me that not only the immigrants but the saloon passengers boarding the ship at Liverpool were subjected to unheard-of indignities, an officer using his fingers to manipulate the eyelids of each passenger, without cleansing his hands between each operation. It did not matter what any of these passengers were suffering from, whether barber's itch, cancer or granulated eyelids, it was all the same to this officer, and as a result of the rough and unsanitary method adopted one lady suffered very severely with her eyes all the way over. I believe in thorough inspection of immigrants, but surely it can be done in a scientific and humane manner. But apparently the Liverpool treatment is mild compared with what takes place on this side. At the port of landing here is where the real embargo begins—a kind of slaughtered-on-the-dock, as it were. It is a shameful thing for this nation that men and women of all classes are herded together in pens waiting for inspection. I think that state of affairs should be altered at once.

Mr. SPENCER: I am going to give the House the type of advertising that was circulated in the States some years ago to attract immigrants to this country, because I hope that future advertising will not be along the same lines. Referring to the western provinces, where settlers were invited to take up land, the advertisement ran something like this:

> It was a common thing up there for the farmers to grow from forty to fifty bushels of Number One wheat to the acre. What one man can do, another can do. Those farmers up there have more real money to spend than any other people on the American continent.

We have been wondering why people attracted to this country by such immigration pamphlets do not remain here. Is it surprising that immigrants become disgusted, and leave when this sort of pamphlet entices them to pick up gold bricks, and instead they find a lot of hard work. I hope that this is not the sort of advertisement that is going to be circulated in future, unless we want to lose most of the immigrants who are attracted to this country by such misrepresentation.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like to add to what has been stated by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) in regard to medical inspection on the other side of the Atlantic. I have a case on my hands now of a Scotch family, the members of which bought their tickets and checked their baggage about a year ago. After they had gone through the preliminaries and were ready to sail, a doctor stopped one of the children, a little girl, on the ground that she was mentally deficient. These people had sold all their goods in order to put themselves in funds for the voyage, and as a result of the doctor's action they had to postpone their voyage, and go to work, boarding out all the time. After a year the doctor finally passed

the girl, and the family are ready to come to Canada, but they have spent all their money and are unable to pay their passage. Surely there is something wrong with the machinery of inspection when a case like this can happen.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I intend to deal with a great many of the questions that have been raised by hon. members with a view to prevent the recurrence of such cases as have been mentioned, but I regret that I am unable to do so to-night because we have not yet come to any definite conclusions as to what is best to be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I notice that the staff of this department has been increased by six. The minister shakes his head. Well, one hundred and twenty-six and six make a hundred and thirty-two, which is the number given for the current year. What is the explanation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Simply this: two of them are additions—the secretary to the deputy minister, and the female investigational officer. The others were in the department, but were paid last year from the general contingencies vote; they are now transferred to the civil government vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): When were these two added?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In September and October.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Just about the time the new deputy minister was appointed. I wanted that answer in relation to my other question about the deputy minister. The right hon. leader of the Opposition stated the other day when the estimates of some other department were under consideration that when a new deputy head is appointed, he wants a staff. That is proved here; we have a new deputy head who takes on two people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one, I understand.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes; the other, the lady investigational officer, was attached to the women's branch.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): She would come under the supervision of the deputy, would she not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand she came on some time before the deputy was appointed. As regards the Department of Immigration, I would like to make one comment in view of certain observations that have been made. Up to the war our immigration had increased almost continuously. It was at its highest point just before the war—some 448,000 in one year. The population undoubtedly was increasing—not, of course, at the full speed of the immigration returns and of the natural increase as well, but, proportionate to that, the increase was equal to that of any other country. The United States itself has a tremendous immigration. Every country in the world has immigration. It is true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Manion) says, that the immigration into Germany was the least marked of all, particularly subsequent to 1878. But every country, particularly every northern country, has immigration. Our immigration figures are most satisfactory up to 1914. Naturally the war practically put a stop to immigration; everybody knows the reason why. With the cessation of hostilities the Department of Immigration was reorganized to meet the situation. The returns for last year show results; the returns for this year, I have not the slightest doubt, will show good results as well. Indeed, we might have had hundreds of thousands more immigrants—and no one knows this better than the minister himself—had we opened the doors and let them in. But the laws of this country, and the will of the people reflected in those laws, are such that we do not propose to open the doors indiscriminately to immigration. A great deal of the expense, a great deal of the executive activities of the department, are directed to the selecting of immigration, the weeding out, at the proper point for doing so of those who come. I should be sorry indeed to see anything in the way of slackening of energy on the part of the Immigration Department. Certainly there is work enough there for a good deputy; the bigger and the abler the deputy, the better results we are going to have. If there is any department of government in which I would like to see increased rather than diminished activity, it is the Department of Immigration and Colonization. Furthermore, in western Canada at the present time, as all of us know, there is a great voluntary movement, a big voluntary organization, which is interesting itself in colonization. I have not myself gone fully into the details of its organization, but I know many of those who have put them-

selves behind it and are determined to make it succeed. That organization should have close relations with the Department of Immigration and Colonization, and the work of the two together should, I think, go a long way to solve the problem of peopling the near-railway lands of western Canada. The time now is not to talk about slackening down the activities of the Immigration Department, but rather to speed them up. We are sufficiently past the war to get the impetus we need so much in this country. The nation that is going to succeed best in the post war period is the nation that directs its immigration policy along soundest lines and puts the most horse power and momentum behind it.

Mr. JELLIFF: Mr. Chairman, I did not have the slightest idea of saying anything in regard to these estimates, but I wish to support as strongly as I can the remarks that have just been made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). If ever there was an occasion for liberality in connection with our immigration policy, it is the present. It is only a year or two since, under the influence, I presume, of the leader of the Opposition, something like $500,000 was appropriated by the government to carry out surveys and plans for the redemption of southern Alberta through the irrigation projects that have been set on foot in that province. I want to give the hon. leader of the Opposition credit for hard work and painstaking effort in connection with these projects. Now, what is our position to-day? I am not going to depend too much upon my memory to-night, because I did not expect to speak on this subject. But of the 12,000,000 acres to the south of Calgary that are within the boundaries of the area affected by the drought, 5,000,000 acres approximately are in the hands of farmers. In that area there are 20,000 farmers, or, allowing four to each family, a farm population of 80,000. With the help of the government they have started to lay out and extend their surveys to redeem that whole country from the affliction of drought. Let me point out to you what that means. Take Lethbridge as a centre, and draw a circle which will include the affected area. In 1915, the year of our bumper crop in that part of the country, we shipped from that area 41,000,000 bushels of grain. In 1916 we shipped 39,000,000 bushels. A dry season followed, and in 1917 the crop yield dropped to about 18,000,000 bushels. The drought and the dry seasons continued, and in 1919 only 4,000,000 bushels were shipped from there.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon member's attention to the fact that we are on item 7, the vote for immigration and colonization.

Mr. JELLIFF: I will attempt, Mr. Chairman, to connect this up, if you will allow me to place a few figures before the committee. The area which in 1915 produced 41,000,000 bushels of grain for shipment, produced in 1919 only 4,000,000 bushels. In 1919 we shipped 4,000,000 bushels only, but 1920 was a better year, with more moisture, and our shipments rose to 19,000,000 bushels. Then last year again we had dry conditions and our shipments decreased to 7,000,000 bushels. So you will see how important a national problem it is when production drops down to almost one-tenth between the years 1915 and 1919. There is only one way to solve the problem and that is to place the farmers on a basis where they can depend upon sufficient production to make a living for themselves and their families, and the way to do that is to introduce artificial irrigation throughout that territory. That is what we are doing. Those farmers have bonded their farms for that purpose to the amount of $40 per acre.

Now the application my remarks have to the item under discussion is simply this: This is a question of colonization. The individual farms out there are large in area, and the farmers, in order to make a success of irrigation, must subdivide their farms into plots not exceeding 160 acres each, and engage in a more intensified agriculture. For that purpose immigrants have to be found and brought into this country who are acquainted with irrigation methods. That must be done through the Department of Immigration, and the department must have sufficient funds available and enough men at its disposal to go out into the irrigation districts of the United States and carefully select immigrants who have had experience in irrigation methods. Every town and every city in southern Alberta is interested in this question; our railroads depend upon it, and I trust that when the minister brings down his final estimates they will contain an appropriation to help fill up that southern Alberta country with a suitable class of immigrants who will help subdivide these lands and bring up their families on them.

If that is done that whole territory instead of being a liability, as it has been at times in the past, will be a positive asset to the whole country. I might mention that in the Budget recently brought down by the government of Alberta quite a sum of money is provided for this same immigration work, which really should be carried on by the federal government, and I think I am quite within my rights in urging that this Government should at least go fifty-fifty with the province of Alberta in backing up that project and settling the country.

Mr. IRVINE: Do I understand that my hon. friend has moved for an increase in the vote for that purpose?

Mr. JELLIFF: No, I simply suggested that the supplementary estimates should contain an appropriation for that purpose.

Customs and Excise—salaries, $559,385; contingencies, $48,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I notice that there are in this department 94 clerks, costing $125,250, who are engaged in statistical work. As this is not constructive work, I think we could pare down the item by at least $100,000.

Mr. CRERAR: I have been doing a little research work in respect to the cost of civil government in this country, and I find that in respect to the Department of Customs the total cost of civil government twenty years ago was $41,690: ten years later, in 1913, it had risen to $276,000, and the amount which my hon. friend is asking the committee to vote this year is $559,000. That is a very considerable growth. The expenditure has practically doubled in ten years, for the Department of Customs alone.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs): The Inland Revenue Department does not exist separately now; it is merged with the Department of Customs.

Mr. CRERAR: There is still an increase of over $200,000. Perhaps my hon. friend could give some explanation of that very considerable increase.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend has quoted the figures of ten years ago. Ten years ago we collected $73,000,000 at a cost of $2,187,174.76. In 1921 we col-

9 p.m. lected in round figures, $209,000,000 at a cost of $5,000,000. As my hon. friend knows, these estimates cover both Customs and Excise. I would point out that although in item 13 on page 8 there is an apparent increase of $10,745, that is really a sub-normal increase. The normal increase would be about double that amount. We have 231 clerks in the service who are entitled to statutory increases, and if conditions were normal the salaries of last year would be increased this year by $17,945. Now, there is an increase of $10,000 which I may explain. Some hon. gentleman referred to a remark which had dropped from the lips of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that when a new minister came in he wanted a staff. I think it is only right he should have one, and when I was on the other side of the House I always advocated that, not only should a minister have a staff of his own, who should follow his fate, and when the minister goes out should go out with him, but that the members of the House are entitled to secretaries of their own. I do not think it is right that we should send our private papers down to a room where there are 50, or 60, or perhaps 100 stenographers, and where the papers would be open to the curiosity of all-comers. But this increase of $10,000 is due to the fact that we have taken advantage of a clause of the Civil Service Act, which provides that in any case where the commission decides that it is not practicable, in the public interest, to apply this act to any position or positions, the commission may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, exclude such position or positions in whole or in part from the operation of the act. Under that recommendation, the commission have excluded certain positions; for instance private secretary, secretary-clerk as they call him, and the secretary to the executive, one senior clerk-stenographer, one clerk-stenographer and one confidential messenger. That accounts for the increase. As I said, if things were as usual, we would have the ordinary amount of salaries, plus the statutory increase of $17,945, but this increase, with the $14,160, will make a total of $32,105. The salaries of nine positions, amounting to $12,630, have been discontinued during the past year, and a reduction of $8,730 has been effected by promotion, transfer, etc., making a total saving of $21,360, or a net increase of $10,745. I may say that the positions to which the minister was allowed to make appointments in his department are those which I have enumerated, secretary clerk, $3,360; secretary to the executive, $1,860; senior clerk-stenographer, $1,630, clerk-stenographer, $1,260, and confidential messenger. So that this is not an increase, it is a sub-normal increase.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not quite understand the minister. Does he say there are twenty-five less employees now?

Mr. BUREAU: Apparently, there are nine less.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought he said there was a saving of twenty-one employees. Amounting to how much in money?

Mr. BUREAU: $12,000 odd.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When did that take place?

Mr. BUREAU: That took place during the year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When?

Mr. BUREAU: I could not say the date.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the election probably.

Mr. BUREAU: Before and after.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many after?

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot say from memory, but I know I have seen cases where the positions were not filled.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many positions were dropped, whether by complete retirement, or under what is known as the Calder Act, prior to the end of the year in his department? I think he will find that before he had any opportunity to reverse the policy very considerable economies were effected there.

Mr. BUREAU: I am informed not in the inside service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were nearly all in the outside service, but these were in the inside service; I think there were nine anyway before the end of the year, besides scores in the outside service.

Mr. BUREAU: I am informed not, but I have not had time to go through all the —I do not know how to qualify it—all the doings of my predecessors. I have no doubt I will have a job when I go into it, but I will go into it and give the information to my hon. friend. If he wants credit for all the good that he has done, I am not in a position to refuse it, because I do not know anything about it, but next year I will be able to give him credit for all he deserves, and blame him where he deserves it, and I have no doubt upon which side the balance will be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor have I. The Postmaster General has a much larger department, and he is no abler a man than the hon. gentleman. How was it he was able, three or four days ago, to give us all the information while the Minister of Customs, whose department is not of the magnitude of the Post Office Department is not able to give us that information?

Mr. BUREAU: If it will soothe the feelings of the right hon. gentleman, I will bring it down. You cannot expect me to have all the information at my finger-tips. The Post Office Department may have more officers, but they are not scattered all over the Dominion, and they have not as difficult duties as the officers of this department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the other minister was not afraid of giving credit to us for the work we did.

Mr. BUREAU: I have never been afraid to give credit to hon. gentlemen for what they have done, because it has not amounted to much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry the minister has a sort of off-period to-night, but we will wait in patience.

Mr. MILLER: Does the question of liquor export in Saskatchewan fall under this department?

Mr. BUREAU: No, that would come under the outside service; this is only the inside service.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is for external use—not internal.

Mr. BRETHEN: I notice here that a sum of $548,640 was asked for 1921-22, and the sum of $607,385 is asked for 1922-23, so that we must accept the minister's explanation of the sub-normal increase, but I would like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that the imports had decreased from $1,305,593,000 a year ago to $778,702,000, why there should not be a decrease in the expenditure?

Mr. BUREAU: I may answer the hon. gentleman that we have not only to collect the revenue, but we have to protect the revenue. Now there has been put under the charge of the Customs Department the sales tax, which involves a lot of work, the prohibitive legislation and the bonding of liquor in the dry provinces.

An hon. MEMBER: What provinces are they?

Mr. BUREAU: Provinces that are supposed to be dry but which are importing more liquor than the wet provinces,—for export purposes, I suppose. The legislation passed by those provinces has given rise to a lot of illicit distilling, boot-legging and moon-shining.

Mr. BRETHEN: Would that be outside or inside work?

Mr. BUREAU: Outside. When we talk about inside work, we must not forget that all the outside work has to come to the inside,—the head office. There is only one control in the Department of Customs. What these men do must be controlled. I would not be able to give my hon. friend any information this evening, if all the various officials in the outside service did not reuort to the officials in the inside service. It is only in that way that we can control them and compile the information in our statistics.

Mr. SALES: I notice in the list of officials a supervisor of drawback claims and, lower down, four checkers of drawback claims, costing us altogether $6,360 for the four checkers and $2,520 for the supervisor or a total of $8,880 to superintend drawback claims. I do not know how much it cost us to collect the amount, but this drawback business seems to be an expensive one.

Mr. BUREAU: Drawbacks each year amount to about $15,000,000, and they have to be very closely watched and controlled. That cannot be done unless we have properly qualified officers for the work, and we cannot get them unless we pay them a sufficient salary.

Mr. CRERAR: I notice further down on the page a provision for sixty two customs excise statistical clerks, involving an expenditure of $91,000. The other evening, when the estimates of the Labour Department were under consideration, I drew to the attention of the committee the fact that the Labour Department appeared to be building up a statistical branch with an expensive staff to look after work that might very properly be done in the Bureau of Statistics. Would it not be possible to have this work done in the Bureau of Statistics, where they have all the equipment and machinery for doing it at a much less cost than it is done in the minister's department?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Before the minister answers, I would remind him of the figures I gave a few minutes ago of 94 clerks engaged in statistical work, and costing altogether $125,250.

Mr. BUREAU: These clerks are engaged in getting statistics compiled from entries which are kept under the Customs and Excise Act for the Trade and Navigation Report. These statistics are issued monthly. They are taken from all the invoices that are scattered over all the ports in the Dominion. They are transferred afterwards to the Department of Trade and Commerce. This work could not be done otherwise, because those invoices cannot be made open to the public; even under the act they are considered confidential.

Mr. CRERAR: Would it not be possible to have the compilation of those statistics done in the Bureau of Statistcis?

Mr. BUREAU: No, because the invoices are in the various ports of the Dominion. They come to Ottawa afterwards; but if they were to be handed over to some other department, we would lose control absolutely, and if anything should happen after an entry was put through, we would not have the entry with us; or we would have to make copies, and that would involve another expenditure without any corresponding benefit.

Mr. HARRIS: Have the secretary-clerk and the confidential messenger, mentioned in the list as additional for 1922-23, taken the places of men who, perhaps, had charge of that work in the former ministry; and, if so, do they intend to stay with the department, or will the minister take them with him when he goes?

Mr. BUREAU: The situation is just as I have stated. I will not take them with me when I go, but they will go when I go. Not a man, woman or girl in the general office, or the minister's office, has been removed. These are employes the minister has a right to have in his office, and their life in the service is equal to the life of a minister as a minister.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): It appears a new position has been created, that of General Executive Assistant. Was this office in existence last year?

Mr. BUREAU: No. This office has been created as part of the reorganization of the department. As I said a few minutes ago, both Customs and Excise have been combined with the result that a large

direct saving has been effected. I will give credit to my hon. friends for having brought that about. I did not do it, but I am carrying on the plan of the reorganization.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one deputy minister?

Mr. BUREAU: He is not a deputy minister; he is Commissioner of Customs and Excise. He was Commissioner of Customs, and he, who was heretofore deputy minister of Inland Revenue, is now assistant commissioner of Customs and Excise. Instead of having a collector of Customs and a collector of Inland Revenue, we have one collector of Customs and Excise at each port. My hon. friends may take credit for that. It is a feather in their cap. I am going on with my explanation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A little louder.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend understands. He hears me quite well. This business requires reorganization which has been commenced, and, as I have said, legislation in the various provinces has created a great deal of preventive work and the sales tax has also created a great deal of work. I do not think the House is desirous of merely having taxes imposed. The imposition of taxes would not pay our debt very fast; we have to collect the taxes. The collection is the important part, and to collect the taxes, we must have a staff to do the work. The staff has been found insufficient to do the work properly. As I said a few minutes ago, the outside work comes inside. The commissioner and the assistant commissioner are not able to cope with the work which is imposed upon them. The minister himself is not able to attend to all the work of receiving delegations from morning till night. This takes another officer whom we are going to call General Executive Assistant, who is going to be an assistant to all these officers in the department. For this position a man is required who knows thoroughly the customs laws, the excise law, all the regulations that are passed by the department, who is familiar with seizures, with all the routine of the department, who knows the interpretation to be given to the various items of the tariff, the various regulations that are being passed, who can assist the minister to receive delegations, and who can be a supervisor of all the work done in the department and be in a position, by his knowledge and experience, to control it. This is an absolute necessity; otherwise, the officers at present in the department could not cope with the work.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): A little further down the list I notice a supervisor of refund claims and further on four checkers. Will the minister explain just what are the duties of supervisor of refund claims?

Mr. BUREAU: Those are refunds of overpaid duties. All those claims for refunds, after they have passed through the hands of customs officer at the port, come to the department, and they have to be checked and controlled. This supervisor certifies all claims that are made and the moneys paid back for refunds.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Do I understand that those are corrections that have been made by officers of the department? In other words, are they mistakes that must be corrected?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, very often a man will import some goods, and they turn out to be not according to the order. In that case, if, within the time allowed by law, he returns the goods, he is entitled to a refund, because he does not use them. There may be errors in the invoice or in the appraisal. Sometimes, machinery that comes to this country does not suit the purpose for which it was ordered. It is returned, and it would not be fair to keep the money collected as duty upon such goods. We refund the money to the importers. I understand that the money saved pays the salary of the officer in charge, and the staff as well, ten times over.

Mr. BROWN: Does the refund include the moneys that are paid back to certain manufacturers when goods are exported?

Mr. BUREAU: The manufacturers are given a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty on raw materials entering into the manufacture of goods that they export.

Mr. EVANS: The minister says that the important thing is to collect the revenue. I would suggest that the really important thing is to retain the revenue, and not pay some $15,000,000 back to the manufacturers in the form of a drawback. What percentage of the duty is paid in the shape of drawback, and on what articles?

Mr. BUREAU: It would be difficult to answer that question in detail offhand.

Mr. EVANS: Does the minister think that it is good business to pay $10,000 for handling $15,000,000 in the way of draw-

back? My hon. friends to the right contend that we should have a tariff in order to get a revenue. Well, is it a sane policy to pay $15,000,000 in the form of a drawback on raw material when our own natural resources are undeveloped?

Mr. BUREAU: A rebate of 99 per cent of the duty on raw materials entering into the manufacture of articles that are exported is allowed. The manufacturing of these goods provides labour in Canada, and we desire to encourage our export trade. We lose nothing. We did not have the raw material, but we had the benefit of the labour, and we keep one per cent of the duty to pay expenses.

Mr. BROWN: I would ask the question put by the ex-Minister of Finance so persistently in the Tariff Commission: Where do you get your revenue?

Mr. BUREAU: We get it from the articles that are imported and remain in Canada for consumption. We get our revenue from the excise and income taxes and the sales tax. That is where we get our revenue; but we want to encourage Canadian industry.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: If foreign material is required for the manufacture of goods in Canada we tell the manufacturer to bring in that material and pay the duty, and when he exports the goods we will refund 99 per cent, keeping one per cent for the trouble of putting through the entry.

Mr. CRERAR: I want to draw a point to the attention of the minister and also to the notice of my hon. friends to the right, who appear to be getting a great deal of satisfaction out of his remarks. We import steel and iron from the United States for the manufacture of agricultural implements. On that material we pay a duty. The Canadian manufacturer makes the implements and if he sells them in Canada the cost to the Canadian consumer is increased by the extent of that duty. I think my hon. friend will agree in that statement. If, however, the manufacturer exports those implements to the United States he gets a drawback on the duty. So that the actual fact of the matter is that our Canadian manufacturers are thereby enabled to supply the American farmer with Canadian implements cheaper than the Canadian farmer can obtain them in Canada. Does the minister think that that is a desirable policy?

[Mr. Evans.]

Mr. BUREAU: Rolled steel and pig iron when used in the manufacture of mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders, and attachments for binders get a drawback of 99 per cent. The American does not enjoy the advantage of making the implements, and I do not think that Canadian implements, by reason of the drawback, sell cheaper in the United States than in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad to have even one solitary voice in support of my remarks. My hon. friend says that these implements would be cheaper in the United States than in Canada. I am not able to go into that question now, because I do not know the price of agricultural implements in the United States, but it has been the practice to pay this drawback and it is intended to encourage manufacturing on this side of the line. If you have to import raw material it is only fair that when you do not consume the finished product here you should get a rebate upon it. We do not lose anything because our workmen are employed.

Mr. EVANS: What are the chief articles on which this drawback is paid?

Mr. BUREAU: There are various kinds of raw material on which the drawback is paid, but I cannot name them offhand. If the hon. member will put a question on the Order Paper I will see that he gets the information.

Mr. HALBERT: Does the minister think that one per cent pays the full expense in connection with this matter?

Mr. BUREAU: I am informed, not.

Mr. HALBERT: I was thinking that if it did, and you could run the whole department as cheaply as that, you could save money.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Is it not a fact that a drawback is paid on the duty on raw materials that go into the manufacture of implements sold in Canada?

Mr. BUREAU: In the Customs Tariff Act, at page 96, under the heading "Goods subject to drawback for home consumption" in article, No. 1002, there is a list of articles on which a drawback is given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That provision was made at the time of the last reduction in duties on these articles. Is it not a fact that by means of the rebate or drawback as it is called on the raw material, the export trade thus developed adds to the scale of

production that it brings down the cost of the manufactured article in the home country?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. EVANS: Why is it that we do not use our raw materials in the manufacture of these goods? Since we are told that we should develop our natural resources, why do we import such raw material as iron and steel and other things that enter into the manufacture of implements to-day when our own forests and mines abound in these things and 250,000 men are idle at home? Is this the policy that we are going to maintain as a national policy?

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question a little time ago, but I did not get an answer from you, nor from the minister, and I rather think he treated it as a joke. I should like to know now, through the chairman, if remarks regarding export liquor houses in dry provinces are in order?

Mr. BUREAU: That matter will come up later, Mr. Chairman, when the outside service is discussed. I did not treat the question as a joke. It is a very serious question and I am ready to discuss it with my hon. friend when the other estimates come up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood that point to be well covered by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the first day that estimates were submitted. You then ruled that the general policy of the department, whether directly or indirectly connected with the item before the committee, might be discussed within reasonable limits. Therefore with that ruling in effect it is perfectly clear that the hon. member is in order in discussing the outside service.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the question?

Mr. MILLAR: The province voted "dry" by a very large majority, and yet there are export liquor houses in operation that can not be controlled by the provincial government, and up to the present time the federal government has refused to take action for their suppression. Those houses serve as supply depots for the bootlegger, and also for those who are running liquor across the line into the United States, cars going backwards and forwards at all hours of the night. The work of the police who are kept there in an effort to control the situation leads sometimes to danger to life, because these liquor runners are armed and desperate men. What is the attitude of the minister towards these export liquor houses?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think they are under our jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman, because they are duty-paid liquor stores, and the moment we get our duty we have no more control over them. If my hon. friend means there are any bonded warehouses, my reply is that we do not grant any licenses for them unless we have the consent of the attorney general in the province. There are only two bonded warehouses in Saskatchewan, the licenses for which were granted long ago. I think my hon. friend is dealing with a matter which comes more under the jurisdiction of the provincial government than of this Government.

Mr. MILLAR: There are more than two. I think I am using the proper term, "export liquor houses."

Mr. BUREAU: They are not bonded warehouses.

Mr. MILLAR: I have received several petitions from local people protesting against those export liquor houses. The Minister of Agriculture was, I believe, in the provincial house when this controversy took place. The provincial government has always taken the attitude that it has gone as far as it possibly could in barring those houses.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a matter within our jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLAR: The question has been discussed many times as to who is responsible, and we are led by the provincial authorities to believe that the federal government is responsible.

Mr. BUREAU: No, Mr. Chairman. They are not bonded warehouses, they are duty-paid warehouses, and entirely under the control of the provincial government. I am informed that there are only two bonded warehouses in Saskatchewan, and that the licenses for those were granted quite a while ago. I am also informed that the licensees have only been granted sufficient time to liquidate their stock, and have no right to import any more liquor.

Mr. MILLAR: I am told there are seventeen such houses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that the licenses were granted under the approval of the attorney general of the province?

Mr. BUREAU: That has been and still is the policy of the department. We do not grant any licenses unless we get the approval of the Attorney General attached to the petition for the license; at the same time we have the designation of the warehouse by him.

Mr. GOULD: Perhaps I can throw a little light on the subject. The majority of the warehouses referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) are in the electoral district of Assiniboia, and, along with him, I have received many petitions protesting against their continuance. Likewise, I personally know of some of the acts done because of these warehouses. I believe there are twelve or fifteen on the southern line in my own electoral district.

Mr. BUREAU: They are not ours.

Mr. GOULD: Last year I placed questions on the Order Paper concerning those warehouses, and the replies given to me by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue I accepted in good faith. Those replies were to the effect that the Dominion Government did not have any bonded warehouses there. Premier Martin took exception to that, and I believe he carried on a discussion with the then Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, contending that the Dominion government was responsible, and repudiating the answers which had been given to me. When I returned home I complained that I had not been taken into the confidence of the premier of Saskatchewan and that in the provincial campaign he had used the information given to me by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue.

As it appears to me the circumstances are these. On our referendum in Saskatchewan we voted for only a partially "dry" province, and not for a "bone dry" province. But it appears that certain liquor interests throughout Canada—and the charge is made that Jewish capitalists are at the back of it all—made application to the provincial government for the privilege of erecting warehouses in Saskatchewan. In my questions I used the word "license," but it seems that the authorities of Saskatchewan contended that I should have employed the word "tax." A tax of $1,000 was imposed for the privilege of erecting each of these liquor houses. I believe that at the last session of the legislature that tax was increased to $5,000. In correspondence and in discussion I have taken the ground: If you want to carry out the wishes of the people of the province, as expressed in the referendum, why do you not impose a million dollar tax?

It seems to me that if the license had not been granted by the provincial govenrment the federal government would have had nothing whatever to do with the export business, because the buildings would not have been there. I protest in the name of decency and good government against those buildings being permitted, because the traffic carried on by means of them is a menace to life and property and a disgrace and shame to the community. The women in those localities fear to remain alone because of the traffic that is being carried on by the rum-runners, desperate characters that come in all the way from as far south as Oklahoma in big cars, as many as eight such cars loaded with liquor leaving one small town in an afternoon. This is a condition that I object to, and I would be glad if something could be done to remedy it. For myself—and I am sure I speak also for my people—if it is a matter of the department losing revenue, I would rather see it go without one cent of revenue if the result would be to do away with the abuses to which I refer.

Mr. BUREAU: The liquor to which my hon. friend refers is duty paid liquor, stored with the consent and on the responsibility of the provincial government. We did not get a cent of revenue from it. It was in the province before the law came into force. The moment the duty on it was paid, the liquor belonged to the individual and the Crown had no control over it. There are no bonded warehouses for export licensed by the Dominion government in Saskatchewan, with the exception of the two that I have just referred to. These two were licensed with the approval of the Attorney General of Saskatchewan.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not like the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), that the cost of Canadian goods to the Canadian consumer is increased by the duty, to pass wholly without challenge. There was a case not long ago in New Brunswick where it became necessary, through default under a contract, for the person entitled to certain goods to purchase them in the American rather than in the Canadian market. The result was that with practically the same freight mileage, the cost of a farm article of similar character delivered in New

Brunswick was higher than the Canadian cost by the amount of the duty, showing that the Canadian manufacturer did not take advantage of the duty. The statement of the hon. member for Marquette was, no doubt, made in good faith, but I think it was an attempt to sum up the prejudices of the party which he leads against the customs tariff of this country. It may have been based upon an observation made at some time or in some place under fortuitous circumstances, but in my judgment it is not a correct summing up of the general operation of the tariff. The round of applause with which he was greeted was not so much an expression of a concurrence in his view as it was a protest against the administration of a customs tariff.

Mr. IRVINE: In answer to a question put, I think, by the hon. member for Marquette, did I understand the minister to say that the increase of $10,000 was due in part to his employing certain persons who would leave the department when he left?

Mr. BUREAU: Part of the increase is due to that.

Mr. IRVINE: Is that ordinary patronage?

Mr. BUREAU: It is ordinary necessity, for the proper working of the minister's office.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not think it is ordinary necessity. I am opposed to the voting of $10,000 simply in order that a minister may have his staff leave when he goes. It is bad policy, because the efficiency they have acquired while under him is lost to the country. I am opposed to that kind of thing.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) made the statement that the practice of paying drawback claims on raw material entering into the manufacture of implements sold in Canada commenced seven or eight years ago, at the time of the reduction of the duties on agricultural implements. Is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said I thought it took place on the occasion of the last reduction. But it may not have been at that time, for there was a reduction since—I think it was in the spring of 1919. I am not positive as to my information, but that is my impression.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I thought it was rather new light on this subject of the reduction of the duties on agricultural implements. The minister has in his department a tax-collecting organization, and within it there is another and smaller organization to hand back a portion of the taxes he collects. As has been suggested, the most important function of the tax-collecting agency is to retain the taxes collected. I submit that the minister should consider the advisability of adopting a saner policy in this regard and do away with the organization which has been set up within his department—not by him, of course—for the purpose of handing back a portion of the taxes taken in. He has a supervisor with assistants who receive salaries amounting to $8,000 for the purposes of these refunds. Would it not be better for the department simply to collect such taxes as they intend to keep?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Can the minister give us any information as to the amounts refunded on duties collected on farm tractors under $1,400 in value? A rebate of these duties was authorized, I understand, in 1919. Some hon. gentlemen to our left have been criticizing the refund of duties, and I think it is important that the committee should know how much is refunded on tractors inported into Canada for farm purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: All tractors valued at $1,400 and under were entered free of duty under the order of remission and refund. There was no refund, because they were entered free.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): How is it that Canadian manufacturers are importing steel and iron from the United States or elsewhere when we have down in Nova Scotia a steel industry whose workmen are employed only on half time? Is that encouraging home industry?

Mr. BUREAU: That is a matter I would have to consult the manufacturers about. It is more related to their business than to the administration of this department.

Mr. CALDWELL: With regard to the remark of the hon. gentleman for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter), he surely knew better than to make the statement he did that the duty does not enhance the cost of goods purchased in Canada. Does my hon. friend tell me that Henry Ford does not take advantage of the duty on automobiles when we are paying $260 more for a car on the Canadian side than on the American side?

I was also surprised to hear the ex-Minister of Finance say that farm machinery did not sell dearer in Canada than the United States, because when the Tariff Commission sat in New Brunswick last year I supplied the commission with a very comprehensive list setting forth the figures at which a certain firm was selling farm machinery in New Brunswick and in the state of Maine, at two points only six miles apart. The figures were very much higher for New Brunswick than the state of Maine. We paid as much as $65 more for a potato sprayer in New Brunswick than our neighbours paid for the same article in the state of Maine. This present year we are paying $9 per ton more than they are paying in Maine for the same fertilizer shipped from a Canadian factory. I have the two price lists on my file upstairs, printed in a Canadian office, for fertilizer shipped from a Canadian factory. Going into the state of Maine, this fertilizer passes over two roads, and a longer haul, whereas it has only one road to pass over to reach the county of Carleton; yet it is selling for $9 more per ton in Carleton county than in the state of Maine. There is absolutely no manufacturing done at this fertilizer plant in Canada; they simply import the chemicals free of duty, mix the ingredients, barrel the fertilizer, ship it out, and sell it to the American consumer $9 per ton cheaper than to the New Brunswick consumer. Last year the difference in the price was $15 per ton; I have those price lists too on my file upstairs, on the company's own bill head, for this fertilizer shipped from a Canadian plant.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would the minister say how much was expended under this vote last year?

Mr. BUREAU: This is the first year of consolidation so it is pretty hard to tell, but I am informed that practically the whole salary list was paid, and that about $42,000 was expended under contingencies, with some bills still to come in.

Mr. McTAGGART: I understood the minister to say that the total revenue for excise and customs in 1921 was approximately $209,000,000 collected at a cost of approximately $5,000,000. How much of that was excise and how much customs revenue?

Mr. BUREAU: The customs revenue for 1920-21 was $179,695,137.72 and excise $116,918,750.31.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Charges of Management—amount to be voted, $965,000.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): It will be noticed there is a small reduction in the offices of the Assistant Receivers General and Country Savings Banks. This is due to some readjustment and the dropping of some temporary clerks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the closing of one office I think.

Mr. FIELDING: I think perhaps so. There is an increase, apparently a large one, for printing, advertising, inspection, express and so forth. That is largely accounted for by the express charges on gold. As the House is aware, the export of gold from the Dominion by private parties is forbidden; the gold from our mines is received by the Government and refined at the Mint. Then we have to express it to the United States, and the express charges on our shipments to the United States have increased very largely, but a gratifying feature of that increase is that it really represents a large increase in the output of our gold mines. For example, in 1918 our Canadian gold refined at the Mint was about 300,000 ounces; in 1919, 500,000 ounces; in 1920, 750,000 ounces, and in 1921, 1,100,000 ounces. All this passed through the Mint and had to be sent to the United States. That is the chief explanation of that increase.

10 p.m.

There is a small increase for brokerage on the purchase of sinking funds, but that is governed entirely by the amount that may be purchased.

At the bottom of the list there is an increase of $100,000 for clerical assistance in connection with the transfer and registration of bonds, the flotation of loans, and so forth. The House is aware that we have to look forward to the issuing of very large refunding loans. That is the chief explanation for the very considerable increase in this item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With respect to the last item, I take it from what the minister says that this is to cover the cost of a refunding loan for the issue of $184,000,000 falling due in December. I take it that it is for the purpose of looking after a domestic loan that this money will be required.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that is probably correct, although we have not yet made any final determination. It is, however, for refunding a domestic loan.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only reason I rose was to say that if it was for a foreign loan, accompanied with the usual underwriting, and the like, the increase seems unnecessary, but if it is for a domestic loan there is no doubt my hon. friend requires the vote.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the minister explain the item of $400,000 for printing Dominion notes?

Mr. FIELDING: This is the same amount as voted last year. It is the amount paid to the company which has the contract for printing our Dominion notes. There has been in that service of late years a considerable increase, explained simply by the volume of notes which the trade of the country requires.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend referred to the question of refunding loans. I think in one of the early discussions of the session reference was made to some financing in New York in regard to railway loans, and the remark was made, I think, by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that he approved of that method of financing, because it avoided the payment of commission. I should like to know from my hon. friend the minister whether or not that loan of $11,000,000 in New York was arranged without the payment of any brokers' commission.

Mr. FIELDING: I contemplated at a later stage making a full explanation of that, but I have no objection to answer at once. We did not exactly advertise, but invited proposals from leading financial houses in New York. They named their price and we got their price, and no commission in any shape or form was paid, as far as I am aware.

Item agreed to.

Uuforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before parliament within fifteen days of next session, $75,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Experience has shown that the appropriation in that respect has been insufficient, and we have been called upon to meet the difficulty by Governor General's warrant. I think it will be found that we will require the whole sum. It is difficult to estimate in advance what may be required. Experience has shown that $40,000 is insufficient.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask what the amount paid last year was, and for what purpose?

Mr. FIELDING: The deputy informs me that, including the Governor General's warrant, the expenditure of the last year will be about $78,000.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the National Battlefields' Commission:

(a) for expenses of administration..	$ 6,000
(b) for expenses of the National Battlefields' Park..	35,000
(c) for maintenance of Martello towers	1,000

Mr. CHURCH: With reference to this vote for the National Battlefields' Commission which has done good work, while there is no objection to this expenditure for maintenance of the national battlefield's park in the province of Quebec, I should like to ask the Government to consider the advisability of extending this work to other portions of Canada. I might refer to the ruined battlefields of the war of 1812 in the Niagara district. It would be a good thing for the people of Canada if something were done to commemorate and mark these battlefields. Those in the Niagara district are to-day in ruins and nobody knows who owns them. I hope the Government will take this matter up and do something. Then, there are the battlefields of the North West Rebellion, 1885, and also of the war of 1837. I hope this Government will consider this matter and extend these grants so as to include the various other battlefields in other parts of Canada which are in a neglected condition. I hope the Finance Minister will give the House some idea as to whether it is the intention of the Government to extend this work to the other battlefields of Canada. People from the United States who have visited the Niagara district have been much surprised that Canada is so far behind the times. If you go to Chattanooga in the southern states, and to the valley of the Cumberland, where Grant made his reputation in the war between the North and South, you will see how the United States people have remembered those who fought for their country, and have beautified the battlefields and have commemorated the deeds of the fallen.

I realize, of course, the financial situation and the high cost of money, labour and materials in these days, but I hope the Government will look into the matter with particular reference to the Niagara district.

Mr. FIELDING: I am thankful for what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Church)

has said, and I am sure his words will meet with the sympathy of the House. For the moment, I could not make any official statement, but his suggestion will receive due consideration. I can only deal with this particular appropriation which is confined to Quebec, but the matter as mentioned by my hon. friend will not escape our attention.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Press Limited.. .. .. .. $50,000
Canadian Press Limited.. 8,000

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): I would like an explanation of these two items. I do not understand them.

Mr. FIELDING: The general object of these items, I think, ought to commend itself to the House. It is intended to assist the Canadian press in the distribution of news in a larger way than they could possibly do with their own resources. I think there is very strong reason why we should try to make the different sections of Canada better acquainted with one another. The press is not always wealthy. There is a long stretch of country between our eastern provinces and our western provinces which produces nothing in the way of revenue to the newspapers and it is, I think, largely for the purpose of bridging that long distance. At all events, it is not a source of any great wealth to the Canadian press. It helps them to give service which they otherwise would not give, and I think it is of the utmost importance that the various sections of Canada should be better informed of what is going on, each knowing the other section of Canada better than it does to-day. How far this is effected by the appropriation is a matter to be considered. I think the object of the appropriation is one which will readily commend itself to the House.

Mr. EVANS: I would like to ask the minister if all the newspapers in the country will receive a subsidy out of this fund?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is open to all who are willing to participate and to contribute their share of the expense.

Mr. EVANS: I ask this question, because I read the other day, in one of our most influential journals, that it was a kind of tyrannical institution; that it has the right to say who shall be members of it, what papers shall be established, what shall be sold and so on.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: It is an association of newspapers, and I suppose, like all other associations, they make their own regulations for their government. I am informed that no representations have been made by any newspaper against it. My impression is that every newspaper in Canada has an opportunity of participating in it, if the proprietors are willing to do so. If that is not the case, I shall be glad to look into the matter, because the association should be open to all.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Press Ltd., $8,000.

Mr. FIELDING: This is a continuation of an old grant designed for cable service between Great Britain and Canada. It was established a good many years ago, and I believe I had something to do with the establishment of it. It was a service in which the late John Ross Robertson took a warm interest; he was its chief advocate and promoter. It has been continued in later years, and, so far as I know, it has given satisfactory service. It is distinct from the ordinary news service in Canada; it is devoted to cable service.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Victorian Order of Nurses, $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING: This is a grant that has been given for a number of years, and I think the committee generally realizes that the service is an excellent one.

Item agreed to.

Grant in aid of the Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts Association, $15,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What was the amount last year?

Mr. FIELDING: This is a case in which we are increasing the grant. The cases in which increases have been made are not very numerous. It was represented that the service was a very deserving one—indeed, we all feel that—and that it needed this additional amount. Indeed, a larger grant was asked. His Excellency the Governor General is Chief Scout; but Dr. Robertson, whom we all know in connection with the agricultural work of the country, is its chief director, and it was his eloquent persuasion that induced us to put this increased item in. It is an object which has the sympathy of the country generally, and that is my justification, if it be a justification, in asking for an increase.

Mr. McMASTER: There are, throughout the country, hundreds of worthy organi-

zations that deserve grants if we had the money to subscribe to them; but in the financial position in which this country is now, I do not think we should increase three times the Government grant to this very worthy object. I am not complaining about the Boy Scouts; no doubt they do splendid work, but this does not seem to be the proper time for increasing the expenses of the country. We have given a grant of $5,000 to the Victorian Order of Nurses this year, and I think they received the same amount last year. I am not complaining about that. Someone says that they should have $10,000. I suppose if they had all the money we would like them to have, they might have $25,000 or $100,000. That is not the point. There are hundreds of worthy objects throughout the country, and that we should single out this worthy object for three times the grant of last year is something that I would like to protest against respectfully.

Mr. MARLER: Can my hon. friend point to a more worthy object, one that has more far-reaching effects than the Boy Scouts Association?

Mr. McMASTER: I do not know whether I am called upon or have a right to judge of the Boy Scouts as compared with hundreds of other worthy organizations. That is not the point. My hon. friend (Mr. Marler) has not quite grasped the point. I thought I had made it perfectly clear that this is an excellent institution. But until we meet, with ordinary revenue, the ordinary expenditure of this country, I, as a member of this House, and as representing the farming classes of the eastern townships, who are seeing their own revenues cut in half, am going to protest against any increase in the public expenditure of this country except for absolute necessities.

Mr. MARLER: I accept my hon. friend's rebuke and, no doubt, the House does, in the same spirit.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to go on record as most heartily supporting the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in opposing this $10,000 increase.

Mr. FIELDING: The speech of the hon. member for Brome is so much in line with my thought on other questions that I have difficulty in dissenting from it. I am not going to break my heart if the committee does not want to increase this grant. It is for the committee to decide. There are exceptions to all rules and if there is anything in which we are willing to make an exception, it would be in regard to the boys of the country who are going to be the men of to-morrow, the men who will be our successors at no distant date. I think this Boy Scout movement is a very commendable one; but I am not going to urge this inceased grant on the committee. If any hon. gentleman thinks this a grave departure from our sound policy of economy, he can divide the committee on the question; but I am not going to support him; I am going to have the liberty of voting against striking it out. I am not, however, going to urge this upon the committee at this late hour.

Mr. FORKE: I am just as anxious for economy as any one in this House and will cut down the estimates wherever possible; but I have had some experience of the Boy Scout movement, and as I have no boys of my own, I am not speaking for myself in this case at least. There is no greater or more important work being carried on in Canada to-day than the Boy Scout movement. I have great respect for the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) but I do not think he has looked at this matter in all its bearings and in every phase in which we might consider it. As has already been remarked to-night, the boys will be the men of to-morrow; they will take up the burden, and I hope they will carry the flag a great deal better than their fathers have done. No dollar that is spent is lost when it is spent in bettering the conditions of these same boys. I have much pleasure in supporting this appropriation at this particular time.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I have much pleasure in endorsing what the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) has just said regarding the Boy Scouts. I have a boy who is a Scout, and I do not think this money is thrown away. I think it is one of the best expenditures the country can make.

Mr. WARD: I wish to concur in all that the hon. member for Brandon has said; but I can go back to my constituency and find a whole army of boys who have not clothes enough to go to school with, and it is a crime for us to spend money in this way while there are boys who have not clothes to go to school with and whose parents have not money with which to buy them proper clothes.

Item agreed to.

Loan to provincial governments to encourage the erection of dwelling houses, $9,550,080.

Mr. FIELDING: It was originally provided that $25,000,000 might be devoted to this purpose. Some money has been spent from year to year, and this is the balance of the $25,000,000. It takes the shape of a loan to the provinces that avail themselves of the arrangement, and as they pay interest it is not an unprofitable expenditure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: While the original appropriation was $25,000,000, my recollection is that last year, owing to representations by the Committee on Soldiers' Re-establishment, the Dominion held itself open to increase the appropriation to $31,000,000 in order to make further advances to the provinces in proportion to population. Have any provinces taken advantage of that offer?

Mr. FIELDING: The amounts paid to date are:

Nova Scotia	$1,100,000
Manitoba	1,975,000
Ontario	8,750,000
New Brunswick	1,525,000
British Columbia	1,701,600
Quebec	2,056,620

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have any provinces received their full quota?

Mr. FIELDING: Manitoba and New Brunswick, I understand, have taken their full proportion. The original appropriation was increased in order to allow an additional grant to be made to Ontario, but it is based on population.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I understand it, this is merely a revote of what was unspent last year.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is this money spent by the provinces in organized or unorganized districts?

Mr. FIELDING: The provinces determine on their own responsibility how the money shall be expended. They deal with the details. We advance the money and they are free to apply it subject to the general regulations.

Mr. McBRIDE: There should be an understanding that the unorganized districts should have the same privilege as the organized districts. I know a great many farmers in our district who would like to take advantage of the loan, but they cannot participate in it because they are not in an organized district. It is not right for us to advance money that serves the purpose of increasing the population of the cities. The cities are top heavy, and we should give more consideration to the country.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend's district will have to look to the provincial government. I have no doubt that, in any case, the provincial government would be desirous to meet all demands. It is not, however, for us here to say how they shall spend the money. We loan the money and they must take the responsibility for its application.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that we have already advanced British Columbia its full quota.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, British Columbia has received its full share.

Item agreed to.

Grant in aid of the Dominion Council of the Girl Guides, $3,000.

Mr. FIELDING: The member for South-east Grey (Miss Macphail) is not present. If she were she might possibly claim that we were not dealing fairly with the Girl Guides. This is an appropriation that has been made for several years, however, and I am sure it will have the sympathy of the committee.

Mr. McMASTER: If the Boy Scouts have been trebled, why not the Girl Guides? I believe in equality between sexes.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will serve notice that we ought to increase the grant we will take it into consideration.

Item agreed to.

To provide for Canada's proportionate share of the cost of expenditure made by the Imperial War Graves Commission—probable amount required, $669,410.

Mr. FIELDING: This is our share under an agreement between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian government. The Imperial War Graves Commission have intimated that they will need this amount during the year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the House may assume that the difference in vote is not the result of any change of policy, but is merely carrying out the request of the commission?

Mr. FIELDING: Entirely so. We have made no change of policy whatever.

Civil Government—Health—salaries, $147,307.50; Contingencies, $71,000; Total, $218,307.50.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there any satisfactory reason for the increase of $4,000 for travelling expenses?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health): This increase is mainly in connection with the enforcement of the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act. Illicit trade in these drugs is apparently on the increase in some of the provinces, especially in the large cities, and to cope with the situation it is necessary for our officials to travel more than in previous years. Their travelling expenses are very closely controlled and examined by the department. There may be some portion of the increase connected with the Food and Drugs Act, but the main increase is in connection with the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister I know has given very close attention to this matter. Could he state whether he will be prepared to introduce any amendment of the act to meet the representations recently made to him?

Mr. BELAND: It has been my privilege to receive an important delegation from British Columbia, composed of members from that province regardless of their political affiliations, and of some gentlemen from outside, in connection with the suppression of this illicit traffic. The matter is receiving our most earnest and favourable consideration in so far as some amendment of the act is concerned. I cannot say to-night what the nature of the amendment will be, but we hope to be in a position to satisfy my hon. friend and those who accompanied him in the delegation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the cost of the department last year in regard to salaries?

Mr. BELAND: The amount expended to date is $135,496.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Will an opportunity for discussing the Inspection Act as applied to immigrants be afforded when the main Estimates are brought down? I assume that that medical inspection takes place under this act?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As there was an expenditure of only $135,000, I suppose the saving was occasioned by dropping certain employees?

Mr. BELAND: The difference between the amount asked for last year, $157,000, and that asked for this year, $147,000, is accounted for by the transferring to the Food and Drugs Act branch of a number of analysts and one food inspector because they reside outside Ottawa.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid my hon. friend does not quite catch my point. He is showing why he can get along more cheaply this year than last; but I was rather wondering why it is costing more money to get along this year, because while $157,000 was voted last year, as a matter of fact only $135,000 was expended, yet my hon. friend wants $147,000 this year. There is an increase in expenditure with a reduced staff.

Mr. BELAND: A number of those officials were made permanent during the year, and consequently they are paid for only a part of the year.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that the work of this department has decreased through the administration of the Fertilizer Act being transferred to the seed branch under the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that this is a very small item indeed.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—salaries and contingencies, $52,245.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Chairman, as we have already agreed in the House that there shall be a reduction in the Mounted Police force, I have suggested to the commissioner and the comptroller that we should not provide by these estimates for any additional permanent employees. I would therefore move that the item for salaries be reduced by $5,982.50, and that the figure "10" under the first column, 1922-23, page 83, be changed to "2".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In view of the large decrease in numbers, I suggest that my hon. friend might simply take last year's vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a slight increase to provide for the statutory increases in salary for the present employees. We shall have to let that stand as it is until we decide what reduction shall be made in the Mounted Police.

Mr. LEWIS: If you are going to take away this provision for eight additional

employees, why make the reduction only $5,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: The reduction is practically $6,000; it is $5,982.50.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government — annuities — salaries, $22,320.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This department was attached to the Post Office Department, but it has been transferred to the Department of Labour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has any further progress been made in the sale of annuities?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I shall have to wait until the items in the main Estimates are under consideration. I cannot say offhand what progress has been made.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Friday, April 7, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GRAIN TRADE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I move that the second report of the committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the report, concurrence in which is now sought, comes from the Committee on Agriculture which met about five days ago. It reads:

> That without delaying investigation by this committee as to the advisability of the re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board, the matter of the constitutionality of such re-establishment be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada and that every effort be made to secure decision at an early date.

There had been, in this connection, referred to the Committtee on Agriculture the subject of handling the wheat of this country, and although the reference was not correctly or, at least, not adequately made, the intention was, no doubt, to ask the committee to consider the subject in three aspects: First, whether the Wheat Board, with all its old powers and duties, should be re-established; or, second, whether there should be established a Government organization to handle and dispose of wheat committed to it by the voluntary act of the producers; or, third, whether the whole question should be left to what was described as co-operative action on the part of the producers themselves. The reason I say that the matter was intended to be referred in that form is because, in that form, the intended reference was described by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech on the Address. Consequently, though the words of commitment were narrow, I apprehend that a third report recommending a fuller reference will be adopted and the reference widened accordingly. It will be recalled that the former Wheat Board, that is the Wheat Board, established by Order in Council of July 31, 1919, which Order in Council was continued by this House very shortly afterwards in the same year and later on confirmed by legislation in the spring of last year, had very ample powers in a sense, indeed, monopolistic powers. It had certain control over the elevator system of our country and over the transportation of grain committed to it, and certain priorities and extraordinary rights which at the time it was deemed wise to repose in the board. That Wheat Board was discontinued—or rather the time that was originally given to it as its term of life expired, and consequently, no act of discontinuance was essential. It handled the wheat crop of 1919, and having so disposed of its duties, it ceased to exist. In the spring of 1920, there being some doubt at that time as to what would be the condition of the buying market in Europe, and also as to what would be the policy of the United States, whether that country would remain in control, in some form or another, of its wheat marketing, or whether it would revert to the old marketing conditions, Parliament, on the advice of the government of the day, passed legislation empowering such government, if in its opinion conditions so demanded, to restore or to continue the Wheat Board as it had been established, for the purpose of taking in hand the crop of 1920. The government of the day did not exercise that power. European countries were no longer purchasing, as they had been doing, through the single agency of the British Government, which in turn acted through the British Wheat Commission, but were buying through agencies—although Government agencies—active in competition the one

with the other. Besides, the United States Government had abandoned all attempts at wheat control, or marketing control of any description as regards grain, reverting instead to the old market conditions. In view of these facts the late Dominion government exercising its judgment did not re-establish the board.

Some time after, a grain inquiry commission was instituted under the Inquiries Act, upon complaint, which had become very general, that there were abuses in connection with the handling of the grain trade of western Canada. That commission was enjoined; the Order in Council establishing it was challenged, and that Order in Council was declared invalid by a judge of the King's Bench of Manitoba. Subsequently, upon appeal—and in all modesty I call this to the attention of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), whom, had he not shown the contrary in his speech on the Address, one would have expected to be already aware of the fact—the validity of the Order in Council was established, the powers of the Government to pass it were confirmed. This matter was decided by the Court of Appeal of Manitoba.

In view of the evidence adduced before that commission, and in view of the very evident condition of dissatisfaction throughout the West over the whole question of purchase, storage, financing and disposal of its grain, I, in the late campaign, proposed an alternative, namely, the second alternative recited by the Prime Minister in his speech on the Address: that is to say, the establishment, not of a board with compulsory powers, not of a single agency excluding all other agencies of sale, but of a board with ample powers to receive, move, finance, and finally sell, and distribute the proceeds of, all grain committed to its charge by the will of the producer. I am not proposing to discuss now the merits of this plan or of any of the plans to which I have made allusion; I do not purpose even to discuss whether or not the late government took the right course in this regard. That question does not arise on the motion of my hon. friend the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture (Mr. Kay). But a review of the facts such as I have given is necessary in order that what I have to say anent this motion may be the better understood. The demand for the old Wheat Board that was made has been received by the committee who, proceeding to deal with the question, have made a report to the House that while they were considering the wisdom of its re-establishment—whether or not differing in personnel—the Government refer to the Supreme Court of Canada the question as to the power of this Parliament to establish such a board.

Now, I submit to the House that if we concur in this report it is going to be impossible to meet the situation for the coming summer. I do not pretend to judge the full measure of those who demand the establishment of the old Wheat Board with all its powers, but I do say that there is a very strong body of support for that proposal. Of its numbers, its strength, and its right to be heard before a committee of this House and this House itself, there is no question. But there are those among its numbers—I do not know what proportion, but I should say a substantial proportion, I think I can say the majority—who, while they urge strongly, under what they describe as abnormal conditions existing now, their right to the advantage of the old Wheat Board, with all the means of disposal it afforded, during this year and perhaps next year, at any rate while these conditions prevail; nevertheless do not ask that the board be established as a permanent institution. They insist only that it be put into operation to take care of the situation during this period of abnormalcy. Their insistence is mainly that it be established for the purpose of taking care of the wheat crop of this year. There are, I do not know how many, but doubtless a considerable number, who would favour the establishment of the board permanently. But however great their numbers may be, the number of those who want it, not on a permanent but on a temporary basis, is far greater. Of that there can be no question. Consequently this House, before it takes any step that will put it practically out of its power to comply with this demand, must very carefully decide, yes or no, thereto. Whether the demand is right or not, of its very nature it calls for a decision by this Parliament at an early date.

What will happen if this resolution carries? This House will have instructed the Government of the day to submit to the Supreme Court of Canada a definite question, namely: Is it within the competence of the Parliament of Canada to re-establish the Wheat Board with the powers vested in it under the Order in Council of July 31, 1919, as confirmed by Parliament? Be it noted, there is no question at issue

at all as to the powers of the Governor in Council. The committee realized that fully in this report. There is no doubt at all that the Governor in Council has no such powers now; but the question is whether the Parliament of Canada has such powers. It was the Parliament of Canada that acted before. Parliament confirmed the action of the government, because the government had to act, if it took any action at all, before Parliament met, or there would have been no time to take in hand the 1919 crop. Parliament confirmed the government's action, and the question is: Has Parliament the right to do what Parliament actually did in the special session of 1919? If that question is submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, assuming, as I do, that every effort will be made by the Government to prosecute the suit to a decision—I will not be asked to assume any more, indeed I think I am liberal enough when I assume that much—is there any substantial hope that we shall get a decision from the Supreme Court of Canada, upon which we can act, within such time as will enable us to dispose of the question at this session? Who are entitled to be heard before that tribunal? Well, the Government of Canada will be heard. They will undoubtedly be there by counsel, endeavouring, I presume, to establish the power of this Parliament. I would also expect that some, possibly all, of the provinces of Confederation, whether unitedly or separately, would appear before the Supreme Court on the issue. I would expect the Grain Exchange to appear before the court. Possibly the Grain Exchange would come individually, or perhaps forty companies strong, as it has been known to come before the courts of the country before. How many companies of the Grain Exchange are going to be heard? Can they be denied a hearing? I would expect, as well, the millers' association, and perhaps individual milling companies would want to be heard. I would expect that the railway companies would be there, and possibly our banks as well. It is a matter that interests in an important degree many great fields of enterprise in this country. There would be inevitably a warring clamour of interests before the court; and when any one of those interests could establish a prima facie case for postponement, how could the court deny a postponement? I know of interests that would have a lot to gain by a postponement; I know of interests who would desire postponement. In the hands of able lawyers, I do not know of any kind of case that is more easily made out, than a case for postponement, and I for one would despair, were I acting for the Government in such a connection, of any early decision, no matter how assiduous and vigorous was my conduct of the case.

But, suppose we get a decision, is there anything to prevent an appeal to the Privy Council? There will be one, you may be sure, if the case goes in favour of our powers. And if there is such an appeal who is going to take care of the 1922 crop of wheat?

But, beyond that, suppose my conjecture as to what is going to occur on the argument of this case before the Supreme Court is wrong, and we find lawyers, opposed perhaps from forty different angles, all in agreement to press the case to a decision in order that Parliament may act in the light of that decision; suppose that happens—which would be a miracle—what then? We get a decision. Is the decision going to be of great practical value? Is it going to be of a character that would enable Parliament to act in a practical way? I do not think it can be. In the original statute twenty-seven different powers were given to the Wheat Board; starting with A, B, C, continuing through the whole length of the alphabet, and still one more. There were multiplied duties besides imposed upon the Wheat Board. The Supreme Court would have the power to go into one and all of those powers and duties. But I do not know that it would do so. It might say: Here is a power that we find the Parliament of Canada cannot repose in the board; it is ultra vires; therefore we need not decide the other points at all.

But suppose the court went on and decided one and all, supposing they did everything, assume, indeed, a set of facts the most adverse to my contention possible, suppose they deal with A, B, C, and so on all through the list. What then? Assume they decide that we are ultra vires as to the whole twenty-seven, it might still be that by a modification, perhaps an unimportant modification, of each one we could come well within the powers of this Parliament, and at the same time establish a board so armed and equipped that it could substantially meet the ambitions and desires of those who seek this method of the disposal of their grain. The judgment, when it comes, shall not in all prob-

ability be such to enable us to act on it in a practical way.

To sum up what I have argued so far. First: follow this course and you are plunged into the caldron of litigation, from which in all human probability you will not emerge until it is too late for you to act with much value this session. Second: though there may be harmony, and all go smoothly to an early verdict, the judgment alone will not be of such a final, definitive and detailed character as to be what we want in building the fabric of legislation.

Then I am asked: What are we to do? Well, I would advise Parliament to say to the committee: Go back and do what has always been done,—take the advice of the law officers of the Crown. When you decide just what you want, the principle you want to follow, the body you want to establish, the powers you would like to give it, go and sit beside the law officers and ask them: How far in that direction can we go and be as safe as any one can be from the threat of injunction? There is no difficulty about taking that course. I know it may be said that possibly after you take their advice you may be faced with an injunction afterwards. Why, so you may be, whatever you do. But in the light of the decisions that have so far been handed down, particularly in the light of the decision a few months ago by the Court of Appeal of Manitoba, I do not think there would be any great difficulty on the part of the law officers of the Crown in so framing legislation that we would be tolerably, if not wholly, safe from the danger of successful injunction at the instance of any litigant.

Mr. CRERAR: Might I interrupt my right hon. friend? Is he arguing on the basis that the enactment by this Parliament would confer all the powers that the original Wheat Board had?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I have not been fully understood. I say, suppose the committee decides: We would like the Wheat Board; but if we cannot have the Wheat Board with all its powers, we would like to get as close to those powers as we are sure we can safely go. Then let them express that desire through the Government to the Justice Department, and have the Justice Department frame legislation which will in the opinion of its law officers reach as far as this Parliament can go. That seems to me the practical and sensible course to take.

Let it be remembered that there has been expressed some doubt as to the power of this Parliament in regard to the entire handling of the grain trade. We may be in some danger there even as we sit now. But the fact is this, the grain trade has become of such a character, it is so interprovincial, it is so broadly Canadian, that whatever may be the constitution of this country, that trade must be under the control of legislation enacted by this Parliament,—under the control of federal authority. And if there is successful attack that goes to the root of our power in this matter, I for one would be prepared to support legislation which would address the Imperial Parliament in terms requesting an enabling amendment of our constitution.

I express here no opinion one way or the other on the merits of these different proposals; I am not arguing for the Wheat Board, nor against it; I am not arguing for a voluntary government board, nor against it; nor am I advocating abandoning the whole difficulty in a spirit of laissez faire to what is called "co-operation." For the present it seems to me the sensible step to take is to let the committee decide after hearing evidence and arguments what they believe would be best in the interest of the whole country, and let them express their decision in a resolution. Let the committee as well go, through the Minister of Justice, to the law officers of the Crown and arrive as closely as may be done at the expression in statutory form of powers within the competence of Parliament which in the judgment of that committee should be vested in the board which they think this Parliament should create. That is the alternative course that I propose.

I only want to impress this thought upon the committee before I sit down. You never can get wholly out of danger of litigation, no matter what you do. But take the course proposed in this matter from the government side and you will wave good-bye to any wheat board established by any act of Parliament this session. I do not know of any way by which a decision could come in time to be of any value except by general concurrence adverse to our powers. In a word, take the course proposed in the motion and you ditch the whole question; you abandon it; you are done with it. That, in my judgment, would be the practical result. I urge on the contrary that the other course be followed; and I therefore move:

That the said report be not concurred in but be referred back to the Committee on Agriculture for further consideration.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter underlying the reference to the Committee on Agriculture, the second report of which has brought about this discussion, is one of the very greatest importance. There is no question what the opinion of western Canada is—not only of the agricultural portions of that part of the Dominion, but of its business interests as well—as to the urgency of this matter of the re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board. I could, if this were the proper occasion, give many reasons why it is in the national interest that the Wheat Board should be re-established along the lines advocated by the memorandum submitted by the Canadian Council of Agriculture to the Government, and later, referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The conditions in the West have been of an extraordinary character. I am not overstating the fact when I say that an overwhelming majority of the farmers of western Canada conducted their business last year at a loss. One reason why they have had such a poor return for their year's labour was the manner in which their grain was marketed under the exceptional conditions prevailing throughout the world. We cannot throw into the markets of Winnipeg, forty or fifty or sixty million bushels of wheat a month and expect the markets of the world to absorb it as freely as it is offered for sale without a considerable depression in prices. That constitutes one of the strongest reasons why action along the line of re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board should be taken.

I am, therefore, quite in accord with what my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has said as to the urgency of this matter. In fact, I wish to express my delight at the interest he is manifesting in it. I recall that back in 1920 the government of the day was empowered to re-establish the Wheat Board under act of this Parliament, and one of the first things my right hon. friend did after he became prime Minister was to announce to the country that no wheat board would be re-established,—and the need for it then was fully as great as it is to-day.

There is, apparently, a doubt whether this Parliament has the power to pass legislation enabling the Wheat Board to function, as it did function, when it marketed the crop of 1919. My right hon. friend has refrained from giving an opinion upon that question; probably he has a doubt in his own mind whether Parliament has that power. Being a layman and unfamiliar with the tenets of the law, I certainly would not venture an opinion on the point. But I know that the view is held by eminent legal gentlemen that a doubt exists whether Parliament has the power to pass legislation creating a Wheat Board with compulsory powers, that is, with powers to pass regulations and orders compelling farmers to sell their grain and market it through the agencies created by the board. The position taken in the committee was inspired by the desire to clear up that doubt, if possible, before any such legislation was passed. The report of the committee suggests that, without delaying an investigation by the committee of the merits of this method of marketing the grain, steps should be taken to secure from the Supreme Court of Canada at as early a day as possible a decision as to the power of Parliament in the matter. I think that view was expressed by the committee in order that, if possible, the legal doubt hanging round the thing might be cleared up.

My right hon. friend argues that there would be a great deal of delay in getting such an opinion from the Supreme Court. That might be; I am not familiar with the regulations governing the Supreme Court and I am not in a position to say with what despatch they could consider this matter and come to a decision upon it. I have it in mind, however, that in the summer of 1917, when a question arose over the powers vested in the Government under the Military Service Act in the city of Calgary—

Mr. MURPHY: In 1918.

Mr. CRERAR: I stand corrected—it was in 1918. As to the powers vested in the Government under the Military Service Act, a question arose in Calgary which necessitated a submission to the Supreme Court. If I recall the circumstances correctly, habeas corpus proceedings were taken to release a young conscript who had been imprisoned for violation of some of the provisions of the conscription law, and the Supreme Court of Alberta sustained the injunction. In that case it was necessary for the government to determine quickly just what the legal status of the conscription law was, and I recall that steps were taken at once to have a stated case placed before the Supreme Court, and the court gave its decision within a week of submitting the case. It does seem to me that it would be possible, if the Govern-

ment used despatch, to get a decision from the Supreme Court as to the powers of Parliament in this matter in a very short time. I do not think there is any one, either in this House or outside, who approaches this question with the honest desire to get the best possible conditions established for the marketing of grain, who would wish to see the Wheat Board re-established, and then find it, after it had started operations, hung up in the air and unable to continue its work.

Legal gentlemen in private conversation with me have also cited the case of the Board of Commerce. This act creating the Board of Commerce was passed by the preceding parliament in 1919, conferring very wide powers on the board in the matter of the regulation of trade. I think it will be in the mind of every member of this House that that legislation was contested in the courts and that the Board of Commerce was restrained and put out of business as a result of the decision of the Privy Council.

Those are some of the considerations that moved me in my consideration of this matter. I recognized, and the committee recognized, the urgency of the case by urging that the Government should secure a decision from the Supreme Court as quickly as possible.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who, I am free to confess at once, has had eminent legal experience, seems to be of the opinion that a decision could not be secured from the Supreme Court in any reasonable length of time, and he suggests instead that this matter should be referred to the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Supreme Court might give an adverse opinion at an early date, if it was the general opinion of the court that Parliament had not this power, but in my judgment certainly we would not get a favourable opinion in time to deal with the matter this session.

Mr. CRERAR: That is a matter, again, in which I am upon rather unfamiliar ground. I would be of the opinion that if a majority of the Supreme Court gave a decision in favour of the contention that Parliament had the power to create this board, that would be ample warrant for the Government going ahead and establishing it; but in any case I have no fault to find with the suggestion of my right hon. friend that the matter be referred to the law officers of the Crown. The only point in respect to that is that there would perhaps be a doubt as to the conclusiveness of an opinion handed down by the law officers of the Crown.

I want to repeat, this is a matter of urgent importance and one on which action should not be delayed a moment longer than is absolutely necessary. I do not know what action the committee might take, assuming that Parliament had the power to pass legislation creating the board, but I do say this: I think the committee whose reports we are considering were perfectly well intentioned in the matter when they desired to ascertain the exact legal position, and at the same time have their inquiry proceed, as indeed it is proceeding now, as to whether the re-establishment of the board would be a desirable course to take.

Mr. EULER: For the benefit of those of us who do not belong to the Agricultural Committee, perhaps my hon. friend would explain whether the doubt with regard to the power of Parliament bears on the primary power of Parliament to establish a Wheat Board or is the doubt merely with regard to the compulsory feature that is mentioned?

Mr. CRERAR: The doubt exists, I think, in the minds of the committee, as to the power of Parliament to pass legislation creating a board with compulsory powers such as the powers the board had that was established in 1919.

Mr. EULER: It is the compulsory feature as to which there is a doubt?

Mr. CRERAR: The compulsory feature. It is not necessary to have action from Parliament, I take it, for the creation of a voluntary pool, but there is no doubt that if such action were necessary Parliament has the power to pass legislation creating a voluntary pool, such as my right hon. friend advocated during the election. But that is more a matter for action by the Government than by this Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is it the view of the committee that the creation of a Wheat Board with powers less than those of the original Wheat Board would be satisfactory to the interests in the West that are affected? In other words, would a Wheat Board without compulsory powers be satisfactory?

Mr. CRERAR: I think I may say that such a board would not be satisfactory. The memorandum of the Council of Agriculture

which gave rise to this question asks specifically for one thing and one thing only, and that is the re-establishment of the Canada Wheat Board with all the powers it had in 1919. That is what the memorandum asks for, and that is what we are considering in the matter.

I do not know that any harm could come from a further reference to the committee, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition suggests. It might be that the collective wisdom of the committee could proceed a little further in considering this question, although I must confess I am rather doubtful of what results could be obtained from such a reference back. However, it might be productive of good results, and is a step that I think could be adopted by the House.

The main thing I want to emphasize is the urgency of action in this matter. If the doubt could be cleared up quickly as to whether Parliament has the power to re-establish this board, I think it would be distinctly in the national interests that that be done. It may be that an opinion from the law officers of the Crown, as my right hon. friend suggests, would carry with it a greater degree of conclusiveness in the public mind than seems to me now probable or likely, but in any case I see no reason why that action should not be taken by the Government. Let the Government, through the law officers of the Crown or through the Supreme Court, find out what the powers of Parliament are in this matter, and in the meantime let the committee proceed with its inquiry and bring in a report based on all the evidence that is placed before it. I think it would be of great service if the powers of Parliament in this matter were determined as quickly as possible.

In closing, I simply wish to say that this is a matter of very great urgency, and I trust that it will receive the consideration of this House from that angle, and that angle alone.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I venture to address the House on this question, because in my judgment it is one of the pressing problems of the hour in so far at least as the western part of Canada is concerned. Let me at the outset state quite frankly that I am in favour of the re-establishment of the Wheat Board. I am not prepared to say that I favour that as a permanent arrangement, but I certainly am in favour of it as a means of taking care of this year's crop and perhaps of next year's crop as well. Now, I am not by any means alone in that contention. I understand that the United Farmers in the province of Alberta in convention assembled have practically unanimously favoured the creation of this board, and the farmers of Saskatchewan, and I believe also the farmers of Manitoba, with equal unanimity have concurred in the views of those of Alberta. If, therefore, the Wheat Board is to be of any value for this particular year it is necessary and urgent that every effort be made by this Parliament to ascertain whether or not the reappointment of that board is in the interest of this country.

I endorse the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) on the subject of referring this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada. It is true, as the hon. member for Marquette has stated, that in the military case, the Lewis case, which arose I believe in the city of Calgary, a decision was given by the Supreme Court in one week; but hon. members will realize that that case is entirely different from this, because there the accused himself was anxious to have it determined whether or not his liberty should be taken away from him in the particular manner complained of. In the present instance reference to the Court could only be made after a very careful study of the questions involved; and of course this would take considerable time, because the constitutional questions involved are serious and extremely difficult. Not only that, but the Supreme Court must necessarily give ample opportunity for the provincial governments, and the various interests concerned, to appear and to prepare their cases and to present arguments before it. Now what I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is this: It is absolutely physically impossible to have the Supreme Court of Canada give a decision in this particular case in anything like the limited period suggested by the hon. member for Marquette; it seems to me the result would be that this matter would be long drawn out. A litigant—and perhaps there would be many of them, and also various conflicting interests, before the Supreme Court—who felt dissatisfied with the decision of the court would have the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and then the matter could not possibly be determined until long after the 1922 crop had been cut and harvested. Now my suggestion is simply this—and I will not detain the House longer—that the matter should go back to the committee with instructions that they

should consult the legal staff of the House —and I think everybody will agree that the legal staff are indeed able, in connection with the particular constitutional problems involved—and ascertain whether or not valid legislation can be passed, or whether in the event of legislation being passed, enabling legislation might also be passed by the various provincial legislatures, the converse of what has been done in connection with liquor legislation. I simply make the suggestion because I seriously contend that the adoption of the report of the committee means that we simply embalm the Wheat Board in litigation long before it is born.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The amendment of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition is to the effect that the committee be permitted to reconsider its own report. The report of the committee was, I understand, a unanimous report. One or two of the members of the committee have since expressed their views in a manner which would indicate that they desire to reconsider the report. I can see no reason why under the circumstances, they should not have this privilege.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, before the matter is finally dealt with I want to touch on one feature of the case which has not yet been alluded to. With a great deal that the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for West Calgary, and the hon. member for Marquette have had to say I most heartily agree, but there are some other matters that perhaps should be brought to the attention of the House. The illustration of the Board of Commerce has been mentioned and it has been pointed out that should this legislation be put into operation, and part of the crop be taken off, an injunction might then be served upon the board with very serious consequences. That might be the case but I submit that although for many years the Canada Grain Act has been in question, yet because it has been of inestimable value to the nation as a whole and because its operation was a matter of national good, no one has yet contested the validity of that act. If the Wheat Board should be established and the fact of its being for the general good of the country recognized by this Parliament, no one will seriously question the proceedings of the board while it is operating temporarily.

4 p.m.

Mr. ROBB: Is it not a fact that the Canada Grain Act is now being attacked in the Manitoba courts?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not know whether it is or not. If such is the case then I am slightly at fault in that regard. The other matter to which I wish to refer has reference to the widening of the powers of the Committee on Agriculture. I for one am absolutely free to say that I would encourage the widest possible investigation into anything that would promise relief to the conditions in western Canada; but in this particular instance I would like to call attention to the fact that there is no demand for anything else but the Wheat Board; and as was stated in answer to a question by an hon. member opposite a moment ago, nothing but the re-establishment of the Wheat Board, with powers almost identical with, or similar to, the powers of the old board would satisfy the West at this time, in my opinion. So far as my own constituents are concerned, and to them I owe a duty in this matter, I must say that I cannot support anything but the re-establishment of a board with powers similar to those of the old board. I stand most decidedly in favour of that policy.

Now I do not think at this time it is proper to go into a discussion as to the value of the board. That can very properly be done in committee, but when this matter is being referred back to committee for consideration I would also submit that the committee be advised to follow this procedure: First, to consider the recommendation of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. When that is absolutely disposed of, one way or the other, let the committee take up question number two, and afterwards question number three. Because, I do not think we should close the doors to an investigation into any matter that may be productive of good. Nevertheless, the chief question before the committee, and the one that was referred thereto by this House for a decision, is the one question of the appointment of the Canada Wheat Board.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question raised in this discussion, as to the legality of the proposed Wheat Board, involves the most interesting constitutional point and one which I think, in the interests of the people of the West, as indeed of the whole country, ought to be settled along lines that would leave no doubt as to the power of this Parliament to deal

with the subject. The suggestion that the determination of the constitutionality of such legislation should be deferred—a suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition—does not seem to me to be one which would be in the interest of the gentlemen from the West or of their constituents. A matter of so much importance as this ought to be determined by that court in Canada which has the power of saying what the constitutional rights of this Parliament and the various legislatures are. It might be proper to enable this committee to go to the limit of what seems to be the powers they have under the advice of the law officers of the Crown; but I think those who are very much interested in this matter would be well advised if they would join in urging that the Government should take steps for the early and final solution of the legal powers involved.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) referred to the fact that a decision had been given not long ago as to the power of this Parliament to constitute the Board of Commerce. That decision was one upon which the members of the Supreme Court of Canada divided equally. The judgment of Mr. Justice Duff upon that subject was strong and clear; and, looking at it, as I have since this discussion came up, I find that he laid down principles which, if they are followed by the courts in dealing with this subject, would make it clear that this Parliament has no power to constitute a board similar to the Wheat Board of 1919. His judgment was confirmed by the Privy Council in a deliverance so clear that every hon. member, who is acquainted with legal matters and who follows this case, will realize that this Privy Council decision is one of the most important decisions given of late years. Let me submit this statement by Mr. Justice Duff as regards the question of the power of this Parliament in dealing with matters of this kind. He states:

> The creation of an authority endowed with such powers of fixing the terms of contracts in relation to specific articles appears to involve an interpretation of the words, "regulation of trade and commerce," much more comprehensive than anything contemplated by the decisions and judgments referred to above. I have indicated the principle which in my opinion is deducible from Parson's Case (1), namely, that section 91-(2) does not authorize an enactment by the Dominion Parliament regulating in each of the provinces the terms of the contracts of a particular business or trade, for the reason (put very broadly) that such legislation involves an interposition in the transactions of individuals in the provinces, within the sphere of property and civil rights and local undertakings not contemplated by section 91-(2).

Further, he states:

> I cannot discover any principle consistent with these conclusions, upon which an enactment delegating to a commission the authority to regulate the terms of particular contracts of individual traders in a specified commodity according to the views of the Board as to what may be fair between the individual trader and the public in each transaction, can be sustained as an exercise of that power;

That language of Mr. Justice Duff which was confirmed in terms by the Privy Council, seems to me to lay down principles which materially interfere with the theory that a Wheat Board can be legally constituted. As I say, the decision given by the Lords of the Privy Council on this matter went further than most lawyers anticipated that it would have gone. It was held previously that the fact that section 91 of the British North America Act gave to this Parliament the right to deal with the regulation of trade and commerce, carried with it certain ancillary powers, which enabled this Parliament to go further and deal with matters which might fall within the purview of property and civil rights, subjects within the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures. But this declares that the powers which this Parliament assumed in order to pass the Board of Commerce Act and to give that board power to deal with certain matters which might arise in certain provinces of the Dominion, were not ancillary to the regulation of trade and commerce and were beyond the power of this Parliament. It seems to me, in view of this decision, hon. gentlemen who, I know, are interested in this subject and are anxious to see the business and trade of this country, especially in the great West, put upon a solid footing, would be well advised if they saw to it that steps were taken, at as early a date as possible, to have a decision by the Supreme Court as to just what this Parliament can do in regard to this Wheat Board.

Mr. T. H. McCONICA (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I had not purposed discussing this matter, and I will speak of only one or two questions that have been presented. It has been urged that it is beyond the powers of this Parliament to pass legislation compelling individuals to sell their property to any particular board. I apprehend that is the law; I apprehend it will always be the law. But is such a power necessary to the enactment of legislation that will bring

about that which we seek and that which is asked for by the people of western Canada? What is the situation to-day? The people of western Canada are not asking this Parliament to regulate the trade of selling their wheat to neighbours; they are asking this Parliament to determine how their wheat shall be marketed in the markets of the world, how it shall be handled by the great transportation companies of our country, what agencies shall engage in the commerce of handling the wheat of western Canada. Those powers have been vested in governmental authority for years. Every bushel of wheat that has gone out of western Canada since the enactment of the Grain Act, has gone out under the regulation of laws passed by this Parliament, and it will continue to do so. We ask that that power be placed in the hands of a government board, and that power may be properly placed there. Under our constitution, trade and commerce are within the purview of this Parliament. That has been the case with our Grain Act. It is suggested that the constitutionality of the Grain Act has been challenged. Possibly, there may be features of the Grain Act that are unconstitutional; but are they necessary features? I think not. The only question that I have heard raised was whether the provision in regard to the forfeiture of certain overages to the Government was constitutional. Probably it is not. I do not apprehend that the Government has a right to take private property without paying for it. But is it necessary that such a power be put into the hands of such a board? Most certainly not. The question is raised whether the right to issue a license is not a provincial right. It is a provincial right as to three particular kinds of licenses — keeping a hotel, acting as an auctioneer, or running a saloon; such licenses must be issued by the province. But the elevator business is not auctioneering, nor hotel-keeping, nor running a saloon; and when the provision covers those three powers, does it not withhold the balance of the power? This matter should go back to the committee. I believe that when this legislation is proposed, it will be attacked, and if we present a case to the Supreme Court any blackleg lawyer, who represents some curbstone broker, can hold it up for two or three years. In the meantime, where shall we be in the West? I ask that this matter go back to the committee and that we have legislation drawn that will effect the purpose which we seek. It may not be couched exactly in the language of the old bill, but it must be such as will give the people the relief they desire and that we need most sorely.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Medicine Hat): On the question of enlarging the powers of the Committee, I would emphasize the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). We in western Canada are not asking for any voluntary wheat pool or any other system of marketing grains, except under such conditions as prevailed under the old Wheat Board. If the Committee has extra powers conferred upon it, I would suggest that it confine its activities, as far as possible, to looking into the question of a compulsory Wheat Board.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Supporting the action of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), I would point out that if the report goes back to the committee and the law officers of the Crown are able to produce an act that in their judgment will be constitutional, we shall be that much further ahead than if we appealed to the Supreme Court. Even if a Wheat Board is appointed by Parliament and an attack is made upon it, we shall certainly be as far ahead as, if not further than, if we submitted a stated case to the Supreme Court of Canada. If Parliament puts through legislation and it is subject to attack in the courts, it will reveal to those who are anxious to have the Wheat Board established, the persons, firms or interests that are trying to frustrate that desire. And that, I submit, would be something worth while discovering. I notice that my hon. friends, who know more about farming than I do, do not want a permanent Wheat Board. I have said in this House before that one thing which, in my judgment, Parliament ought to do is to prevent, as far as it can, any speculation in foodstuffs. I may be somewhat straight-laced, or possibly I do not understand some particular phases of the question; but to me it seems almost a crime to permit such speculation in food as raises the price to the consumer and reduces the return to the producer. I have always thought that a permanent Wheat Board that would get the most that was possible for the producer, and at the same time protect the consumer, was legislation that we might very well pass in this House. As I say, my hon. friends from the prairies do not seem to believe in a permanent Wheat Board, and I con-

cede to them a greater knowledge of the case than I can possibly have. But they would gain more, in a matter of great urgency, by having some measure passed by Parliament, after being properly considered by the officers of the Crown, than if they submitted the question to the Supreme Court.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. Kay moved that the third Report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 30, for the relief of Wentworth Barnes.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 31, for the relief of Hazel McInally.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 32, for the relief of Edward Lovell.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 33, for the relief of Elizabeth Lillian Sharpe.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 34, for the relief of Percival Andrew Jamieson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 35, for the relief of Frederick Henry Gill.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 36, for the relief of Blanche Elizabeth Macdonell .—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 37, for the relief of Frank Charles Butt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 38, for the relief of Edward Sidney John Turpin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 39, for the relief of Georgina Gibbings.—Mr. ————

Bill No. 40, for the relief of Albert Bethune Carley.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 41, for the relief of Ernest Zufelt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 42, for the relief of Harry Johns Leach.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of Nellie Berry. —Mr. Church.

Bill No. 44, to incorporate the General Missionary Society of the German Baptist Churches of North America.—Mr. Hudson.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding, that the following proposed resolution be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House:

[Mr. Hocken.]

Resolved, That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the following Treaties, of which copies have been laid before Parliament:—

The Treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, for the limitation of naval armament, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The Treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, to protect neutrals and non-combatants at sea in time of war and to prevent the use in war of noxious gases and chemicals, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The Treaty between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, and Portugal, to stabilize conditions in the Far East, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The Treaty between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, and Portugal, relating to the Chinese customs tariff, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The Treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, and Japan, for the preservation of the general peace and the maintenance of their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean (and the accompanying Declaration), and the Agreement between the same Powers supplementary thereto, which Treaty and Agreement were signed at Washington on the thirteenth day of December, nineteen hundred and twenty-one, and the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two, respectively; and that this House do approve of the same.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Prime Minister give us an idea on what day he is likely to take up this resolution?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Possibly Wednesday of next week, but not before. I shall inform my right hon. friend definitely later on.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St. Henri): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to direct the attention of the Government to an article published in La Presse of last night on the St. Lawrence waterway scheme. Is it a fact that negotiations are proceeding directly between the British Embassy at Washington and the American Government with regard to this matter? If so, what does the Government intend to do to vindicate our national status, if we have any?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The Prime Minister has not caught

the question of my hon. friend. All I can say is that we have no knowledge of any negotiations on the subject.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

On the motion of Hon. G. P. Graham (Minister of Militia and Defence) Bill No. 27 respecting the Department of National Defence was read the third time and passed.

SALARIES ACT, SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. G. P. Graham (Minister of Militia and Defence) Bill No. 14 to amend the Salaries Act and the Senate and the House of Commons Act, was read the third time and passed.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 25 to amend the Penitentiary Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The explanation of the Minister of Justice was almost negligibly brief on the introduction of this bill. Perhaps he will give us a better explanation now.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As I said in introducing this bill, when a prisoner is sent to a penitentiary, the warden cannot receive him if he is suffering from an infectious disease, and there is no provision in the statute to authorize the return of such prisoner to the jail whence he came or to any other institution, to be treated. We propose by the amendment to remedy that omission in the statute so that in such a case the prisoner may be sent back to the provincial authorities for treatment and returned to the penitentiary when cured.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—prisoner may be kept in penitentiary, etc., until necessary documents, including a certificate of health, are delivered to warden:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 45 of the Penitentiaries Act reads:

> Whenever a prisoner is ordered by competent authority to be conveyed to any penitentiary from any other penitentiary, or from a reformatory prison, or from a jail, there shall be delivered to the warden of the penitentiary receiving such prisoner, together with all other necessary documents, a certificate signed by the medical officer of the institution from which prisoner has been taken, and countersigned by the official in charge of the penitentiary, reformatory or jail from which such prisoner has been taken, declaring that such prisoner is free from any putrid, infectious or contagious disease, and that he is fit to be removed.

Then, section 46:

> The warden shall receive into the penitentiary every convict legally certified to him as sentenced to imprisonment therein, unless certified by the surgeon of the penitentiary to be suffering from a dangerously infectious or contagious disease, and shall there detain him, subject to the rules, regulations and discipline thereof, until the term for which he has been sentenced is completed, or until he is otherwise legally discharged.

These are the sections proposed to be amended by the bill. The amendments are found to be necessary by the provincial authorities.

Mr. MANION: I notice that the amendment makes no mention of a hospital or similar institution.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, the prisoner has to be sent back to the jail from which he came. No special hospital is provided.

Mr. MANION: But suppose the jail has no infirmary, for example, in connection with it?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: He can be treated in the jail. There is a department for such purposes in almost every jail in the country, I think.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When I had the honour of acting as Solicitor General, a number of cases arose in the Department of Justice upon which this amendment would have a direct bearing. The difficulty was that in some of the jails in Ontario, and in many similar institutions in Nova Scotia, there was no proper arrangement for the custody of prisoners suffering from contagious diseases. The matter was brought to the attention of the law departments of the various provinces on more than one occasion, but they did not seem to recognize it as their duty to provide suitable quarters for such cases. There is no doubt that hardship and difficulty resulted to prisoners because of this condition. I can recall several cases in Ontario where prisoners had contagious diseases of a very virulent type, and the placing of these men in the ordinary penitentiaries would be just ground for objection on the part of the other convicts. On the other hand, there is no adequate facilities in the local jails to take care of these prisoners, and what is to be done in the circumstances is a rather difficult problem.

Men who are the victims of a loathsome disease are sometimes sentenced by judges to penitentiary terms. They are first confined in the local jail, and orders for their removal to the penitentiary arrive in due course. But they should be accompanied by a certificate as to health before being admitted into the penitentiary, otherwise trouble might ensue among the other convicts. If they are returned to the local jail, the same difficulty may arise there, or the unfortunate man may receive no adequate treatment. In a number of cases while I was in that department, persons suffering from certain diseases were treated in the local hospital under guard. Frequently we had to release prisoners for the purpose of having serious operations performed on them; they were released on parole or under guard and after recovery were brought back to the penitentiary. But some new system should be evolved. The authorities in charge of the provincial jails should be compelled to see that some proper treatment is accorded to prisoners who are so afflicted. Personally, I think the amendment proposed by the minister is a proper one and ought to be adopted. But it does bring up that broader question: what are we going to do with the unfortunate criminal who is condemned by a court of law and does not receive proper treatment in our jails? If he is treated in the jail, what are you going to do about the other prisoners who are there and who are liable to the contagion?

Mr. MANION: Not only are the prisoners—the diseased men as well as the others—to be considered in this matter; it affects the public generally. If a number of prisoners take ill, say, with scarlet fever, diphtheria, or any other contagious disease, the expense to the country is increased. I do not know whether another clause could be added to the amendment to provide for this. I notice that the minister shakes his head; apparently it cannot be done. Now, I have been in some of these jails—though not as a prisoner—and I know that often there are no facilities for caring for men afflicted in this way. I suggest to the minister that if something could be done to provide for these cases it would be in the interests not only of the prisoners concerned, but of the public as well.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We are now legislating in respect of penitentiaries, which are under the jurisdiction of the federal government. We have no power to legislate for the provincial jails. As to the cases my hon. friend mentions of contagious diseases in certain jails, I do not know much about the other provinces, but I had the honour of being Attorney General of Quebec for some fifteen years, and I know that when such cases arose there the prisoners were sent to a hospital and returned to the jail after treatment. If the matter is to be dealt with as regards the provincial jails, it must be done by the provinces themselves. As to the penitentiaries, we do the best we can. We are legislating to give full protection to the prisoners, and I have reason to believe that even under the law as we had it before, full protection was given them. We are providing here that the provincial authorities may take a prisoner suffering from a contagious disease and treat him in a jail or some hospital if that is found necessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree with the minister that we are legislating in regard to our own penitentiaries, but we must remember this—that the judges who administer our criminal law, which we pass, convict these men, and sentence them to the penitentiary. The penitentiary is under our jurisdiction and if we pass this act and a man suffering from a contagious disease is sentenced to a penitentiary and that sentence is not carried out by reason of his disease, he is readmitted to the county jail, which has no adequate means of taking care of him. I know county jails in the province of Ontario, and apart from those in the larger cities I do not know of one that has any facilities at all for caring for convicts suffering from a contagious disease. We pass the criminal law; we appoint the judges who administer it; our appointees sentence the convict to the penitentiary, and now we are passing a law which says that unless the convict is in good health he cannot be admitted to the penitentiary; he must go back to the county jail whence he came, where there are no proper facilities for looking after him. I agree that we have no authority over these county jails. That is the difficulty of the situation, and in correspondence I have had on that matter when we have suggested that the county jail should be put into a condition to attend to these prisoners we have been practically told to mind our own business. There is the difficulty, and it is that I wish to point out.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is another point involved that has not been touched upon, and that is that if a prisoner is sentenced to serve a term in a federal prison, and is afterwards under this legislation sent back to a county jail, the cost of maintaining him is thrown back on the county, when by right it should fall on the Dominion. Am I right in that?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: There seems to be a lack of provision as to who is to pay for the medical attendance necessary. There is something also in the draftsmanship of this bill which requires a little attention. It proposes to amend section 46 of the present act by adding at the end the following:

> Provided that a convict, if certified by the surgeon to be suffering in manner aforesaid, may remain and be kept in his former custody until his condition shall in the opinion of the surgeon justify withdrawal of the certificate.

Now you have the sentence of the court, which says that he shall go to the penitentiary. Then, under this provision, if the convict is suffering from a contagious disease, the sentence is suspended, and the will of the surgeon is substituted for everything else. Suppose the surgeon finds him incurable—and he may well be possessed of a disease which is readily communicable and is not curable—apparently then he would remain in the jail for life at the cost of the municipality, which has to maintain the jail. The municipality would have to pay for his board and medical attendance. Of course, no such result is contemplated, but it seems to me there is a deficiency in the structure of the Act in not providing for a resumption of the jurisdiction of the court which sentenced the convict.

I may also add to what has been said on the subject of the unfitness of the county jails. There is not in the province of New Brunswick one jail in which it would be humane to keep a prisoner who is suffering. In the city of St. John—I do not say the jail there is the best—the jail is utterly inadequate. There are no proper accommodations, and it would only be inflicting unnecessary cruelty on a man under sentence to compel him to be looked after in such a place. I trust that this matter will receive more consideration. I am satisfied that every one in the House wants to accomplish the most beneficial results, but from my knowledge of the local conditions I think the county jails are not fit to look after convicts suffering from contagious disease. I think it would be far better, and much more humane to segregate such cases in the penitentiary and treat them there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I do not wholly agree with those who have spoken on this matter. I would not like to see legislation passed which virtually threw upon the Dominion government the care of incurables by the mere act of the incurable committing a crime. The incurable, in so far as he requires care at all, is the ward of the provincial authorities, and the upon the Dominion government the care of him. Consequently, in endeavouring at least to rid the Dominion of the obligation of accepting a charge which constitutionally is a provincial charge, I am wholly in sympathy with the minister. I only make this comment; in legislating that the man may remain, are you also legislating that the province must keep him? If you are, I am afraid you are doing worse than establishing a wheat board. Can this Parliament legislate to compel the province to maintain a prisoner who has been sentenced to the penitentiary?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I may say that this request has come from the provinces themselves. I do not anticipate any difficulty over it. This has been the practice for years, and there has never been any trouble. In the past, no person suffering from a contagious disease could be admitted to a penitentiary. The prisoner has to be sent somewhere to be treated, and as he comes from the province, if he is suffering from a contagious disease he is sent back to a jail in a district of the province. There is only one question before us, because the question of maintenance does not come in now, and that is the treatment of prisoners suffering from a contagious disease. We could give them their liberty, but they have to be kept somewhere, and the provincial authorities say: Let us take them back to our jails or hospitals, and we will treat them. If any complaint should come from the provincial authorities, we shall consider it and try to settle it to the satisfaction of the province.

Mr. CALDWELL: What has been the practice in such cases in the past?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The provincial authorities now take the prisoners back to their jails, but there is a doubt whether they have a legal right to do so, and it is

to remove that doubt that we are proposing this amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL: This amendment does not change the practice at all?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Not at all.

Mr. SEXSMITH: In the county of Lennox that has always been the practice. If a criminal in the jail is sick, we take care of him in the hospital, and return him to the jail when he is better.

Mr. ANDERSON: I was surgeon to a county jail in Ontario for about twenty years, and I would point out that no prisoner is sent from a county jail to the penitentiary without the surgeon's certificate that he is free from disease. If he contracts the disease on the road to the penitentiary, the governor of the jail would refuse to take him back. The governor of the jail would not consider that he was entitled to take charge of a man because of his suffering from an infectious disease. Furthermore in the smaller jails in the counties of Ontario absolutely no provision is made for the treatment of diseased patients, and no accommodation exists for them except in the corridor or in the cell—there is not even a hospital ward in the majority of these institutions. Consequently, if a prisoner suffering from an infectious disease is returned to one of these jails he is put in with the other inmates and thus becomes a menace to their health as well as to the health of those philanthropic people who pay visits to the inmates from time to time. There is likewise a lack of hospital accommodation, I think, in connection with the jails in the smaller towns. Under the circumstances I think it will be found that the jail governors will refuse to accept prisoners suffering from infectious disease and will send them back whence they came.

Mr. LOGAN: According to the Minister of Justice we are by this legislation only making legal what has been done without authority in the past. Let me say a word or two in reference to the condition of our jails in the province of Nova Scotia. I can supplement what has been said of conditions in the other provinces by stating that I do not know of a jail in my own province even in the city of Halifax, that is equipped to look after a prisoner suffering from infectious disease. There is, on the other hand, a possibility that such legislation as this may make it easier to retain men in the local jails; it has occurred to me that such a thing might be possible by connivance between the local medical officer and the friends of the prisoner. I think I can remember in the practice of my profession the attempt being made to retain a man in a local jail in order not to have the stigma put upon him of having been an inmate of a penitentiary. It does seem to me also, as has been suggested by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) that there is some danger of perpetrating an injustice upon the local authorities. Because, in Nova Scotia, the cost of maintaining a prisoner in jail devolves upon the municipal authorities, in the county of Cumberland, for example, that cost is borne by the county council and not by the provincial authorities. There may be very good reasons for the municipalities objecting to paying for the maintenance of prisoners who have been sentenced to the penitentiary; but there is one thing that we should do as far as we possibly can, and that is to provide humane treatment for the poor devil who has been jailed whilst suffering from an infectious disease. Cases have come under my personal observation of men who have been forced to lie in a pretty close cell, destitute of even sanitary arrangements, suffering and almost dying from infectious disease, and nobody seemed to worry very much about them. I think it would be better practice, wherever possible, to get a man who has been sentenced to the penitentiary sent to that institution as quickly as possible because proper hospital accommodation is obtainable and the needed facilities to look after his particular case.

Mr. BOYS: It is not the province upon whom the financial responsibility rests, and that is a fact I would like to bring to the attention of the minister. I can quite understand the provinces being satisfied with this as legalizing a practice heretofore obtaining, but it is the county that bears the entire cost in connection with these jails—even the surgeon is paid by the county. Now what does this legislation mean? It simply means that it is left to the local municipality to take care of any expense that may be occasioned by the present amendment. They have not the necessary facilities to care for those suffering from infectious disease, and it is not at all likely that those facilities will be provided. It seems to me that if this amendment is to be adopted the rights of the municipalities should be safeguarded by some scheme properly worked out. If

the provinces would undertake this responsibility all well and good; but if they will not do so it simply means that these patients will not get the requisite treatment. It seems to me that when a man receives a sentence which takes him to the penitentiary he becomes a charge upon the federal authorities and it is for them to see that proper care is taken of him. Whether they should go to the extent of providing facilities for treating such patients locally is a doubtful point; but I can assure the minister that legalizing a practice which has prevailed in the past will not do away with the trouble. After all it is most important to see that proper treatment should be provided for these men. That cannot and will not be provided in the local jails, the expense of whose maintenance is now entirely borne by the counties.

Mr. RANKIN: In the province of Ontario the Public Health Act prohibits the transfer from one municipality to another of any person suffering from infectious disease. Therefore a prisoner suffering in this way could not be transferred from the penitentiary to a local jail or otherwise without violating the Public Health Act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We are not proposing by this legislation to change what has been the practice in the past; all that is being done is to legalize the existing procedure. As to the question of expenditure the obligations of the provinces are not being increased; they will in the future be the same in this respect as they have been in the past. One hon. member stated that the expense in these cases is paid by the counties. In our province that cost is borne by the provincial authorities. If parliament decides that we should take charge of the prisoners from the day they are convicted, whether they are suffering from infectious disease or not, that is another matter. We are only asking here that the mode of procedure under which the provincial authorities have acted in the past shall be legalized. I cannot say what the experience has been in other provinces but I am not aware that a single complaint has ever been made on this account in the province of Quebec. Another objection raised is that if the law is amended in the manner proposed, a prisoner may be detained in a provincial jail for the whole term of his sentence, which might be for four or five years. But it should be remembered that the time spent by a prisoner in a provincial jail or a provincial hospital will be counted on his sentence; and should there be any doubt on that score the Minister of Justice would certainly liberate the prisoner upon the expiration of his term. Therefore, considering all the objections and all the observations which have been made in regard to these two amendments which I have the honour to propose, I do not see that we can do more to-day than what is proposed in them. We say that we go according to the old rules; we refuse to receive, in penitentiaries, prisoners if they suffer from infectious or contagious diseases, and we authorize the provinces to keep such prisoners in their charge, to treat them and, if possible, to cure them. I have reason to believe that the explanations I have given are sufficient to convince hon. members of the necessity of these amendments.

5 p.m.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Civil Government—Insurance—salaries, including Superintendent of Insurance, $1,000 additional to salary authorized by 7-8 Edward VII, Chap. 69, and contingenciss, $117,385.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): There is a small increase in the salary item. That we must expect as there is a constant increase in the insurance business. The number of officials is one less; but, against that, there is an increase in the contingency appropriation, out of which temporary employees will be paid. The increase in the volume of insurance which has to be handled by the department, is very great. Let me give these figures for the purposes of illustration. In 1915, the total fire insurance in force was $3,531,620,802. In 1920, according to the latest figures with which I have been furnished, it amounted to $5,969,872,278. The percentage of increase between 1915 and 1920 in the total fire insurance in force is 69. Between those two years there is an increase of 91 per cent in the net fire insurance premiums received, an increase of 103 per cent in the total life insurance business in force and an increase of 185 per cent in the amount of new life insurance issued. Altogether, these figures indicate, as they must, that there will always be a growing business in that department and this growing business will call, from time to time, for some increases. The additional

amount asked by the superintendent is not large, and I am quite sure it will be only in harmony with the growth of the business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe, of course, what the minister himself has remarked, namely, that efforts at economy in this case have again resulted in an increased expenditure of about eight or nine per cent. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance particularly acknowledge that, with increase in the functions of government, in the business of government, there necessarily will be some increase in the cost of operation, and, in a word, that if that goes on, as it has been going on, the cause of economy must be confined pretty much to propaganda.

Mr. FIELDING: It is rather too early to expect any government to indulge in economy in regard to Civil Service departments before there is any opportunity of making any inquiry. As regards my department, I make no boast of economy. I have not dismissed anybody; I took the estimates as I found them last year and I made a few changes. As time rolls on, I hope we can manifest economy in these branches. For the present, I suppose most of the ministers will be obliged to accept, in large degree the estimates of the past year, and time must be allowed for any economy to be exercised. At any rate as regards any branches with which I am connected, I am making no boast of economy at the present time. What will be done in the future remains to be seen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That remark applies with some force to cases like those of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), possibly the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) and, perhaps, some others; but if there is one case to which it does not apply, it is that of the Minister of Finance himself. He was Minister of Finance of this country for fifteen years, in the very department in which he is now. He knows the organization of the department. Even in the ten years during which he was out of office, he followed its work and development very closely. I do not doubt at all that he knows intimately most of the higher officials of the department. They are the same people who were there in his time. This is something that he has at his fingers' ends. The Minister of Finance is all too modest when he seeks to convince me that three months would not be ample time for him to see if there was any extravagance in his department in the matter of civil government. Three months! Why, in three weeks, the Minister of Finance would have a pretty good idea; but with all his experience and knowledge of the department, with all his concentration on that department, for that has been the work of his life, he is now compelled to come to this Parliament and, in every instance so far, not to confess his total inability to ask for any reduction, but rather to ask for something more.

Mr. FIELDING: If, in the last three months, I had nothing to do but study the Civil Service, in all probability my right hon. friend's remarks would be to the point; but, if he does not know this fact, I have had a great deal to do during the past three months. There are a number of vacancies in my department; my predecessor left some, and they have not been filled yet for the reason that I have not had time to investigate the matter. I have as much desire for economy in my department as I commend to my brother ministers, but time must be allowed for the exercise of economy; it cannot be accomplished in a day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I trust that is not an intimation that all the vacancies in this department are to be filled. The appropriation put through amounts to about $413,000, and my recollection is that what it costs to run the department is $350,000. I recognize that my hon. friend will have before him circumstances which may require the extra vote. For instance, supposing that he puts into effect, what I think would be a very proper reform, the centralizing of all the bookkeeping of the country in the Finance Department, he may want more money; but I hope, simply because there are vacancies, my hon. friend is not going to fill them at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend left some vacancies, and I may say that I intend to have some of them filled. They will have to be filled by the Civil Service Commission. I do not want to call in question the wisdom of the Civil Service Commission, but I am not sure, under the machinery we have in the Civil Service Commission, we shall get the best men. Some of these vacancies will certainly be filled, and I do not hesitate to say that the men of my department are overworked. We are, however dealing at present with the Insurance Department. I think in that respect there is no ground for criticism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never disputed the desire of the minister to reduce, and

he will search my remarks in vain for any suggestion of the kind. But he said enough before I spoke, and if he did not he has certainly said enough since, to show that though he has had other things to do he has had ample time to look into his department. Having done so, he comes here and says: "I have gone into the department, and though I have not had as much time as I shall have, I have had opportunity enough to discover that there are quite a lot of vacancies which I must fill because the men are overworked."

Mr. FIELDING: That is a perfectly correct statement of the matter.

Item agreed to.

Auditor General's Office—Salaries, including Auditor General at $1,000 addition to 7-8 Edward VII, Chap. 6, $253,885; contingencies, $34,000.

Mr. FIELDING: The item shows an increase. The Auditor General states that provision is made in his estimates for six additional audit clerks and six more junior audit clerks. He says that the preparation of the annual report for the past fiscal year was completed about the end of February, 1922. It is hoped to have the report for the current year much earlier than this date next year. To do so it will be necessary to have additional help. He says:

A number of the clerks now temporarily employed have qualified for permanent employment. I wish to retain the services of those who are rendering efficient service rather than have them assigned to another department and inexperienced clerks sent me in their places.

It is important that the Auditor General's report should be got out at an early date in the session, as hon. members will no doubt readily agree, because that document has a considerable bearing on the business of the House; and if the additional clerks whom the Auditor General desires will help to get that important report out at the beginning of the session, I am sure the committee will commend the increase for this purpose.

Mr. GOULD: Is the current report true, that the Auditor General is retiring?

Mr. FIELDING: He has intimated his desire to retire and it is expected that leave of absence will be granted him up to the first of October, at which time it is contemplated he will retire. He has been for no less a period than fifty years in the public service.

Mr. GOULD: In connection with the estimates of several departments, members have repeatedly inquired upon whose recommendation the civil servants are appointed, and it was stated in reply a few nights ago that they were employed on the recommendation of the deputies or other officers higher up in the service. I think that is a most arbitrary proceeding. Members of Parliament, who are responsible for moneys voted in this House, desire to do everything possible to promote the efficiency of the public service. But we are led to believe, in certain instances, that departments are overmanned and officers higher up overpaid, as evidenced in the frequent increases asked for in civil government estimates. In view of this fact I have wondered whether it would not be advisable to appoint a parliamentary committee at this session to look into the various departments, with the deputy ministers and other officers of the Government, to ascertain and report to Parliament in what directions possible retrenchment, without impairment to the efficiency of the service, might be effected. I think there is good work in that connection that a special committee of the House could undertake, and I am sure that deputy ministers would co-operate with such a committee. I offer this merely as a suggestion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Although there is a blanketing of officials in this item, there seems to be a considerable amount carried in the contingency vote, as well, for clerical and other assistance. It is suggested that certain temporary employees will be put on the permanent staff. I hope the minister will not transfer them all to the permanent staff, because the permanent staff is ample as it is. I had hoped that the department might be brought up to something like a state of modern efficiency, so that the requirements of modern business might be met, providing a proper audit that would adequately safeguard the Treasury, especially in regard to petty cash items. If that is to be done the department will have to be largely reconstituted. Otherwise my hon. friend will find that the character of the work will not conduce to a proper up-to-date system such as I suggest. I hope, I repeat, that he does not intend to place all the temporaries on the permanent staff, because we have enough permanent employees as it is. But if he does so, surely he will not need the vote for clerical assistance.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know how the word "blanketing," as it is used fre-

quently in connection with the Estimates, originated. If it means the transfer of temporary employees to the permanent list, it will be found that during the past year a good deal of that sort of transfer was made. I cannot say that the present Government has done nothing of that kind, but I do know that efforts have been made in the various departments to transfer many of the officials from the temporary to the permanent list and the matter has been held for further consideration. I agree that when you transfer a man from the temporary to the permanent list he acquires a larger vested right and it is harder to displace him. For that reason we are resisting the movement to transfer temporaries to the permanent staff. I concur in what my hon. friend says regarding the desirability of a reorganization of the department; but that will take time, and for the moment we must accept the organization as we find it.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the expenses of work in the interest of fire prevention, to be carried on by the Department of Insurance, $17,000.

Mr. FIELDING: The work of this branch is carried on by the department in co-operation with the Dominion Fire Prevention Association. The increase in the vote is due to the expenses of an investigation, undertaken at the suggestion of the association, of roofing materials with a view to determining their safety from a fire prevention standpoint, as well as their durability and cost. There is also being conducted at the present time an investigation of matches. A resolution of the Dominion Fire Prevention Association some months ago recommended that, if possible, legislation standardizing matches manufactured or imported into Canada be sought, and it is probable that legislation for this purpose will be submitted during the present session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that there is a Dominion body, known as the Dominion Fire Prevention Association, and that this is a grant to that body?

Mr. FIELDING: I understand they work in co-operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, the Insurance Department and the Dominion Fire Prevention Association.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The money, then, is checked out for the individual purposes of the association by the Insurance Department?

Mr. FIELDING: It is a government grant, and subject to all the principles governing such an appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it is a grant?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is paid out by the Superintendent of Insurance upon evidence that the conditions set forth have been complied with. I am not familiar with the matter, but that is my understanding. Being a Dominion grant, it must of course be subject to Dominion orders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the point I am at. I have come to the conclusion myself that many of these Dominion grants would be better restricted than amplified. I pretend to no special knowledge of the work of the Dominion Fire Prevention Association, but I had to do with other bodies, and I think the practice of turning over our money to organizations of this kind, to prosecute special work that they are interested in, must be confined within very rigid limits indeed, and an examination made of the actual work done with the money from the Treasury and also with the money contributed from other sources to the same end. I found instances where these organizations had merely constituted themselves an agency, always under salary, for handling Dominion moneys to further purposes that they, of course, exalted to the skies, but that really did not get very far.

Mr. McMASTER: The Alpine Club, for instance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Alpine Club $1,000 has bothered my hon. friend for years, but if he would not strain at the gnat so often he might reach the camel.

Mr. FIELDING: There are occasions when grants are made as lump sums to various organizations, and they of course have to assume the responsibility of administration. My impression is that this grant is not exactly of that type, but that it is a matter in which the Superintendent of Insurance exercises an active part. If there is any doubt as to that, the item can be held over. But at any rate I will call the attention of the Superintendent of Insurance to my right hon. friend's remarks, because I would agree with him that Parliament should have some assurance that these grants are being applied to the purposes for which they are designed.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—Experimental Farms, $1,315,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: In view of the increased expenditure, would the hon. minister kindly explain?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, a going concern like these farms cannot be administered with any degree of success without a corresponding increase in expenditure. I am sure my hon. friend from Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) has frequently noticed in the past that opportunities of spending a little more money on these experimental farms have increased, but during the war the vote was held down, and properly so I think. Since then conditions have not improved very much, from a financial standpoint, and in fact the vote is still being held down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think there was a continual increase during the war.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: And there will be now; but notwithstanding that there may be an increase in some items, the expenditure generally is being held down. There are twenty-two experimental farms located throughout the Dominion, and certain extensions are made from time to time of the work they are engaged in. As we go over the vote I shall be able to explain in detail how the aggregate is made up. A new farm was established last year at Swift Current that my hon. friend is familiar with. It is in a very primitive condition yet, and a reasonable amount of expenditure has to be incurred in order to get it properly launched. The vote does not contemplate the addition of any new experimental farms this year. An item will be found later of possible expenditure for the acquisition of necessary land in the event of one or two more farms being established, but that would be as far as we would go this year.

Mr. HANSON: This is a very large amount of money and we are not supplied with any details. I am interested, as one of these experimental farms is situated in my constituency, and I know its work has been curtailed very much, in fact too much it is claimed. Will the minister give us details of this vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have a mass of information here, Mr. Chairman, but it would not be convenient to burden the committee with the whole of it. If my hon. friend will particularize what he wishes to be informed about I shall be glad to help him. We have all the farms tabulated here. Beginning in the east, we have farms at the following points: Charlottetown, P.E.I., Kentville, N.S., Nappan, N.S., Fredericton, N.B., St. Anne de la Pocatière, Que., Cap Rouge, Que., Lennoxville, Que., La Ferme, Que., Kapuskasing, Ont., Morden, Man., Brandon, Man., Indian Head, Sask., Rosthern, Sask., Scott, Sask., Swift Current, Sask., Lacombe, Alta., Lethbridge, Alta., Agassiz, B.C., Invermere, B.C., Sydney, B.C., and Summerland, B.C. There are also a certain number of sub-stations.

Mr. HANSON: How much was spent on the Fredericton farm last year, and how much is proposed to be spent this year? Is the vacant position of superintendent of that farm to be filled right away?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The total amount spent last year was $40,482. The position of superintendent has been vacant for some time and is in the process of being filled. The position will have to be advertised by the Civil Service Commission, and that usually takes a couple of weeks. When the applications are all in, there will be the usual procedure of appointing a board to examine the applicants.

Mr. HANSON: How much is to be spent this year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: $42,882, an increase of nearly $3,000.

Mr. HANSON: The work of that farm has been very largely curtailed; it does not appear that there will be any extension of activities in the coming year. I wish also to point out that in order to encourage good men to remain in the service, the principle of promotion should be adopted. The superintendent of the farm resigned last year, and the work has since been carried on by a man born on a good New Brunswick farm. He had the advantage of living on that farm for a considerable length of time, and subsequently had the advantage of experience in a banking institution. He has been acting as assistant superintendent for the past three years. I hope that his claims to promotion will be given serious consideration. The department can exercise considerable influence in the appointment of a new superintendent, and I trust that the principle of promotion will commend itself to the minister and his officials as applying to this case. It will not be a popular move if some one who is not now in the service is appointed to that position, and if what I have heard is true, it is the intention to bring in an outsider.

If such a course is followed it will not commend itself to the people of that community.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The principle enunciated by my hon friend is quite sound. I do not know the gentleman to whom he refers; I understand his name is Taylor.

Mr. HANSON: I do not happen to know him, either. I am not interested in him personally.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The principle is sound, and should be followed wherever possible. I would not like to say just how much influence we have in the matter of the appointment. If the deputy minister and myself, and, we will say, the Director of Experimental Farms, recommended that this man should be appointed, it would no doubt have some influence on the commission. Sometimes such representations have effect; at other times they do not, according to how strong our case is and what the other applicants are like. I take it that the advisory board would be governed by the ability of the various applicants, though they would no doubt take into consideration the fact that a certain employee was in the line of succession.

Mr. LEWIS: The suggestion has been made that the amount of this vote seems rather large, but considering the importance of agriculture I do not think it is at all excessive. In fact, I think it could be largely increased with a great amount of profit to the agrarian interests of Canada. The minister, speaking of the farm at Swift Curent, said that it was in a very primitive state. Did I understand him to say that a sum would be included in the Supplementary Estimates to provide this farm with buildings, or is the amount for that purpose included in the general vote for experimental farms?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Certain minor buildings will be taken care of by this vote. It is quite probable that when the Supplementary Estimates come down they will contain a further sum for buildings. That, of course, will depend on the condition of the finances of the country.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the minister give me the same information in respect to the Swift Current farm that he gave the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), in respect to the amount spent last year and the appropriation for this year?

Mr. MICHAUD: The minister says that money will be voted to provide new buildings that are urgently needed to meet the conditions of agriculture in the West. Agriculture is a line of work which should not suffer through lack of this equipment, and we should not hesitate to vote the money necessary for that purpose. There are other parts of the country where money could profitably be spent on buildings of this kind, and I reserve the privilege of speaking on this subject on the first opportunity when other estimates are presented.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: With regard to the inquiry of my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis), I may say that there is an item of $75,000 in the Public Works estimates for repairs and extensions which would take care of certain necessary building at these various experimental farms. As I have said, the matter of going on with new buildings of any considerable size is still under consideration, and if any provision under that head is to be made, it will have to be included in an additional vote to be brought down later.

Mr. LEWIS: The minister said that $40,000 odd would be expended on the farm to which reference was made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). Would he give me similar information in respect to Swift Current?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The amount spent last year was $19,450. This year is is $25,450.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is any appropriation included in this item to open up an experimental farm in northern British Columbia? We have a large area up there which is rich in an agricultural sense, lying in the neighbourhood of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. The conditions there are different from those existing in any other part of British Columbia, and different from those on the prairie. It is a country that will be very valuable in the future as a live stock country, and more particularly as a dairy country. It is very productive in the way of hay, roots, and such things as are necessary for the proper carrying on of dairying. The area up there is immense. It is a country that at the present time is perhaps a little subject to frost, but it is one where an experimental farm would render very valuable service, indeed, if established in the near future, to the settlers in that part of British Columbia. I would be glad to know if there is an

appropriation included in this item for that purpose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is one place I had in mind when I spoke of experimental farms. There is an appropriation of $30,000, but just where it will be expended I cannot say. It will take some time to select the locality. I am in hopes that next summer I shall be able to visit that country. The locality we had in mind for an experimental farm out there is on the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific between the main range of mountains and the coast mountains. That is a splendid territory capable of a great deal of development in a colonization way. Of course, we cannot expect new settlers with very little resources to do much demonstration work and make a living. So far as my information goes, that will be the next district to have an experimental farm, but before making any decision I would like to visit that country, not only for that purpose, but for many other reasons. I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with a number of members from British Columbia, and they seemed to think that an experimental farm somewhere between the main range and the coast mountains is the proper place; but just where I am not prepared to say at the present time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How many experimental farms are there in British Columbia at the present time, how many substations, and how many demonstration farms?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are four experimental farms, one sub-station, and I believe twelve illustration stations. I will give my hon. friend a list of them later. These illustration farms are small allotments running from twenty-five to forty acres, frequently leased from a local farmer. At all events, that is the usual practice on the prairie.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should also like the number of substations and illustration farms in each of the provinces, with their area, also the amount expended in connection with each of them, particularly the expenditure, outside of the civil government vote, for the permanent farm labour on each farm, the wages of the foremen, superintendents, and so forth.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask if the minister expects to get a successor for Professor Saunders, who carried on insect pest research work in the maritime provinces, also what is being done with regard to devising ways and means of overcoming potato disease, finding out the cause and the best preventive measures.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I can now give my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) a list of the illustration stations in British Columbia: Armstrong, Barriere, Comox, Frances Lake, Kamloops, Kerville, Prince George, Smithers, Salmon Arm, Telkwa and Vanderhoof.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would also like to know the revenue derived from the farms in each of the provinces.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I presume my hon. friend means the gross revenue. There is not very much net revenue.

Mr. FORTIER: Are the expenses of the illustration farms included in this item? Is it the policy of the Government to establish more illustration farms in Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In reply to the first question, yes. With regard to the establishment of more illustration farms, in the natural development of an institution of this kind there will, of course, be more farms. There are not very many in the different provinces, partly due to the fact that some of the provincial governments, the Ontario government, for instance, have taken up this kind of work, in a measure, and partly because there has not been a great demand for it, and such demand as there was, was being gratified. I remember that in the western provinces this work was being taken up in a small way before the Dominion government went into it. It is not an easy matter to get a suitable location and a suitable farmer to take charge of one of these illustration farms. The work is not overpaid, and it requires a lot of time and care, and a man with an experimental turn of mind, but in the majority of cases we are fairly successful. Occasionally we get a man who does not come up to our expectations, and in that case we eliminate him and get another man. There is no capital outlay in connection with these farms, except in one or two instances in the Peace river country, where a certain amount of capital has been expended. As a rule the land is just leased, the farms ranging from twenty-five to forty acres. We do not undertake much risk in these matters but occasionally our anticipations may not altogether be realized. Even so, I think the work can be extended with advantage.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is an increase in this item of $44,360. The minister has already practically promised about $30,000 of this increase for a farm in the northern part of British Columbia which will not leave very much money for meeting the necessities of other provinces. I would think that the province of Ontario is entitled to be treated more generously in the matter of farms of this character, but if the minister's plans are carried out there is not very much likelihood of it receiving more liberal treatment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may inform my hon. friend that there was no absolute promise given to my hon. friend from Victoria city. Accompanying any such promise was the reservation that I would like to see the locality, not in connection with this farm alone, but because many other reasons render a visit to British Columbia desirable. With the information at present at our disposal that is where the next experimental farm should be located. If my hon. friend can throw any additional light upon the matter that will help to change my opinion, as well as that of the Director of Experimental Farms, I shall be very glad to receive it from him. I hope I have an open mind on the subject. As a rule, however, these farms, when established in new territory prove far more useful than when located in the older parts of Canada. How can we teach Ontario people to farm when a hundred years of actual practice has done that most effectively?

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 3, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 9, respecting The Canada Trust Company.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate Canadian General Insurance Company.—Mr. Lanctot.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 28, respecting The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Sheard.

VANCOUVER, FRASER VALLEY AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY

On the motion for the second reading:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and some opposition has been raised to it. He, unfortunately, is not in the House to-night, but he requested me to ask for the permission of the House to move the bill into second reading, to have it referred to the proper committee, and to have that committee, a little later, appoint a special day on which all the opposition may be brought against the bill. If that is satisfactory to the House, I beg to move the second reading of the bill.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): This is a bill to which I would direct tne particular attention of the House, because if this bill passes, it will have the effect of taking all the street railways in British Columbia out of the jurisdiction of the local authorities and placing them under the jurisdiction of the Dominion and the Board of Railway Commissioners. As stated by the hon. member who preceded me, there is a great deal of opposition to this bill. It is opposed by the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, the Union of Canadian Municipalities, and practically all the municipalities in which the company operates.

Mr. MANION: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I have received objections to the bill and was told by the promoter that if any objections should be made to its having a second reading I should let it stand. Rather than have objection carried further, I would move that the bill stand.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I understand that there are representatives here now from Vancouver and elsewhere in British Columbia who are opposed to the bill. It is possible that if the bill does not get the second reading to-night it may not be ready for reference to the Committee on Railways by the 25th, as arranged by its promoters from the West. I also am inclined to oppose such a bill but as the representatives are here from the West now, perhaps the hon. member, unless he desires to delay it, might allow it to go to the committee where it will be properly threshed out.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In the circumstances I will not discuss the bill further at this stage.

Motion agree to and bill read the second time.

SUPPLY

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock, Item No. 41, page 22 of the Estimates, was under consideration. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. SALES: Before we rose at six o'clock the minister was making some rather pertinent remarks regarding the value of experimental farms in new districts, and he seemed to be questioning the value of those in the old districts. I would call his attention to the situation in his own province with which he is very well acquainted. At Indian Head there is a farm which has been in operation for some years, I do not know just how many. By the Auditor General's Report for 1920 I see that that farm cost $44,482 that year, while the income from it was only $2,955.66. We have at Saskatoon, as the minister well knows, a large farm operated in connection with the university, at which all kinds of experiments can be conducted; forty-two miles distant is the experimental farm at Rosthern, and about one hundred miles west of it is another at Scott. Now, realizing the importance of economy at this particular time, I am wondering whether there is not a certain amount of duplication there—whether all that experimental work could not be better carried on at Saskatoon and the money thus saved employed usefully in some other direction. I am also wondering whether these farms as they become better established cannot be made self-sustaining. When one looks at the immense amount of money spent on them, and the small returns received from the sale of produce, the contrast is striking.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is a very interesting and important question. I think every member of the committee will recognize that no matter where the experimental farm may be located, there will surely be some local benefit accrue from it. When we rose at six o'clock I was discussing the relative values of experimental farms in old and new districts. I believe that in the new districts we will probably get three or four times as much value in proportion to our expenditure as we get in the older districts. That will hold good whether it is an old farm in a new district like Indian Head, or a new farm in an old district in Ontario. But inasmuch as the old farms were established at Brandon and Indian Head when these were new districts, naturally we are rather disposed to continue them.

With regard to the farms at Scott and Rosthern I think the latter was located before the university was established at Saskatoon, if I remember rightly.

Mr. SALES: I think so.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That accounts for its proximity of only forty miles. The farm at Scott is in a peculiar district in regard to soil, which is of an entirely different character to that around Saskatoon, and therefore I suppose the distance of only one hundred miles was not considered an objection to its location at that point. But quite apart from that, I cannot help thinking that since the University of Saskatchewan has been established at Saskatoon as a state university, that is, combining in its curriculum agriculture as well as the arts and sciences, the whole question of duplication might be considered. We have not yet had sufficient time to deal with it conclusively. But for the sake of standing by what is generally looked upon as a good thing, I do not think we should countenance duplication such as my hon. friend refers to. I have discussed this matter with Dean Rutherford of the Agricultural College on more than one occasion, having in view the possibility of some time merging those farms into the activities of the university. That can only be accomplished by the joint action of the province and the Dominion, but it is worth considering. As a good many of us know, the university authorities look forward to establishing a number of stations throughout Saskatchewan tributary to the university, and it occurs to me that some of these farms that we look upon as instances of duplication might be made part of the university's activities. Possibly the work might be entered into jointly by the Dominion and the province, we still retaining supervision over the work for a time, at all events.

There is no doubt that with respect to the older established farms we feel sometimes that we do not get full value for what they cost us. But it must be remembered that the value of the Indian Head farm when the old territories of Alberta and Saskatchewan were one was simply incalculable.

Mr. SALES: Agreed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But that was thirty years ago. Despite present conditions, I feel almost like continuing that farm even though it may have passed the point of maximum usefulness for the sake of the work it has done in years gone by. But apart from sentimental reasons, there is no doubt the day will come when these older farms will be required for other purposes, such as stock breeding and multiplying certain new varieties of grains developed at the experimental farm here. For those purposes they are still useful, but a large proportion of their usefulness for the purposes for which they were originally designed has automatically passed away. That is unavoidable, and cannot be regarded as in any sense derogatory to the general plan of experimental farms.

But the point I wish to bring out is that during the first twenty-five years an experimental farm in a country like that is at its period of maximum usefulness to the community: that maximum, however, gradually declines as we pass into a new era, until finally the time arrives when we have to consider the question of soil fertility and cognate matters.

Mr SALES: I agree thoroughly with what the hon. minister has said with regard to the usefulness of these farms for the first twenty-five years, and as to their further usefulness afterwards as to stock breeding and seed multiplying areas. The only point I had in mind was not the cutting down of the estimates, but of seeing that we get as full value as we possibly can for the money spent. I know that he is so thoroughly familiar with his province that it is only necessary to draw his attention to the matter for him to do his very best to that end.

Mr. KNOX: The minister mentioned the differences between the soil at Scott and at Saskatoon. There is a vast portion of the province of Saskatchewan lying north of those points that has no experimental farm, and the difference in soil is far greater. I refer to the country lying north of probably townships 43 and 44. This is generally known as park country, and is devoted principally to stock-raising and dairying, besides raising grain fairly extensively. I hope the minister will keep this in mind so that if there is any change in the arrangements that portion of the West will be selected in which to conduct experiments. There is ample opportunity for establishing experimental stations in that northern country.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I gather from the information given by the minister that there are twenty-two or twenty-three experimental farms in the Dominion. How many of these are located in each province? And what is the basis for apportioning so many farms to each province?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think there is any recognized basis. In the older districts they had to do without experimental farms in the earlier days. For instance, if one hundred years ago a philanthropist had offered to give assistance in this respect—for there was no government money for the purpose in those days—there would have been many opportunities for the establishment of experimental farms in the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But to-day the tendency—and I think it is a correct one—is to establish these farms where they will do the most good, to assist the new settler in demonstrating the capabilities of the particular area in which he has cast his lot rather than oblige him to do the demonstrating himself and at the same time try to make a living. In such cases the government comes to the rescue. Such is the farm at Indian Head, referred to a few moments ago by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales). Such is the one we have in view along the line of the Transcontinental in British Columbia, about which the hon. gentleman for Victoria city (Mr. Tolmie) spoke. The requirements of some of the provinces are not so great in this respect; they are settled and established; their people have for the last hundred years been demonstrating the possibilities and capabilities of those areas. I do not think it would be wise to establish an arbitrary basis, relating to population, geographical division, or otherwise, upon which the opening up of experimental farms should be carried on.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I judge from the remarks of the minister that there is no particular basis upon which these farms are established; I presume the district that brings the greatest pressure to bear upon him gets the farm. I remind the minister, then, that our district is new, and assure him that we are going to bring a lot of pressure to bear upon him in the near future.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have particular sympathy for my hon. friend, because I

have had very pleasant relations with that territory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have always felt that legislation originating in this Parliament is of a federal nature, and that we should look at things from the point of view of the general welfare of the whole country, not from the narrow or provincial point of view. But I am inclined to think that instead of broadening out, instead of having an outlook more national in its character, we are really becoming more provincial than we were a few years ago. I am sorry to have to admit it, but that seems to be the case. I believe there has been a disposition on the part of the older provinces to meet the requirements of the newer districts so far as that can reasonably be done. It is a somewhat significant thing that of late years there has been a tendency to make it appear that the agricultural industry has been receiving great consideration at the hands of the government. I am not now referring to any particular government; this has been the case with all governments. There has been a tendency to vote large sums of money for agricultural purposes, sometimes with no proper conception of what real value shall be obtained for the expenditure made. In some instances where large grants have been given we have not received, I am inclined to think, the value that we should. Furthermore, the provinces are not as careful in the expenditure of grants made to them by the federal government as they would be of moneys raised by themselves. I am satisfied that in our own province—and I am referring now not only to experimental farms, but to other things for which we have been voting money—there is a tendency to say: Well, this money comes very easily; we will let it go very easily.

I hope no one will think that I underestimate the value of experimental farms. In fact, I attach much more importance to them and to their value than the Minister of Agriculture does, judging from his remark that after a farm has been established for twenty-five years, seventy-five per cent of its value disappears. On the contrary, my view is that the older the province or district becomes and the more the science of agriculture develops from year to year, the greater is the need for experimental work. I am not sure that some of the difficulties which are being experienced in some of the newer districts could not be overcome if we had better system of experimental farms, and the work was brought home to the people a little more closely than it now is. While the land is new, rich and fertile, it is an easy matter to settle on it and carry on what is called farming, but a great deal of which is not farming at all but exploitation of the fertility which has been stored up in the soil for centuries.

So far as Ontario is concerned, we have never taken exception to any grants that have been made for experimental farms in the newer districts. But I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued and circulated all over Canada by the Dominion Experimental Farm, on the face of which is a map indicating the location of the various farms, throughout Canada. It is somewhat significant that from the Central Experimental Farm, located at Ottawa, in the extreme eastern part of the province, you can go west for five hundred miles into what is a fairly good agricultural district in Ontario and you will not find another experimental farm, with the exception of a small experimental station for tobacco growing in the county of Kent. Moreover, there are three, four, or five farms in each of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba. When you come to Ontario there is practically a blank; when you come to Quebec, you will find that it is dotted with farms, and so on down through the maritime provinces.

Now, this thing has surely reached the stage where we shall have to register some objection to what has been going on. It is true that in 1916 a farm was established in the bush in northern Ontario, and I believe it is doing good work,—I was a strong advocate of having something done there. But that does not remedy the difficulty. The old settled districts of Ontario have been forced to establish farms themselves, and between those farms and the Dominion system of experimental farms there is no connection. We were passing estimates last night to encourage immigration: you will find that the first thing a prospective immigrant wants to know is what are the possibilities of the various provinces, and he will naturally look at the report of the experimental farms as found in these circulars and in other literature sent out by the Experimental Farms branch. An injustice is done to Ontario, or to any other province, when it does not figure prominently in these publications.

The statement has frequently been made that the Central Experimental Farm near

the city of Ottawa serves the whole province of Ontario, and that the money expended in connection with that farm is money expended on the province of Ontario. I think any one who understands the situation will agree that the Central farm has been located near this city for the benefit of the whole Dominion, and that many of the officials connected with it are carrying on their work in the different provinces. The Central farm consists of 467 acres and was established in 1886. There is one feature about the Central farm to which I am going to call the attention of the committee, and I am not bringing this matter up to-night simply because we have a new government and a new minister, because I have done the same thing when conditions were different. I have pointed out before that there is an absolute waste of money in connection with our experimental farm system, and that we do not get that efficient supervision and management to which we are entitled. On looking over the public accounts for the present year I was somewhat surprised to find that notwithstanding the deflation which has taken place in practically every other branch of the service, there was expended on the Central farm near Ottawa during the past year for ordinary farm labour no less a sum than $179,387.18. That is an increase of about $40,000. I do not know whether the increase in the estimates before us is to meet the deficit the minister expects next year. It is true that he gave what practically amounted to a promise to establish a new farm in British Columbia if conditions warranted it, but an increase of $40,000 for farm labour on this little farm close to the city of Ottawa is surely something that requires an explanation under present conditions. An experimental farm in order to render service must show that it is able to practise the methods it is endeavouring to teach. Otherwise, if it merely exists for conducting experiments, it need not be conducted on so large a scale. This increase in the cost of farm labour at the Central farm will seem strange to many who have not inquired into this matter, but I have seen this increase going on year after year. I have paid close attention to what is going on, and I am satisfied that the Central farm near Ottawa is more of a show place for visitors from all over the Dominion than it is an experimental farm. It is all very well to grow tomatoes and oranges in January and February under glass, but is that rendering any good service to the people of this community? Is that the sort of experiments we want? The province of Ontario is establishing a new farm in the county of Kent, with a view to developing the possibilities in that part of the province. We have also a fruit farm at Vinelands in the Niagara district. The returns show that the province of Ontario grows practically all the tender fruits, and yet the province itself has to establish and maintain these farms. The Dominion government has absolutely refused to give any assistance. There is another farm at Kemptville, which was established and is maintained by the provincial government. Then there is the experimental farm in connection with the agricultural college at Guelph, which is also maintained by the province. This province pays nearly one-half of the customs revenue of the country, about 48 per cent, and yet it is compelled to establish and maintain its own experimental farms. We get practically no consideration from the Government in this matter.

The minister states that an experimental farm cannot do the good in an old settled district that it can in a new country. That may be, but I believe there are about twenty-five illustration farms in the province of Quebec, and not one in the province of Ontario. An illustration station or something of that kind might be all that would be required in a new district, where you have not the facilities for carrying on scientific work. I pointed out a year ago when the estimates of this department were up for consideration that the factory output of dairy products in one small county of Ontario was greater than the output of the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia combined. This goes to show what can be done by intensive farming, and it is something that an experimental farm should bring home to the people. The experimental farms should blaze the way and show the people of this country that they can practise what they preach; they should lead, and not simply follow. Otherwise, the money expended is very largely wasted.

The minister pointed out in his opening remarks that a farm was going to be established in the province of British Columbia. I believe there was some idea last year, and it may still be under consideration, of establishing a flax experimental station somewhere in western Ontario. I am not sure whether the purchase of a site has been made. It is true that during the war flax growing increased very consider-

ably in Ontario. In one part of western Ontario people went into it on quite a large scale, and many of them were practically ruined as a result. As long ago as I can remember there have been numerous flax mills in western Ontario, and looking over the territory where they were located forty years ago you can see the effects of flax growing in that district up to this day. In the months of June and July those lands are as yellow as can be with wild mustard which was introduced and went to seed on these lands, and it has been impossible to eradicate it. You could not induce any one in that district who had experience in the growing of flax in the early days to engage in that industry to-day. There may be a considerable amount of flax being grown in western Ontario to-day, but that is only a temporary condition, because we cannot compete with the cheap labour of such countries as India, Belgium and Russia, where they have grown flax successfully for years. I know there are experiments being conducted at the Experimental Farm along that line, and during the time flax growing was a profitable industry no doubt such experiments served a useful purpose. That is the great value of an experimental farm.

But I want to emphasize the fact that the newer districts are not so much in need of experimental work as the old districts are. It is in the latter that scientific methods must be applied, and we must adopt different methods from those we have followed in the past even in the old districts, if we are going to successfully compete with other agricultural countries where labour and land are much cheaper. All you have to do to realize that fact is to look at the imports into Canada. Then you will find that even with conditions as they are at the present time, staple commodities such as we can grow without any difficulty in this country are being imported and sold in our own markets notwithstanding the fact that we have very substantial duties upon such importations. Imagine, if you can, the conditions such as we have had during the year, ending on 31st March last, when over two million pounds of butter were brought into Canada from Great Britain under the British preference and sold to our people. Let me remind my hon. friends to my left that exporters from Great Britain can send commodities into Canada at a cheaper rate than they can be imported from United States. Millions of pounds are being imported into the Dominion under the conditions as they now exist. Look at the imports of bacon and beef, and other food products that are entering the country. Look at the quantity of eggs which is now being imported into Canada under the conditions I have described. We must adopt different methods if we are going to compete with other countries; although I understand the policy of hon. members opposite, and of hon. members to my left, to be to put all foodstuffs on the free list. The Lord only knows what will happen to the Canadian farmer when that day comes, because under the present conditions it is utterly impossible for the farmer in the old districts to compete with the outside world in production of their foodstuffs.

I ask the minister to say to-night whether he can—with all the money that has been spent, amounting to a million and a quarter or a half of dollars—state the actual cost of production of one of the articles I have mentioned at the farm? He is unable to do so, he makes no attempt to comply with the request. Individual farmers are conducting experiments along this line and are able to do so; but if you wait for information from the experimental farm on that question you will wait a long time.

Now, these are some of the things that I think might well engage the attention of the Government and Parliament on this occasion. I say we are not getting value for the money we are expending in this direction; and it is not fair to those who are engaged in agriculture to point to the millions of dollars that are being spent for supposedly agricultural purposes and then say, "How well you are being taken care of." Before the House rose at six o'clock I asked some questions with regard to the number of experimental farms in each province with a view to ascertaining the cost of carrying on these farms and the revenue derived therefrom. I think the minister and those associated with him in the department should be able to place before the committee some of the actual benefits that have resulted from the experiments carried on at these farms. They should be able to show what the actual cost of production is, and whether such methods of farming could be carried on at a profit or not. To my mind that is one of the important things that an experimental farm should be able to demonstrate. I would ask the minister therefore whether he is able to give the com-

mittee the information asked for in regard to these matters.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My deputy has the information here but it is not classified in exactly the way in which my hon. friend wants it. While he is compiling it in the desired form I might answer my hon. friend in respect to two or three other matters. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has almost convinced me that the province of Ontario is very much slighted in the matter of the distribution of experimental farms. If with all this new information he has placed at my disposal I can equalize these matters somewhat I am sure I shall be delighted to do so. I am informed that one experimental farm has been established of recent years at Kapuskasing. My predecessor in office, very wisely, I think, on the advice of his deputy and the Director of Experimental Farms located that farm in what is known as New Ontario along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. If any error was committed in this respect Mr. Burrell was at fault but I do not think he did err; it was a logical thing to do. There may come a time when we will have sufficient revenues to establish these institutions in the old as well as the new districts; but so long as our means are limited surely the new districts are the proper places in which to establish these farms in order to obtain the maximum results from the money expended. I am told there has been a tobacco station established at Harrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is in my riding.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, in the county of Essex. I think it is one of the greatest possible compliments to old Ontario that her agriculture is in such a highly developed condition that she does not require any of these experimental farms or demonstration stations. Our forefathers did the demonstrating in old Ontario fifty and one hundred years ago at immense toil and labour. To-day Parliament comes to the assistance of the new districts and undertakes demonstrations which the old pioneers in Ontario had to do for themselves.

My hon. friend seems to be quite positive that we have not been able to demonstrate at the Central Experimental
9 p.m. Farm what it cost to produce various commodities. Even if that were true I do not think we would be subject to any great amount of censure, because you cannot farm on a commercial scale when you are carrying on experiments at experimental farms or demonstration stations. I do not know that any such institution in the world was ever expected to show as good results as a farm conducted on a commercial scale. Notwithstanding that fact, however, I am informed that many of the Government bulletins and pamphlets do contain figures of the very nature the hon. member desires, showing exactly the cost of producing butter, eggs, meat and many other commodities grown on the farm. Such a thing is not always done by experimental farms because as a rule the showing obtained by them is not as good, measured by dollars and cents, as in the case of commercial farming. That is not the way we measure the value of the experimental farms; but, however, that is too big a subject to enter upon to-night. I merely give the hon. member the information he asks for and I do not make these remarks in any spirit of criticism of my hon. friend. I would say this however: There is a general impression—formed from speeches made sometimes in this House or from careless remarks uttered by gentlemen outside—that these experimental farms are simply huge centres of slothfulness and uselessness, just simply a resort where people can congregate, a sort of haven of refuge, a sort of agricultural senate as it were. That is not the case. Then we have another class of gentlemen—I will not say in the House although I have heard it myself—who never miss an opportunity of slandering the Civil Service of this country, claiming they are enjoying huge salaries, and that they are tumbling over each other and working only one-half the time. Personally I do not believe the greater part of that kind of talk. I have not discovered it at all events. That kind of cheap popularity does not go very far.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman sure about what he says regarding the Senate?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was just in need of an illustration at the time, and I could not think of anything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman may have ambitions himself before long.

Mr. McBRIDE: I should like to say a word in connection with the establishment of an experimental farm at some point along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I fully agreed with the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) when he said it would greatly contribute to the welfare of the district if an experimental farm

should be established in that part of the country. There is a growing community; in fact, no other community that I know has a brighter prospect than the one along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific if the people there are properly looked after in this matter of agricultural education. Many people are coming in from the prairie provinces and settling; and numbers of our returned men have settled there. It is a new district and the people do not know what they can grow to the best advantage and in greatest quantity, so that it is in the interest of everybody that an experimental farm should be established there. An hon. member stated that the growing of flax impoverishes the soil. I worked in the old country on a farm where flax had been grown for a hundred years; it is being grown there still, and I believe it will be grown there for another hundred years. Flax is one of the best paying crops that they have in the old country, and I do not think the hon. member who made that statement was speaking from practical experience. I think the Minister of Agriculture is using very good judgment in proposing to establish an experimental farm at some point along the Grand Trunk Pacific. Such a farm would do a great deal of good, and I hope the hon. members on this side of the House will support the proposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is an experimental farm going to be established at Candora, Saskatchewan? A few years ago the department purchased a quarter section there for that purpose; but for some reason nothing was done. The people in that district are anxious to know whether an experimental farm is going to be established there.

Mr. WARD: When the minister is spreading these farms around, I hope he will not forget Dauphin.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should like to hold out some hopes to all hon. gentlemen with regard to this matter, and I believe I can. My deputy informs me that the item of $30,000, of which I spoke before six o'clock, as being for the establishment of one farm, is for two farms. One of them is to be established along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific near the coast. I do not know where the other one is to be established, and I want to keep all hon. members guessing with respect to that. If hon. members have any recommendations to make, I would ask them not to do so by correspondence, as I am overwhelmed now. As they see me in the corridors and elsewhere, I shall be happy to receive representations. I may say that many places have been mentioned as second choice. It is thought that in these new districts, $30,000 would be sufficient to buy two new farms without very much building on it, and that is the first step towards the establishment of an experimental farm. Therefore, there is hope for all members yet, even though the tentative selection with regard to British Columbia becomes a permanent one.

I have now the information for which the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) asked. It is as follows:

Prince Edward Island—1 experimental farm.
Nova Scotia—2 experimental farms with 12 illustration stations.
Quebec—4 experimental farms, with 33 illustration stations and 1 tobacco station.
Ontario—2 experimental farms, with one tobacco station at Kent.
Manitoba—2 experimental farms.
Saskatchewan—4 experimental farms, with eleven illustration stations.
Alberta—2 experimental farms with two substations and 13 illustration stations.
British Columbia—4 experimental farms, with 1 sub-station and 12 illustration stations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the figures which have just been submitted by the minister substantiate practically every word that I said. I was a little surprised that the minister should make any reference to anyone making remarks with a view to obtaining some cheap popularity. As regards the Civil Service, I made a statement regarding the amount paid for farm labour on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, the amount being $179,600, which I considered was altogether out of proportion to the necessities of the Central farm. Before six o'clock, the minister practically told us that there was $30,000 in the Estimates for an experimental farm in British Columbia. He says now that there is apparently a demand from practically every constituency for an experimental farm; that three of them are going to be established, and, consequently, he is going to keep us all guessing, so that we shall all be in good humour and hopeful as long as no more definite information than that is furnished. This is a serious matter, and it is one that it is not very pleasant to refer to. I have criticized sometimes when people thought that I should not criticize; but I believe I have been sincere in every word that I have ever uttered in regard to the injustice that has been done to Ontario. The minister very glibly refers to Ontario, and, according to him, it is a

great compliment to the people of Ontario that they do not require experimental farms. They do require experimental farms; they are establishing them, and they are paying for them. Because the Dominion government will not do that they have to do it themselves. The minister made reference to the farm at Kapuskasing. I referred to the fact that a farm had been established at Kapuskasing down in the bush where an illustration farm would do just as good work as a farm involving a large expenditure of money. But before that farm was established, the province of Ontario established, near the Grand Trunk Pacific, at Monteith, an experimental farm which had been conducted for a number of years before the Dominion government established the one at Kapuskasing. Even with the experimental farm at Kapuskasing, what do we find? We find another one in Quebec a short distance from it. Consequently, these two farms are very close together; but for over 500 miles west from the Central Experimental Farm, you will not find another experimental farm in the chief agricultural district of Ontario. We are not clamouring for the establishment of experimental farms; we have not been urging their establishment upon the Government, because, during the last few years, everyone knows the need for economy. The time has surely come when we must practise economy everywhere, in this House and outside of it, if we are going to overcome the difficulties with which we are confronted. There is no need of imagining that, by making appeals for assistance in a certain locality or constituency, we are going to get something for that constituency and that we are going to overcome our difficulties in that way. We must assist the Government to the utmost of our power in endeavouring to meet conditions which are very difficult. That is the reason why I am pointing out these things and stating that this extravagance which is being practised on the Central Experimental Farm, must cease, or we cannot expect to see practised in other branches of the Government that economy which should be practised.

It is really worth while studying the Auditor General's Report. We have been paying a bonus to the civil servants, and that bonus has been going to men engaged as labourers on the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. That method applied throughout. Many of these people were hired for a few months, but a great many were employed by the year, and in addition to the salary they drew they were given a bonus. I do not know whether that was the case last year, but certainly it was the year before. The experimental farm system in this country has become so lopsided that I think the remarks made by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) might very well be considered. If some provinces have to do all this work, I think the time has arrived when each province should conduct its own experiments. Certainly one province should not be discriminated against and another province shown favour. There should be a more equitable system than the one now in vogue.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: While Ontario really has only two experimental farms, nevertheless in this Central Farm there is more work being done and more money spent than in any other province in the Dominion.

Mr. LEGER: The minister says that there are in New Brunswick one experimental farm and twelve illustration stations. What are the locations of these stations, and where is the experimental farm?

Mr. PRITCHARD: Are there any demonstration farms in any of the provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are really all demonstration farms. They are usually classified into experimental farms, demonstration farms, and illustration stations. These are all really interchangeable terms, but by usage they have been applied to designate particular kinds of farms.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I have listened with interest to the discussion for several minutes, and I think profitable contributions have been made by the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and some other members. I sympathise with a good deal of what the minister has said. The experimental farms have done good work in the various provinces throughout the Dominion, and I agree with the minister to this extent, that there is perhaps more need of experimental stations in new sections, because settlers going into these places do not know what the land is adapted to grow, and the Government should bear the expense of experimenting on crops in those sections for a time. In Ontario we need a demonstration farm. My idea of such a farm is one conducted under the supervision of government officials on a purely self-paying basis, so that the actual expense to the Government would be very little if any. I have thought for some

time that the ideal experimental farm could be conducted in such a way that all that would be required to prove whether or not it was successfully managed would be the expense of a book-keeper. Such a farm should have the services of a graduate of one of the Ontario agricultural colleges. Let him turn his college education to practical account in the locality in which he is stationed, and demonstrate to the people that farming can be carried on successfully. He could eliminate a good deal of the cost which we have in connection with the experimental farms to-day. We should encourage, through our agricultural colleges and experimental farms, the proper use of a system of book-keeping. Every successful farmer should keep a system of books and from time to time, or annually, examine them to see whether there has been a profit or a loss for the twelve months. In other words, the farm should be managed, so far as its accounts are concerned, just as an ordinary business is conducted. I do not see why this cannot be done in the older parts of the provinces, at any rate, in connection with the government experimental farms. The expense entailed by this system would be trifling to the Government, while the educational value to the people would be very considerable indeed. I submit that this is something we need very much, and this is what I mean by a demonstration farm.

Mr. SALES: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Pritchard) and I have been thinking about the same thing for half an hour. As a matter of fact, I had, written on a sheet of paper, a suggestion which I will now offer to the minister, that in addition to the $30,000 for the new provinces that need experimental farms, he could save $30,730 on Rosthern and $26,256 on Scott, by placing these farms on a commercial basis. They are well located, their lands are good, and they have good buildings; and I would charge them a moderate interest, say 5 per cent, and let them pay their way and prove that farming can be made a commercial success. Since coming to Ottawa and attending the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, I have found that a good many of our friends think that we are pulling a sort of poor mouth and stretching our tale of woe a little too much. They cannot believe that conditions are as we say. Well, here is a chance for the Government themselves actually to prove where the fault lies and whether the farmer is really a poor business man who does not work long enough hours. I find in the Public Accounts that the farm at Rosthern pays $14,443 for labourers' wages, in addition to a superintendent and assistant superintendent at a total of nearly $6,000 more, while Scott pays $17,500 for labour and overseeing. I know men who work farms of the same size from which they do not receive a total income in any way approaching these amounts spent in wages. I am sure the minister and his department would perform a really useful service if they would put two or three of these farms on a real commercial basis for a few years.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): The other night I asked the minister a question with regard to the record of performance in the poultry industry and he informed me that the matter would be taken up to-night. Previous ministers in the late government put into effect a record of performance of a practical nature along the lines suggested by the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). In the year 1919-20 there were entered 4,437 birds, of which 823, or a percentage of 16.7, received certificates for 150 eggs and over per year, while there was a small percentage, 1.8, that got the advanced certificate for 225 eggs. All these birds had to lay eggs of at least two ounces in weight. The next year the number of birds entered was increased to 7,158, or an increase of 69 per cent. This year the number is 11,489, or 80 per cent of an increase, with 122 breeders. Does the minister intend to keep pace with the increase in these birds and follow up the work started by the late government, which is of a practical character and from which much benefit can be derived. If he does that, and it is increased to the extent that seems probable with the work started on the first of November next year, I should like to know if he has made any provision in his estimates for, say, doubling that line of work.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. The work is well begun, and I think I cannot do better than continue it.

These are the names of the stations in New Brunswick with the counties and operators:

Name of station	County	Operator
Apohaqui	Kent	J. H. Manchester.
Adamsville	Kings	J. A. Arsenault.
Boundary Creek	Westmoreland	M. Steeves.
Little Shemogue	Westmoreland	A. Oulton.
Lower Derby	Northumberland	W. R. Taylor.
Middle Coverdale	Albert	H. E. Mitton.
Millville	York	P. Graham.
Perth	Victoria	R. J. McCrea.
Rexton	Kent	J. G. Dickinson.
Woodstock	Carleton	E. W. Turner.

Replying to the hon. members for Dundas (Mr. Elliott) and Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) with respect to operating these farms on a commercial basis, that used to be discussed many years ago when these farms were first established. It was often contended, that even the experimental farm at Ottawa should show a profit, and the gentleman in charge of it at the time was occasioned a good deal of worry because he could not show a credit balance. Well, if it is a real experimental and demonstration farm, I do not think it ever will show a profit in dollars and cents; in fact, I do not see how it could be done. I need not point out to the committee that there are limitations which make it impossible to operate any of these farms on a commercial basis. No plan of farming will show a profit equal to the plan followed by the peasant proprietor. How is government operation of a farm to compare with private operation? How can you make a comparison from which it is possible to draw any intelligent conclusion? There will always be a certain amount of "frills" connected with government operation, no matter how carefully the farm may be managed. The average man looking on realizes that the manager of one of these experimental farms has the whole resources of the Dominion behind him, and if his crops are ruined by hail he is not "up against it". Therefore Mr. Average Man knows that the socalled commercial possibilities of such a farm would be of no avail to him. But we are entering upon a very practical age, and I shall be delighted if anyone will show me how our administration of any farm, whether at Rosthern, Scott or anywhere else, can be such as to combine benefit to the surrounding country and commercial profit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not think the minister is taking the right interpretation. As to making an experimental farm a paying concern, I think there is no one so foolish as to even dream of such a thing. But it has been contended that some of this land that is being used for illustration and experimental purposes, but particularly for the former—we have not any illustration farms in Ontario, although I see there are thirty-three in Quebec and fifteen in the western provinces—could be utilized to demonstrate whether farming can be carried on at a profit. I do not think it is too much to ask that that should be done, in view of the fact that every dollar that has ever been asked for experimental purposes has been ungrudgingly voted. After all these years, and in view of the present very trying conditions for those engaged in agriculture, it is only fair that some object lessons should be available that would help them very considerably.

Mr. BROWN: Knowing the conditions of farming, does not the minister think it would be a valuable thing to this country if what we have often contended could be abundantly demonstrated, namely, that farming can only be carried on profitably where we have a large amount of unpaid labour in the shape of women and children? We have made that assertion very frequently in our conventions, and I do not think it can be contradicted. We have been contending for some time, and we are trying to contend here, that under present conditions, and applying purely commercial principles, farming cannot be made a success. We are sometimes told that we are not businesslike in managing our farm affairs, and then we have the admission—and I believe it is a true admission—that the only man who can get the most out of farming is he who, like the peasant, gives himself wholly to it and has the assistance of his wife and children.

In the Committee on Agriculture to-day it was suggested that we should adopt dairying to a larger extent. Now, the only man who can make money out of dairying to-day is the man with a growing family whom he can exploit for a little time during their growing years and get their unpaid labour, and then they are driven from the farm. It would be a very good thing if that could be so clearly demonstrated on one of these farms that every one in Canada would understand the condition that agriculture is in.

Mr. LEGER: There are some sections of our part of the country in which experimental or demonstration farms should be established in order to encourage the farmers. We have an experimental farm in the extreme west of the province, but it is some hundred miles from the shore counties, where there is a large area of great agricultural value. Farming is certainly the backbone of the country and it should be encouraged in every possible way. I would invite the minister's attention, therefore, to the case of my province. We are certainly not doing as well as we should, due to the fact that in some sections we have no encouragement whatever in the way of experimental farms. The illustration stations may be very good, but they serve only the

district immediately surrounding them, which is a very small area indeed. I would invite the minister to visit our part of the country and see the conditions with respect to farming there; he might be encouraged to do something in this connection. As I have intimated, the western part of the province is well looked after, but the eastern part, along the north shore, has been neglected. I would ask the minister to give this matter his serious consideration.

Mr. WARNER: We are talking about experimental farms and demonstration farms, and I am rather afraid we are confusing the two. As I understand it, an experimental farm is a farm that will do many things that we are not expecting a profit from—I mean, directly, on that farm. The minister is justified, I think, in saying that he does not think it possible to put an experimental farm on a commercial basis. However, there is room for experimental farms, and, as some hon. members have said, there is room for demonstration. An experimental farm can demonstrate, more or less, but a demonstration farm would have to work along the line upon which the ordinary farmer carries on his actual work, and not very much experimenting could be done if it was hoped to make a profit. That is why the ordinary farmer expects the Dominion experimental farms to experiment; he does not want to have to do it himself. I support the idea of demonstration. We have had farms that we called demonstration farms in Alberta. I am not prepared to say just how much they have demonstrated, but I do not think they have made much profit. I do think they have made a mistake in going into the experimenting line; in my opinion, the purpose of a demonstration farm should be to demonstrate whether the methods we know of can be made to pay. The difference, then, between a demonstration farm and an experimental farm should be kept in mind. Some of the money spent in experimenting may be quite unproductive of results; in other cases, the results attained may be worth much more than the cost—that is the way we have to look at the work of an experimental farm. A demonstration farm which can make a success of the employment of scientific methods would be just as valuable to Canada to-day as an experimental farm. I would not expect it to make money, but if it can be done, I would like to see it done. But I would like to see these two things, demonstration farms and experimental farms, looked at from a different standpoint, rather than one taking the place of the two.

Mr. STANSELL: The minister has stated that the farm here at Ottawa, which is known as the Central Experimental Farm but which most of us call the Dominion Experimental Farm, is receiving more money than many of the others put together. I am quite willing to admit that I have a very high opinion of the work that is being done there. But it has occurred to most hon. members that owing to its geographical location this Central Experimental Farm is of equal value to Ontario and Quebec. I would not have mentioned this had it not been for the fact that in answer to a question put by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), the minister stated that outside of the Central Experimental Farm, which, as I have pointed out, serves equally the two old provinces, there are two smaller illustration or experimental farms in Ontario and thirty-eight in Quebec. I am sure that many of us have wondered what conditions gave rise to the necessity for a difference of thirty-six as between the two provinces.

Mr. SPENCER: A statement made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a few minutes ago brought to my mind a subject to which I have given a great deal of thought. He said that in order to make farming pay it was necessary to have a peasant proprietorship. Too many people have been thinking along these lines and making statements of this kind. At present, high as wages are, those paid on the farm do not equal those paid in other industries. That is one of the reasons why it is difficult to get the very best class of labour on the farm—and it is only the very best class of labour that you want on the farm. Just as much skill is required on the farm as is necessary in any other industry; in many respects a great deal more skill is required. This matter of a man working a farm on a family basis, that is, using his family to work that farm without wages, does not tend to the ultimate good of the country. When the people are ignorant you can do that sort of thing and keep the boys at home. But when they begin to know anything at all; when the boys and the girls go to school, they soon learn where the highest wages are paid. Just as soon as they are old enough to

work they will leave the farm for higher wages. You will never have a successful immigration until you put the farming industry on a business footing where it can be made to pay. I saw in the paper the other day that the farmer and labour elements would never agree, because while labour wanted an eight-hour day, the farmer wanted a fifteen-hour day. I want to assure the hon. members of this House that the farmers do not want a fifteen-hour day, and the sooner they get down to an eight or a ten-hour day the better they will be pleased, and the better it will be for the country. You can never build up a country by asking a certain part of it to work for fourteen or sixteen hours a day, while the rest of the country is working a much shorter day. We hear a great deal nowadays of the back-to-the-land movement, but the people who are advocating that are the ones who do not intend to go back to the land themselves. Just as soon as the Government can demonstrate that farming conducted on rational lines can be made to pay like any other business, even if a few extra hours have to be put in, then you will have immigrants coming to this country and they will stay here. But as long as you are content with saying that farming can only pay when it is conducted on the family basis, where the family work themselves without wages, you will never populate the country.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I do not think the minister quite understood my suggestion. I quite appreciate that the experimental farms can do a good deal for every province in the breeding of live stock, poultry and that kind of thing, and experiments along that line carried on at the Central Farm here will be just as beneficial as experiments carried on in British Columbia. My suggestion was not to carry on a demonstration farm at all like an experimental farm, with expensive buildings and lands, but to take a graduate of the Agricultural College and put him on an ordinary farm, let him run it in a businesslike way, and simply go over his books at the end of the year, to see if it is possible for a capable man to make farming pay. All the expense the Government will be put to will be that of auditing his books. If you cannot show that a capable man can make farming pay, you will not get many immigrants coming to this country to farm. This Government, so far as I know, has never done anything to show that farming can be made to pay if carried on in a businesslike way.

[Mr. Spence.]

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): I was encouraged to get on my feet when I heard the minister say that demonstration farms are of greatest benefit in the new territories. In my constituency, up in the Peace river district, we have a great new territory. I am not now asking for a demonstration farm, though some people up there have been asking for another one. The great difficulty there at the present time is freight rates. The Peace river country lies three to four hundred miles northwest of Edmonton. There is an experimental station at Beaver Lodge, and I believe that the gentleman who is in charge of that station is within measurable distance of proving that clover seed can be grown as a commercial proposition there. I believe he is badly handicapped for money this year, and I would ask the minister to take in consideration the needs of that part of the country. If the farmers can grow clover seed there on a commercial basis, the freight rates would not be nearly so oppressive as at the present time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In reply to my hon. friend who spoke of the large number of experimental farms in the province of Quebec, some thirty-eight in number, he made the mistake of bunching them all together. Thirty-three of these are just small illustration farms of twenty to twenty-five acres, and the farmer is paid about four dollars an acre for operating the farm. There is no overhead expenditure, no capital outlay, and few signs to indicate that it is a Dominion Government illustration farm. There are only four experimental farms in the province of Quebec, the other thirty-three being illustration stations that have been located where they were asked for. These farms in the province of Quebec have nearly all been organized during the last two or three years, and whatever credit may be coming to any one in connection therewith may be credited to the gentleman who preceded me in this office. I think some credit is coming to him, because these farms are doing a useful work. So let us get rid of the idea that there are thirty-eight experimental farms in the province of Quebec as against two in Ontario. The reason there are thirty-three illustration farms in the province of Quebec is that the people of that province have applied for them, while there have been very few applications, until quite recently, from the province of Ontario. Applications are beginning to come in now, however, and we anticipate locating a number of these farms in Ontario this summer.

Mr. WHITE: There was nothing to indicate whether the farms in the list the minister read out were three acres or three hundred in extent, and that is how I got my impression that there were many more experimental farms in Quebec than in Ontario.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Quite right. Replying to my hon. friend who stated that a farm cannot be made to pay except as a self-contained unit operated by the members of the family, I think the past year has demonstrated that. As a matter of fact it was demonstrated in this province forty years ago when I was here. There were very few farms here then, more particularly in eastern Ontario, that were not operated as self-contained units, each supplying within itself a great deal of the raw material that went into the clothing of the family, as well as its food. Very few wages were paid out in this province forty years ago. In the western provinces as a result of the deflation of prices, on the one hand, and the high cost of farm implements and equipment, on the other, we have not been able to make it go under a system of hired labour. And if you had happened to go through the constituencies as I have—for example I passed through the constituency of the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) just as harvest was beginning this year; the rust struck that country pretty severely and everybody was rushed on the farm—you would find families there with the boss—as we call him—on the binder, or a boy, maybe only thirteen or fourteen years of age, on the binder, and the parents and a number of children doing the stooking—a self contained unit. That may not be the ideal way to farm but that was the way in which the province of Ontario was largely pioneered—by self contained units.

When I said that the best way to get men on the farm to-day was to operate the farm on the principle of peasant proprietorship, I did not mean to imply the introduction of the peasant system as it exists in the older countries of Europe. The term "peasant proprietorship" is one that is used by economists or at least it was formerly used by writers on political economy in contradistinction to the system of owning and operating large farms. The principle of peasant proprietorship is that under which you own and operate your own farm and receive all the profits. The term I used is one employed by economists in describing the difference between small farms—a self contained unit operated by the owner—and a large farm owned by a landlord and operated by a tenant.

Then the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy) spoke of the eight hour a day system, meaning by that, I presume, working eight hours before dinner and eight hours after dinner. The eight hour day was introduced in the Old Country during the war and there was a great deal of money paid for overtime. I cannot hold out any hope, unless the cost of operating in other respects is very substantially reduced that our hours will be very much lessened. After all, our rules are largely what we make them ourselves.

Mr. WARD: Would the minister advise that one of his little farms be conducted on an eight-hour basis just to demonstrate what beef, butter, eggs, and other foodstuffs would cost to produce on a farm run in that way, with time and one-half for over time?

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I do not want to occupy too much of the time of the committee but several allusions have been made to the experimental farm in this city. I rise in order to pay my respects to that institution. Situated as it is with the acreage available and with the number of buildings it has occupying the land it can not very well be conducted any differently from what it is at present. The branches conducted at the farm include health of animals, poultry, astronomical observatory, geodetic survey, and chemical laboratory. These all occupy space that really should be devoted to agricultural purposes. If I had my wish the minister should be placed in possession of sufficient funds to buy four hundred acres that immediately adjoin the farm. Then he would have an area of land that would not be cluttered up with buildings and would really be conducted as a farm should. At present the farm resembles nothing so much as a small hamlet surrounded by a nice lawn.

So much for the matter of the farm. There is a question I would like to ask the minister. Under Order in Council dealing with the Canadian standard for eggs, all Canadian eggs that are exported from this country must bear the Government inspection stamp on both ends of the case. I would like to know from the minister if it is the intention of the department to make the same regulation apply to eggs imported into this country. For instance, a large quantity of eggs enters Canada from the

United States and a very great quantity of highly flavoured eggs comes here from China. I would like to know from the minister if the same regulation should not apply to these importations that exists in the case of our Canadian exported eggs?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will reply to my hon. friend's question when we come to take up the live stock vote.

Mr. SALES: I notice that further down the list there is a vote for cold storage warehouses.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will come to that later; we are now dealing with the vote for experimental farms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister has practically ignored my request for some explanation as to why there is an increase of over $44,000 for experimental farms; he does not deem the request to be worthy of consideration. It appears, however, that he is dangling the greater part of this increase before somebody as likely to be expended for a new experimental farm; but he does not know and cannot inform the committee where it is going to be. It is a new experience, I think, for Parliament to be asked to vote such a sum as $44,000 without any information being vouchsafed as to what the money is intended for, and where it is to be expended. It is true the minister announced that he had in the back of his mind an idea that $30,000 was to go to the establishment of a farm somewhere in the northern part of British Columbia, but in saying this he ridicules the idea that there should be in an old province like Ontario any necessity for experimental farms. Under the circumstances I move seconded by Mr. Senn:

That item No. 41, being the estimate for experimental farms be reduced by $44.360.50, or the same amount that was voted in 1921.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before the amendment is put let me say that there was no intention on my part to overlook my hon. friend's question. I have been trying to keep track of various questions that have been put and to give the desired information with respect to all of them. If I can be charged with anything it is with being too detailed in my explanations. But I did inadvertently overlook that particular question of my hon. friend. However, I have the information here and there was no intention on my part to ignore it. There is no desire to conceal anything, because there is nothing to conceal. If there is an increase in the vote it is because the experimental farm system is growing and when that is the case we require more money. The increase is intended to cover new work in plant pathology. That has reference to plant diseases, including such diseases as rust; and if we spent $400,000 in that direction and secured a cure for rust it would be money well expended. I wish I could find the best available man in this continent for that work. If I could obtain the necessary salary to get that man and keep him, then we would be able to show a little better results than we are now able to produce. But, on account of being hobbled, handcuffed and hamstrung in connection with securing men and paying salaries, we have to take what we can get. This often means that we do not get results at all. There is an increase in wages. Wages have not gone down yet; they may go down; but when you have a good man on an experimental farm, you cannot reduce his wages. During all the time that I have been farming, I have not been able to say to an old, experienced hand: "I am going to reduce your salary." To say that would be an intimation to him to go, and he would take it in that way. It is not good policy to reduce the wages of good men. As a matter of fact, if I carried out one-half of the representations made to me and, sometimes, by hon. members, I would have four times as many men on the Central Experimental Farm; but the number is being kept down. A farmer has to have sufficient help for spring requirements, and in order to have men, he has to get them a little in advance. If he is sufficiently advanced in his work as he should be, these men will be waiting anxiously to jump to the land. I would imagine, if we sent a committee out to the Central Experimental Farm, they would find, at this particular time of the year, when the advent of spring is awaited, apparently too many men there; but in ten days or two weeks from now these men will be all busy at their respective duties.

10 p.m.

There are, on that farm, some thirteen different divisions, and everyone of them is growing. If they were not growing and developing their usefulness, they should not be there; and if they are going to grow and develop and serve the country properly, the country must be prepared to pay for them. Instead of reducing this estimate, I should be apologizing for its being so small, because that is the way I feel about the matter. Since I had my civil government estimates under discus-

sion, one of the best men in those thirteen divisions has left us simply because we are not paying him a sufficient salary to retain his services. I cannot give the committee his name, because his resignation is not public yet; but he is one of my best men in one of the most important branches. He is leaving us because he has an offer of $2,100 more than he was getting from us, with a prospect of an increase running up to—well, I will not say, but so much larger an amount than we are giving that **we cannot hold him. If you put second and third class men on experimental farms** and then equip those farms with what you like, you can spend a great deal of money and get very little result. But if you increase the value and quality of your "key" men by twenty-five per cent, you will have results worth while, and whatever, within reason, it takes to get those "key" men, should be paid. A $6,000 or $8,000 man will do infinitely more and better work and give better service along the line of plant pathology than three, four or five men of a cheaper class whose salaries may aggregate no more than that of the one man. This is one of the reasons why, in my estimation, we are not getting along faster in the matter of plant pathology. We have not got the best men and these salaries will not secure the best men.

My information is that owing to the high cost, chemical supplies and apparatus in the division of chemistry have been allowed to run down. As a matter of fact, nearly all these appropriations are smaller than were required in past years, and the result is that many of the farms have been handicapped in their work. It is true that the amount is larger than in the preceding year, but it is not enough to take care of the requirements of the farm. I have about half a page of reasons why this estimate is required, and the fact is that every one of these thirteen divisions is increasing its usefulness.

The hon. member for Carleton Mr. Garland) put a question with regard to poultry. At no time in the history of our country has poultry raising been so important as it is at the present. While we are importing Chinese eggs, we are exporting more high class eggs than we are importing of poor ones. We have a slight overage, and the same thing is true with regard to butter. We are importing butter from New Zealand and Denmark, but we are exporting more than we are importing. There is plenty of room for improvement, but you are not going to get improvement by putting cheap skates on experimental farms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was asking for an explanation with reference to the expenditure on farm labour, and the minister has not given it so far. He says: "There are a whole lot of boys there possibly standing around at this time of the year and you cannot get good farms by employing cheap skates." About $100,000 is being asked for under the head of civil government, for this experimental farm in addition to what I have been referring to. In 1920, the amount under the heading of Civil Government was $93,295, and it has been increased considerably since then. I do not know what the exact figure is at present; but there has been an increase of upwards of $40,000 for ordinary farm labourers on this farm, which is not a very extensive one. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Garland) says that it looks like a park. There is somewhere in the neighbourhood of four or five hundred acres in it. In the beginning of his remarks before six o'clock, the minister said that he thought that $30,000 of this amount would be expended for an experimental farm along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific in British Columbia. Now he says that it is for this and other experimental farms. Until we have some well-defined, clear statement, I think we would be voting money very recklessly in increasing this estimate to the amount asked for. I know some people will say: "Oh, you are voting to reduce the amount that the Government is ready to vote for agricultural purposes." If this was for the benefit of agriculture, or if it was the intention of the Government to see that there was to be an equitable distribution of the services of experimental farms in this country, the matter would be entirely different. But if some province has to do all this work itself and to pay for it, and, at the same time, to help to maintain farms in other provinces, that is absolutely unfair, and I am not going to vote in favour of such a proposition.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Entomology, $28,000.

Mr. SPENCE: It seems to me that each departmental head is trying to see how much more he can spend than the other, and the harder it is to get money

the more some of these gentlemen want to spend. This vote is for entomology and the next, administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, shows an increase of $45,000. I think there are altogether too many fads being introduced. First we have an increase of $2,000 on entomology and then $45,000 on this next item alone, for a fad.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I am not thoroughly in sympathy with the remarks of the previous speaker inasmuch as there is ample room for the expenditure of a great part of this appropriation in a manner that would benefit a large section of the community. I do not know what explanation the minister may have for the increase in regard to the Destructive Insect and Pest Act vote, which the hon. member (Mr. Spence) has referred to, but I know where a large proportion of it might be applied with a possibility of great results. When we considered these estimates a few evenings ago some very interesting information was given to the House regarding this particular branch. We were told a good deal about what had been effected and what remained to be done in the way of combatting the enemies of field crops and standing timber. In my own constituency we are continually forced to conduct a warfare against fruit pests. We spray continuously during the spring and summer months to keep down the common pests of the orchard, such as green aphis, woolly aphis and oyster bark scale, which, if not brought under control, would put an end to all hope of profit from the orchard business in British Columbia. I must give the Department of Agriculture the credit which is due it for having co-operated efficiently and successfully, and along very well arranged lines, with the provincial government of British Columbia in the control of these pests. The minister has in his department a gentleman who has been almost of infinite service to us in British Columbia, although unfortunately he is no longer completely at the disposal of the province. I do not mind mentioning his name in the House; I refer to Mr. R. C. Treherne, than whom I doubt whether there is, in the whole range of the minister's officials, a more competent man. In fact, I think I should be safe in saying that there is not in the service of any other government a man better calculated to safeguard the interests of the public, in the particular line of activity he follows, than Mr. Treherne. There is an opportunity to greatly enlarge the activities of the department in connection with the most dangerous menace that threatens the fruit growers of Ontario, British Columbia, or any other section of the country where apples are produced. I refer to the codling moth. In one section of Washington, in spite of the fact that last year the district of Wenatchee expended $24 per acre in spraying to cope with that moth, the fruit growers lost a trifle over a million dollars in affected fruit. Hon. members can understand, in the light of such a fact, with what apprehension we view the danger of having that pest introduced into British Columbia. From 1905, when the pest was first noted in Victoria, up to last year, we have had fourteen outbreaks of this particular nuisance. Two-thirds of them were successfully coped with and the pest eradicated, but only for a while, because with refrigerator cars coming in from infested districts it is next to impossible to keep the pest out. I shall not enlarge on this subject but I could prove that a very considerable amount of money could be profitably spent in combatting this menace in Canada. I have in my hand a resolution forwarded to me from one of the Farmers' Institutes of the district from which I come, and a copy of which, I believe, has also been sent to the Department of Agriculture. After reciting in a general way the dangers and difficulties with which they have to contend the resolution goes on to say:

> Be it resolved that we, the members of this Institute, go on record as being in favour of the enactment of any such legislation as will prohibit the importation of apples and pears from infected districts into Canadian territory.

This is a large question and one on which perhaps the minister is not prepared to give a definite statement this evening. But if possible I want to convey to the institute some answer which would give them an inkling of the intentions of the department. The minister is perfectly aware that other countries have passed legislation of this kind. Japan has a law keeping out fruit from countries infected with the codling moth. Australia has legislation which prohibits the importation of fruit from any country infected with fire blight, which is a far less serious menace than the codling moth. It cannot be successfully proven that fire blight can be propagated by mature fruit brought into the country, but there is no doubt in the world that our infestation in British Columbia came originally from pears brought from California. In other

sections of which I have knowledge the infection came from apples brought from Ontario; and in spite of the constant vigilance of the provincial and Dominion officials it is one hard, long fight to keep the pest under control. I should be glad if the minister could give information as to whether he has answered the request from this Farmers' Institute, or has given it any consideration.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have much pleasure in giving the hon. member the information sought for. The first increase of $2,000 under the Entomological branch vote is intended to cover the purchase of additional apparatus and library supplies and also to provide for the employment of additional temporary employment during the summer, when the demand from the farmers for assistance in combatting insect pests is greatest. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), and no doubt all other hon. gentlemen, will understand that. The insect pest, of course, is developed in the summer time, and during the last four or five years many parts of Canada have had a very much higher average temperature than in the previous five years, with the result that new varieties of insects have developed in the country that we never heard of formerly, or rarely if we did. The corn borer, for instance, has troubled us for some time; and although we have had the grasshopper in the West for some years, we never had it in Saskatchewan to any extent until within the last four or five years. The hot weather and dry season develop their own insects, and the further south you go towards the gulf the more insect pests you encounter, which shows that there is a relationship between heat and the number and variety of pests that are to be found in a place. In the Destructive Insect and Pest Act vote there is an increase of $45,000, an increase that is substantial and yet small when you appreciate the amount of work that is to be taken care of by the vote. The entomological vote is really divided into two sections, entomological and botanical. They are naturally more or less interwoven. They appear here in this form and have been so divided every year I suppose. They should be dovetailed into each other. The appropriation for this section last year was $108,000, the estimate for this year is $140,000, an increase of $32,000. Statutory increases in salaries account for $5,000, while the appointment of an increased number of seasonal officers, as well as additional permanent officers, takes $6,000 more. For providing for emergencies and for scouting for brown-tail moth, alfalfa weevil, corn-borer and grasshopper work an increase of $5,000 over last year will be required. It might be stated that an emergency arose during the current fiscal year in connection with the reappearance of the corn-borer in western Ontario. No emergency fund was provided last year, consequently a Governor General's Warrant had to be issued to cover the cost of this work. A further sum of $15,000 is estimated for the purchase of two vacuum sterilizers, one for the port of Montreal and one for Vancouver, these to be used for the sterilizing of plant material imported, to prevent the introduction of insect pests. That is the entomological section of this insect pest legislation.

Mr. BAXTER: Was part of this vote used for the searching out and destruction of the spruce bud worm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, partly. That comes more particularly under the Department of the Interior. They solicit the services of our men at times, and we do a certain amount of aeroplane scouting over the timber limits where this worm is at its worst. Then, acting on our reports, the lumberman can exploit his limits before the timber is destroyed. After the coniferous trees are partly killed by the bud worm the destruction is completed by the bark beetle. A good deal of this work could be taken care of by the provincial authorities, and no doubt it is, and if greater precautions were taken to burn the debris after the lumberman completes his operations it would possibly prevent some of this trouble.

Mr. BAXTER: The money cannot be better spent in assisting the provincial authorities, because the preservation of our forests is of national importance. The destruction of our forests in New Brunswick by these insect pests is stated to represent thirty per cent of our forest wealth.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Recently a gentleman called on me and told me an alarming story about these insect pest invasions. He expressed the opinion that unless measurements are taken to protect our coniferous trees from the depredations of these pests we will not have any pulpwood at the end of ten years.

Mr. LEGER: That is right.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a very serious statement, and I merely give it for what it is worth, but judging from the aeroplane scouting reports the depredations are very extensive and can be plainly seen from the air. The spruce bud worm is followed by the bark beetle, which completes the devastation, and if the lumbermen do not cut down the affected timber it is soon completely destroyed.

Now the botanical section. The appropriation for this section last year was $82,000, the estimate for this year is $95,000, an increase of $13,000. Of this amount $8,000 is intended to cover the extension of potato inspection work, at present carried on most extensively in the maritime provinces, to western Canada also. The remaining $5,000 increase is required to provide for the establishment of an additional plant pathological laboratory in Quebec, and to pay salaries of officers at the new laboratory at Summerland, B.C., not provided in last year's estimates. Here are the appointees with the expenditure involved that will take care of some of the work referred to by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie):

Fruit Insect Investigations—	
1. Insect Pest Investigator, 5 Months at $90 per month, Victoria, B.C., laboratory	$450
1 Insect Pest Investigator, 5 months at $90 per month, Vernon, B.C., laboratory	450
1 Junior Clerk-Stenographer, Vernon, B.C., laboratory	600

I had the pleasure of visiting some of the orchards at Nelson three or four years ago and was very much interested in their difficulties not only in connection with the codling moth—I do not think it was a trouble at that time—but in connection with many other kinds of pests that seem to be ready to attack almost every form of plant life when you get a summer sufficiently warm to develop them. Here is the item:

Codling Moth—In the province of British Columbia the entomologist in charge of our activities has acted in an advisory capacity in field control operations, basing such operations on the knowledge resulting from life-history studies made from year to year by our officers. In the dry belt of British Columbia there are 1,165,369 apple and pear trees. The value of the apple crop alone to the growers for 1921 is estimated to be over $4,500,000. So far the codling moth has been controlled, but if it were allowed to become generally distributed, the losses from its ravages would in five years, including extra orchard control practices, would undoubtedly reach a total of $1,000,000. For the conducting of the control measures recommended, the Provincial Department of Agriculture appropriated $15,000 in 1921. Our officer in charge for British Columbia has completed an investigation which indicates that fifty per cent of the empty railroad cars entering British Columbia from eastern Canada and the United States, to be used for the carrying of fruit, contain either larvae or pupae of the insect, and to this source the chief infestations have been traced. A method of treating empty cars with live steam to destroy all insect life present has been tested during the year, and it is hoped this measure of control will become a recognized practice.

Mr. MacKELVIE: One question in regard to the resolution I read. Has the minister given any consideration to placing an embargo against fruit coming in from infected districts?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We all have a feeling in the West that there are enough restrictions already against the importation of fruit. Out there we like to get a certain amount of fruit early in the season, and the more restrictions placed on importation the greater difficulty we will have in getting that fruit. But I think there should be another way of correcting that. There is no doubt that the infestations of the codling moth are due very largely to the carrying of infection by the fruit in the cars. But there should be some method of checking it besides that suggested by my hon. friend—an embargo against importation. Am I correct in understanding that that is the suggestion?

Mr. MacKELVIE: It is suggested in the resolution placed in my hands by this institute for presentation to the minister—that is all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If it became a serious menace and that were the only solution, it would be well worth considering. A serious disease sometimes requires a serious remedy.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Of course, if we had the guarantee that every refrigerator car or freight car which contained fruit coming into any orchard district would be thoroughly treated by some superheating process which would destroy the larvae or cocoon, that would largely solve the difficulty.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think the point taken by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie) and emphasized in the resolution he speaks of is well worthy of consideration. There is real danger from having our orchards badly infested with the codling moth, and I do not think it is good policy to wait until the pest gets really

bad in this country before taking measures to combat it. I would respectfully suggest to the minister that this matter be investigated very carefully indeed, and that every possible step be taken now to prevent a further infection of our orchards through fruit imported from other countries. The hon. member for Yale has pointed out that Australia and Japan have adopted measures to keep out the infected fruit. We might carefully study those measures, and if they are really valuable and can be applied to our conditions, we should adopt them.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on this vote for entomology, and I want to back up what has been said in regard to the necessity of protecting our orchards and our farms to the greatest possible extent. Last fall I went through southern Ontario and visited some of the sections where the corn-borer was at work, and the condition of some of the corn fields was appalling. The operations of this pest have reached the point where we cannot afford to relax our efforts to combat them, and we should be ready with the money, if we have to get it by Supplementary Estimate, or by Governor General's Warrant, to meet the situation; otherwise our agriculture will receive a very bad setback. I want to endorse any work that is done along these lines.

Mr. GOULD: If there is any fault to be found with the item under discussion it is not that suggested by the first hon. member who spoke to the item and who questioned what we were going to do with a paltry $28,000 in the face of the depredations of insects against the products of our farms, our orchards and our forests. The minister gave as one reason for the existence of these pests the excessively hot seasons which we have recently experienced. I would add to that another reason: since Confederation we have had in this House men of the same mind as the hon. member who first spoke on this item, and the result has been, as I have stated on the floor of this House on many occasions, that agriculture has been starved. We have had men who have had no appreciation of the value of agriculture, its necessities, or its enemies—and all the enemies of agriculture are not quadrupeds and centipedes; some of them are bipeds. That is what is the matter with this vote. As I have pointed out time and again in this House, agriculture has been acknowledged on political platforms as the greatest thing in all Canada, as the backbone of the country, but when it comes to the floor of this House we find that "the greatest industry in Canada" is given the smallest vote of any department of government. A few years ago it was a paltry $3,000,000. On a previous occasion I pointed out in the House that, according to figures supplied by the Government themselves, the injury caused to agriculture alone was estimated at $125,000,000. According to information which came to my office, and to which, I think, the Minister of Agriculture also referred, it was estimated that over $1,000,000,000 was the extent of the loss to our forests through the depredations of flies and other insects upon our spruce trees. Then, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), there have been the attacks of insect pests upon our fruit areas. Yet we have an hon. member standing up and condemning the Minister of Agriculture for asking for another $2,000 in the entomological branch. I hope that next year—though I do not hope the conditions will warrant it—in the interests of research work, and with a view to finding out means of preventing these depredations, this vote will be increased to $50,000. I hope the minister will have sufficient money to engage the services of real men, men of science, men who will work diligently along these lines. Now, I have indicated what is the matter in Canada at the present time; we have not had the proper perspective. It is false economy to cut down estimates of this kind, and I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Yale and the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) in support of this item and against the criticisms of the hon. member who first spoke to the item. The appropriation is a very small one; it should be larger, so that we could have the kind of men who would discover means of combatting these pests. Did we not hear one of the ministers say a few nights ago that an increase of $400 by way of salary was necessary in his department because his department required men of greater expert knowledge than did the Department of Agriculture? But no department requires men of greater knowledge, information and scientific attainments than the Department of Agriculture. I would support the minister therefore, in every honourable means to secure enough money to enable him to pay his employees salaries equal to those paid in other departments of government.

Mr. SENN: I concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria city (Mr. Tolmie) with regard to the operations of the corn-borer in southern Ontario. I myself come from that district, and I know that the corn-borer is a great menace to corn growing in that part of the province. I would like to ask the minister if his department has estimated the loss which has occurred through the depredations of that insect during the past year and what are the prospects of success in the employment of methods of eradication.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—cold storage warehouses, $26,000.

Mr. SALES: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. CRERAR: What does this vote cover precisely? Does it cover grants to cold storage warehouses?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Where are they situated?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The committee will remember that the Cold Storage Act was amended a few years ago to restrict the grants to municipal cold storage plants. That change means that not so much is paid out in subsidies, because the public are not taking advantage of the act as an assistance to a municipal proposition to the same extent that they would in the case of a co-operative enterprise. Before the act was amended, thirty per cent of the cost of erection was paid out by the government, but since the amendment only one or two plants have attempted to take advantage of it. It might be proper to consider at some time whether we should not revert to the old order.

Mr. MARTELL: Has the minister received any correspondence from farmers' associations in Nova Scotia with a view to the establishment of a cold storage plant in Nova Scotia, in Halifax, say, for the use of the farmers, for the storage of perishable goods shipped there for export?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that some representations have been made from that city with a view to having a government cold storage plant erected there, but nothing has been done as yet. We did contribute to the construction of a pre-cooling plant in the Annapolis valley for the storage of fruit before shipment.

[Mr. Gould.]

Mr. MARTELL: Will the minister be prepared to receive a deputation on this question at any time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes; but I do not know that there is any provision for straight government construction.

Mr. TOLMIE: How many of these government-aided cold storage plants are there in Canada, and what provision is made for the storage of small quantities of meat and fruit by farmers in the localities where these plants are located?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Unfortunately, just about the time we were beginning to speed up and make grants under the act, it was amended and made to apply only to municipal plants. The number of plants erected under this act from the beginning, in the Hon. Mr. Fisher's time, is thirty-four. I think the act was amended in 1917. The total refrigerating space is 5,244,258 feet, and the total cost $2,408,354. The farmers have the same rights in the matter of storage as any one else. I know that in Saskatchewan there is a special apartment allotted for the storing of meat, vegetables, fruit, butter and so forth, but particularly meat, by the farmers. There is a room set aside exclusively for that purpose at the plant at Melville so that the farmers can put in a quarter of beef or mutton and other farm produce. There is no regulation providing for that, but I think all the plants provide accommodation for that purpose. If at any time the operator desires to exclude farm produce, I think he could do so simply by pleading there was no room.

Mr. TOLMIE: What is the charge for storing?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: While the subsidy is in abeyance, the operators are usually pretty good and are not tempted to inflate the storage prices. At the opening of a new institution the rates are fixed between the government and the operator, and if any changes are required afterwards, that is done by negotiation. The rates have been changed from time to time. If the operating cost increases, inevitably the storage rates should increase. The weak point is that after the subsidy has been all paid there is difficulty in properly controlling the rates. I know that for some years after the subsidy has been paid the different plants submit new schedules of rates to the department, recognizing its right to oversee the rates, but in law there

is some doubt whether we have the right to compel them not to exceed certain rates.

Mr. TOLMIE: Under the law, have not the rates to receive the approval of the government?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: The cold storage plants have been a great blessing in many ways, but I would point out to the minister that there has been considerable anxiety in certain of our large industrial centres regarding the operation of some of our cold storage warehouses. The fault found with those plants that are run by large corporations, who store goods in these warehouses for sale later, is that the foodstuffs are kept for too long a period. That has the effect of enhancing the price. They wait until the particular products they are handling, such as eggs, meats and other foods, become scarce throughout the country and then unload them at a higher price. Has the department any regulations governing these particular aspects of cold storage?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is the popular impression that there is a certain amount of villainy in the handling of this cold storage business but I have not found it so—I think there is a whole lot of misconception about the industry. Cold storage is one of the greatest blessings we have to-day in taking care of perishable products, but I suppose like many other blessings you must have control of it. For example a fire is a nice thing to sit close to on a winter's night but it is a dangerous thing if left uncontrolled. Cold storage is the same. Run under proper control it is one of the greatest means for developing the live stock industry that we know of. There is at present a certain amount of control over cold storage but I think it should be tightened up some and our jurisdiction in that respect established more clearly than it is. There should possibly be more regulation as to the length of time the storage of meats is permitted. I may say there is a provision in the law now as to that, and I understand from my deputy that regulations regarding it were drafted a few years ago and submitted to the Department of Justice. The decision was that we had no authority to carry them out. I am not familiar enough with the details to speak with any positiveness on the matter, but it appears we were told we had not authority to do as was contemplated, and that, I think, is the position in which the matter stands at present.

Mr. CARROLL: I notice that an hon. gentleman in another House has introduced a bill regarding the matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes in the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL: A bill was introduced, I think, in the session of 1913, but it received scant courtesy from the House at that time. There is an undoubted grievance in connection with cold storage warehouses. For example, a cold storage warehouse in the city of Montreal a few years ago got a corner on the egg market. Eggs were held up until they became a scarce commodity and then unloaded on the public at a very high rate. That is the thing the people in industrial centres have a right to protest against. There is no doubt in the world that cold storage plants have been a great benefit, but when such plants are subsidized by public money the Government should exercise sufficient control over them as to render impossible the things of which I have complained.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I ask my hon. friend if the plant to which he refers was a subsidized plant?

Mr. CARROLL: I so understood, but I am not in a position to say definitely.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I shall be very pleased to look into the matter.

Mr. CRERAR: In respect to what my hon. friend from Cape Breton has stated, my recollection is that there is a cold storage warehouse under control of the Harbour Commissioners at Montreal.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, a very good one.

Mr. CRERAR: A very good one. I took a good deal of pride in that. It was originated when I was at the head of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend borrowed the idea from Saskatchewan.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, that is where a great many good things come from and some indifferent things also. But in respect of the cold storage warehouse which is under the control of the Harbour Commissioners in Montreal, is that not available for public storage?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: If it is available for public storage, that should get over the difficulty raised by my hon. friend from Cape Breton, because any merchant or wholesale man would be at liberty to purchase his eggs and have them stored in this public cold storage warehouse and shipped out at his disposal. Is that correct?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. They are just beginning to use that cold storage warehouse now. I have had inquiries from Regina in regard to the rates they were charging in Montreal and from that fact I know the warehouse is being used. There is a certain amount of competition, and keen competition where there is a large number of these plants and I want to congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Crerar) in connection with that cold storage warehouse. It would have been a great service to the country if it had been built a few years sooner, especially during the war.

Mr. MARTELL: What action has been taken in the past to protect the public against impure foodstuffs? Do inspectors visit these plants regularly to see that the food commodities are in good condition? Because in the city of Montreal as well as in the much vaunted western Canada hundreds of tons of chickens were taken from cold storage warehouses and destroyed on account of being unfit for human food. What measures are taken to guarantee the public that they will get pure food from these plants?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may say that when a cold storage plant is subsidized it has to be ok'd by the department and during the process of construction a constant inspection is maintained to see that the plans and specifications are lived up to. So long as the subsidy, or any portion of it, remains unpaid we can maintain inspection. But there is no regular inspection and we have not the control that we would have if such an inspection were carried out. There certainly is a weakness there which should be corrected somehow. I have not as yet, had the necessary time to look into this matter and determine the extent to which an inspection might be carried on.

Mr. MARTELL: There is a Food Inspection Act under which, for example, government inspectors visit different stores from which they take samples of maple sugar and have them analyzed in order to determine whether they conform to a certain standard of purity. If the minister has power to do that, why has he not the power to carry out a regular inspection of cold storage plants in order to see that the food products stored therein are fit for human consumption?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that is a matter that would devolve on the provincial and Dominion boards of health.

Mr. MARTELL: The inspection to which I refer is, I think, practically carried out by the federal authorities.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a matter under the control of the Dominion or provincial Department of Health.

Mr. MARTELL: Is that an opinion given by the Department of Justice in writing?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it is an opinion given in writing.

Mr. MARTELL: I think the minister should bring that information down to the House.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will do so if my hon. friend will call for a return.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would like to suggest that as it is now eleven o'clock and as a number of hon. members on this side who would like to take part in the discussion of these items are not present, the committe should rise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We had better pass this item.

Item agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the House adjourns, if I might be permitted with the consent of the House, I should like to suggest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that, when the House adjourns over the Easter recess, we adjourn from Tuesday evening instead of from Wednesday evening. As we sit for only three hours on Wednesday, that is all we shall gain by sitting on that date. I find that some hon. gentlemen from the prairie provinces desire to avail themselves of the Easter recess to go home. If they leave on Tuesday night, as I understand the matter, their days throughout the rest of the week are charged up against them. If my hon. friend would agree to change the motion to read that we adjourn from Tuesday evening instead of from Wednesday, many members on this side of the House would appreciate that very much.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister: The Government has, in this matter, only one wish, and that is to consult the convenience of the members. I had heard that a number of the members desired that the House should adjourn on Tuesday, and I take it that it is the general wish of the members that the suggestion just made by my hon. friend be acted upon. If so, I shall have pleasure, at the close of to-night's sitting, in giving notice that, when we adjourn on Tuesday next, the House shall stand adjourned until the following Tuesday.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Monday, April 10, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): On behalf of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I move for leave to introduce Bill No. 45, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. McMASTER: I am sorry that the only copy I have of the bill I have sent to the Speaker, and I am not familiar enough with the measure myself to be able to explain it. Perhaps the House will allow it to be introduced, and discussion may be had on the second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): In the absence of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I beg to introduce Bill No. 46, to amend the Railway Act, 1919. The bill provides that a return ticket issued by any railway company between any two points in Canada shall be accepted by any other railway company whose line runs between the same termini.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome) (Translation): On behalf of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs); I move for leave to introduce Bill No. 47, to amend the Criminal Code.

Should hon. members of the other side of the House wish for any explanations, I am ready to give them.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

COMMENTS OF ENGLISH NEWSPAPER

On the Orders of the Day:

SIR HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I desire to refer to a matter that has already been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. leader (Mr. Meighen). It is a question that deeply involves the fair fame and good name of Canada, and for that reason I bring it forward again. I refer to the attack made by The Outlook on Canada and Canadian institutions. When the matter was before the House on the previous occasion, the Government took a position similar to that taken by the leader of the Opposition; but I regret that, apparently, they have not been able to make very much headway in dealing with it. I notice that The Outlook, far from desisting or apologizing, has returned to the charge, according to The Globe of Saturday, April 8. For the first time now we have an opportunity of studying this article. The Outlook is printed in London, I think, but I do not know anything regarding its standing, and I am perfectly convinced that both the British Government and the English people would just as much resent the attack made upon Canada as this House ought to resent it. I shall read one or two paragraphs from the article, which has been widely distributed through the press of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that the hon. member is strictly in order, but as the matter to which he refers seems to cast a reflection upon the honour of this country, I think it is of sufficient importance to warrant being brought before the attention of the House in order to elicit from the Government some statement regarding the facts. I would ask the hon. member, however, to refrain from reading any extract from the newspaper in question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Instead of reading, I may point out that the newspaper states that it is now more than two years since the previous government, by daring and unscrupulous trickery, befooled the railway organisation into an arbitration. The publication attacks the standing

of the gentlemen who took part in that arbitration, and it is utterly at variance with the truth when it claims that Sir Thomas White, who was one of the members of the board, was a member of the "inner ring" of the Meighen government. Of course, every hon. member knows that he had nothing to do with the Meighen government, but had resigned from the House, if I remember rightly, before Mr. Meighen assumed office.

The article further goes on to say that, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in the cost of railway operation, the Canadian Government, for the purpose of forcing this railway completely into its power, steadily refused to give any rate increase until the fifteen per cent increase was allowed in March 1918. Well, as hon. members know, and as the fact is, there was no refusal by the Government of any application for a rate increase, the whole matter being in the hands of the Railway Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to refrain from making any comment or argument. I understood that he wished simply to call the attention of the Government to some very libellous statements reflecting on the honour of Canada and of the Canadian Government which have appeared in the London press. Having done so, he can ask what is the attitude of the Government with regard to those statements, but he should not enter upon any argument or comment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, that is what I am endeavouring to do. but it is rather a large field to cover. However, I will be as brief as possible. I want to point out to the Government that the effect of the article is, in the first instance, a libel not only upon Canada, not only upon the Government of that day and upon the present Government, not only upon Canadian tradition, but something which is still more reprehensible,—an evident attempt by indirect means through the press to force this country into an abandonment of its rights, a veiled threat that unless exactly what the financial press of London thinks ought to be done by this Government in regard to the Grand Trunk is done, no further moneys can be raised in England for the development of Canada.

Now, my submission to the Government, Mr. Speaker, is that this article and this propaganda constitute a direct contempt of court. And other means apparently having failed, I would ask the Government as to whether or not they are taking proceedings for contempt of court against this newspaper or any other newspaper engaged in similar propaganda. We must bear in mind that the very issue which is dealt with by this newspaper is now before the Privy Council by the express consent of the Canadian Government.

I would further point out this:

> Contempt of court by speech or writing may be scandalizing the court itself, or by abusing parties to actions, or by prejudicing mankind in favour of or against a party before the cause is heard.

I am reading from the laws of England, not from Canadian laws. It is laid down by English cases that:

> There cannot be anything of greater consequence than to keep the streams of justice clean and pure, that parties may proceed with safety both to themselves and to their characters. Speeches or writings misrepresenting the proceedings of the court or prejudicing the public for or gainst a party are contempts. Nothing is more incumbent on courts of justice than to preserve their proceedings from being misrepresented nor is there anything of more pernicious consequence than to prejudice the minds of the public against persons concerned as parties in causes before the cause is finally heard.

It is pointed out by a well-known authority on English law, that one of the most mischievous things you can have is trial by newspapers when a trial by one of the regular tribunals of the country is going on,—just what we are having in this case.

In view of the authorities, which are perfectly clear, I desire to ask the Government what action is proposed to be taken against the publishers of this article.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised that my hon. friend should seek to give so much publicity to this matter. When it came up last week the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) took exception to an article in the same newspaper as reflecting upon the honour of this country. In reply I said that in so far as that article reflected upon the honour of this House or this Parliament, I placed myself in entire agreement with him. Clearly that states the position before the world to-day as to Canada's attitude. So far as the article reflects in any way upon any transaction of this Parliament, we give it no credence whatever. But when my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) suggests that we should enter into a controversy with any section of the British press, I fear he is going rather far afield.

I cannot see that any further action is necessary on the part of the Government than simply to repeat that in so far as this article reflects upon the honour of this House or Parliament, there is no hon. member who would countenance it for a moment. The article has been replied to in other newspapers, and I think the English public will judge the source from which this and similar articles emanate, and will be as ready to appreciate the truth as any one else. In a word, I think my hon. friend is unduly sensitive with regard to this particular subject.

THE GENOA CONFERENCE

LLOYD GEORGE MEMORANDUM AND RESOLUTIONS, CONFERENCE AT CANNES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, if he would bring down for the information of the House the aide-memoire presented by Lloyd George to the Cannes Conference which laid the foundation for the Conference that is being opened in Genoa to-day; and also if he would bring down a copy of the resolutions passed at the Cannes Conference. I think we are entitled to this information since Canada is being represented at the Genoa Conference. If he could bring these memoranda and resolutions down to-morrow and have them incorporated in Hansard, the material would be available for hon. members' information and consideration in relation to this very important conference.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I can assure my hon. friend that I shall have this information brought down to-morrow. I think it is in the Department of External Affairs at present.

Mr. CRERAR: I understand that these documents have already been published in the British press so there is no reason why they should not be laid on the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House proceeded to Government Notices of Motion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to amend the motion which appears on page 22 of the Orders of the Day, so that the motion will read:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday, the 11th instant, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 19th instant.

I might say that I have been consulted on this matter and that all parties are agreed to the change being made.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House returned to "Orders of the Day."

PRIVATE BILLS

SENATE BILLS—SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 30, for the relief of Wentworth Barnes.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 31, for the relief of Hazel McInally.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 32, for the relief of Edward Lovell.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of Elizabeth Lillian Sharpe.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 34, for the relief of Percival Andrew Jamieson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 35, for the relief of Frederick Henry Gill.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 36, for the relief of Blanche Elizabeth Macdonell.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 37, for the relief of Frank Charles Butt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 38, for the relief of Edward Sidney John Turpin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 40, for the relief of Albert Bethune Carley.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 41, for the relief of Ernest Zufelt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 42, for the relief of Harry Johns Leach.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of Nellie Berry.—Mr. Church.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CALGARY MILK INQUIRY

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What was the total cost of the Milk inquiry held by Major Duncan Stewart in Calgary, Alberta, from January 23, 1920 to June 17, 1921?

2. What amount did Major Duncan Stewart receive per day for his services, and what was the total amount received by him?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. $701.

2. $20 per diem if occupied a whole day on investigation, and a proportionate amount when occupied part of the day. The total amount received by him was $701.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Mr. NEILL:

1. Was the Dominion Government represented at the first International Labour Conference held at Washington in October and November, 1919?
2. Were the provincial governments represented at the said Conference?
3. Was a draft convention passed at the said conference committing the Governments represented at the conference to the acceptance of an eight-hour working day, as recommended by article four hundred and twenty-seven of the Treaty of Versailles?
4. What action has been taken or is contemplated by the Dominion Government to give effect in Canada to any such draft convention?
5. Pending the passage of legislation, will the Government give instructions to have an eight-hour day put into effect on all Government works, whether performed by day labour or under contract?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. The provincial governments were not represented in the conference, as the provinces are not members of the international labour organization. They were, however, represented in the Canadian delegation to the conference, since on the invitation of the Dominion Government each provincial government named an adviser to the Dominion Government delegates.

3. and 4. A draft convention was passed, Canada participating as a federal state and subject to the limitations as to federal states in these matters set forth in Article 405 of the Treaty of Versailles. The Department of Justice having decided that the subject dealt with fell within provincial authority, the Dominion Government referred the draft convention to the several provincial governments as the authorities competent in the matter. Consideration is being given at the present time to suggestions which have been received from certain of the provincial governments for calling a conference for discussion of this matter between the Dominion and the provinces.

5. The practice with respect to works performed for the Dominion Government requires that the working hours shall be in conformity with the practice or law of the locality. Since the provinces are understood to have the representations of the convention under present consideration, in the opinion of the Government a change of practice or policy at the present time might only serve to create a misconception and confusion or to prejudice the position of the provinces in dealing with this matter.

POST OFFICES—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. NEILL:

1. What is the gross revenue of the following post offices in British Columbia for the last fiscal year—Courtenay, Union Bay, Ashcroft, Ladysmith, Port Alberni?
2. Which of these offices are located in buildings owned by the federal authorities?
3. If the answers to questions one and two show that Courtenay has the largest postal revenue of those named, and is the only one not located in a building owned by the federal Government, will the Government place an item in the Estimates to erect a post office at Courtenay?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Revenue for eleven months, 1st April, 1921, to 28th February, 1922: Ashcroft, $4,371.87; Courtenay, $6,073.92; Ladysmith, $6,526.54; Port Alberni, $4,267.18; Union Bay, $1,954.37. As the cash accounts from these offices have not been received covering the period to the 31st March, 1922, it is impossible to make out the revenue for the year ended on that date.

2. Union Bay, Ashcroft, Ladysmith, and Port Alberni.

3. When expenditure on new works can be resumed, matter will be considered.

Mr. ERNEST LAMONTAGNE

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis):

1. Is Mr. Ernest Lamontagne at present employed in the Montreal Post Office?
2. If so, does he hold a position as senior clerk at Station N?
3. When was he first made a senior clerk?
4. Who did he replace?
5. What position did the said Lamontagne previously occupy?
6. Did he pass any examinations?
7. Was public notice given by the Civil Service Commission of the vacancy?
8. If so, how many applications were received?
9. Was an examination set for the position?
10. If not, what were the qualifications of the said Ernest Lamontagne to fill the position?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, senior postal clerk.
3. 1st December, 1921.
4. Mr. Joseph Hebert, who was demoted.
5. Postal clerk.
6. Qualifying examinations, 1915.
7. Yes, it was advertised as a promotion competition among the permanent employees of the Montreal post office.
8. Thirty-three applications.
9. An examination of the relative experience of the candidates, together with a rating on their seniority and efficiency and fitness, was the determining factor of the examination. Written tests are generally objected to by the employees in the case of promotion competitions, and these are resorted to only when absolutely necessary.
10. Answered by No. 9.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. What railway companies carry His Majesty's mails in Canada?
2. What are the details of existing contracts and on what dates do they terminate?
3. Does the Government intend to make arrangements to have all mails carried by the Canadian National Railways where possible?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. The following railway companies carry His Majesty's mails in Canada:—

Alberta and Great Waterways.
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay.
Algoma Eastern.
British Columbia Electric.
British Yukon.
Canada Central.
Canadian National (Canadian Northern Division).
Canadian National (Grand Trunk Pacific Division).
Canadian National (Canadian Government Railways Division).
Cape Breton Electric.
Central Vermont.
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Electric.
Cumberland and Coal Company.
Dominion Atlantic.
Edmonton-Dunvegan and British Columbia.
Grand River.
Grand Trunk.
Great Northern.
Hamilton and Dundas.
Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric.
Hamilton Radial.
Hull Electric.
Hydro Electric.
International Electric.
Inverness Railway and Coal Company.
Kent Northern.
Kettle Valley.
London and Port Stanley
Main Central.
Maritime Coal and Power Company.
Michigan Central.
Montreal and Southern Counties.
Napierreville Junction.
Nelson and Fort Sheppard.
New Westminster Southern.
New York Central.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Electric.
Northern Pacific.
Pacific Great Eastern.
Pere Marquette.
Port Arthur and Fort William Electric.
Quebec Central.
Quebec, Light and Power.
Quebec, Montreal and Southern.
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec and Western.
Sydney and Louisburg.
Temiscouata.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario.
Thousand Islands.
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo.
Toronto Suburban.
Toronto and York Radial.
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern.
Wellington Collier.
Wellington and Waterloo.
Windsor, Essex and Lake Erie.

2. Contracts are not entered into with railways for carrying His Majesty's mails, the conveyance of such mails being provided for by Section 115, of the Post Office Act, which reads as follows:—

> His Majesty's mail and persons travelling therewith on postal service, shall, at all times when thereunto required by the Postmaster General, be carried on any steamship or steamboat navigating the waters of Canada, and on any railway in Canada, and with the whole resources of the railway company if required, on such terms and conditions and under such regulations as are made by the Governor in Council.

Mail services on railways are established or terminated in accordance with the requirements of the Postal Service, and the detail thereof authorized by Order in Council.

Payment for conveyance of mail by railways is made on a car mile basis, and the existing rates per mile authorized by Order in Council P.C. 472, of the 19th February, 1921, in effect since the 1st of March, 1921, are as follows:—

For a full postal car service	34·7c.	per car mile
For an apartment postal car service	19·52c.	"
For service by baggage car	8·67c.	"
For special train ordered by the department	$2.71	per train mile
For special passenger trains	2.17	"

3. Instructions issued under date of 13th December, 1920, by the then Minister of Railways and Canals were to the effect that the Post Office Department should see that the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway were fairly treated in connection with mail service—neither given an unfair advantage. In every case the department is governed by the requirements of the postal service in the territory served by the railway. Any further intention on the part of the Government will be announced in due course.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. In what year was the Civil Service Retirement Fund established?
2. What is the rate of deduction from the salaries of civil servants coming under such fund?
3. What is the total amount of said Retirement Fund now held by the Department of Finance?
4. What is the rate of interest allowed to civil servants upon Retirement Funds deductions from their salaries?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 1898.

2. Five per cent of the amount of salary.

3. As shown by the books of the Finance Department, March 31, 1922, $8,680,-112.76.

4. Five per cent, per annum credited half-yearly.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—SECRETARY

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Has the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission been classified?
2. If so, by whom?
3. What was his salary on April 1, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?
4. Did he receive any back pay?
5. If so, what amount?
6. At what date, month and year?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. The Parliament of Canada, on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. (see classification volume adopted 10th November, 1919).

3. April 1918, $4,000; 1919, $4,260; 1920, $4,400; 1921, $4,620; 1922 $5,100.

4. Yes.

5. $960.

6. 31st December, 1921.

TAX FREE BONDS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What amount of tax free bonds mature on or before December 1, 1922?
2. How does the Government propose to meet this indebtedness?
3. If by refunding with a new issue of bonds will the new issue be tax free?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $182,834,500.

2. The Government is contemplating the issuing of a loan, the precise amount of which has not yet been determined.

3. It is not the intention to issue tax free bonds.

[Mr. Murphy.]

EXCHANGE ON SOLDIERS' PAY

Mr. KELLNER:

1. During demobilization after the late war, and when Canadian soldiers and their dependents were being paid their gratuity in England, did they receive the benefit arising out of the value of exchange?
2. If not, who received such benefit?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. In all cases of money transferred to Canada they had the privilege of converting sums in sterling, representing pay, allowances or gratuities, into Canadian dollars at par of exchange.

ST. JOHN INCOME TAX OFFICE

Mr. LEGER:

1. What are the names of the persons employed in the Income Tax office in the city of St. John, New Brunswick?
2. How many employees have been taken on in this office since December 6, 1921, what are their names and date of appointment?
3. Does this department come under the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. N. P. Mcleod, R. D. Hoben, H. C. Wilson, W. H. Estabrooks, E. B. Clark, H. P. Henderson, A. C. Turner, C. E. H. Corbett, O. A. Reid, G. A. Spicer, F. W. Lanyon, K. W. Lingley, G. M. Thompson, N. L. Lewis, N. H. Sancton, A. E. Hawkins, L. F. Sewell, F. C. Mehan, C. A. Masters, A. L. Campbell, W. C. Birell, M. A. Rogers, E. Climo, N. A. Thompson, J. A. Short, G. M. Belyea, F. H. Gardner, A. A. Allingham, E. J. Nichols, A. G. Lingley, M. M. Calder.

2. Fifteen. Names and dates of appointment: F. C. Meahan, 16th January, 1922; A. L. Campbell, 16th January, 1922; M. A. Rogers, 16th January, 1922; L. F. Sewell, 16th January, 1922; A. A. Allingham, 16th January, 1922; C. A. Masters, 16th January, 1922; E. J. Nichols, 23rd January, 1922; W. C. Birell, 23rd January, 1922; F. H. Gardner, 23rd January, 1922; E. Climo, 23rd January, 1922; N. A. Thompson, 23rd January, 1922; G. M. Belyea, 1st February, 1922; J. A. Short, 1st February, 1922; A. G. Lingley, 6th February, 1922; M. M. Calder, 13th February, 1922; seven male clerks, all returned soldiers; eight female clerks.

3. No.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—REPORT

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the Civil Service Commission made up the yearly report as set forth in article 38b of chapter 22, 11-12 George V, showing the positions which do not come under the jurisdiction of the said commission?
2. If so, what are the said positions?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. This information was given in report for the year 1921 of positions excluded under the provisions of section 38b from the operation of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended by chapter 22, 11-12 Geo. V, Part I in whole, Part II in part, laid before the House April 7, 1922.

PARRY SOUND LIGHTHOUSE INSPECTOR

Mr. HAMMELL:

1. Who is the inspector of lighthouses and wharves for Parry Sound district?
2. When was he appointed and at what salary?
3. Where does the said inspector reside?
4. Who recommended the appointment?
5. Is the said inspector any relation to the member for Parry Sound? If so, in what way?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. James Norman Arthurs.

2. By Order in Council dated 30th July, 1915, appointment to date from the 1st April, 1915, salary $1,600 per annum.

3. Parry Sound, Ontario.

4. The Hon. J. D. Hazen then Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

5. No record of such fact in department.

WARSHIPS AND TORPEDO BOATS

Mr. ST. PERE:

1. Is there any agreement between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Government to maintain the warships Aurora, Patriot and Patrician, and the three torpedo boats now in service?
2. If so (a) when was such agreement made, and (b) of what use are the said vessels to Canada?
3. Are the crews of the said boats composed of Canadian recruits, and are the officers graduates from the Halifax Naval College?
4. Are officers who graduate from the Halifax Naval College able to obtain commissions in the Canadian Merchant Marine, and are they given preference over other applicants?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

2. (a) Answered by No. 1. (b) These vessels are of use for naval training purposes and in case of emergency for the protection of Canadian marine interests and Canadian ports.

3. The crews of the Canadian Squadron are composed largely of Canadian recruits. Of the 21 officers, 17 are Royal Canadian Naval officers, 11 of whom were trained in the Royal Naval College. There are only four officers on loan from the Imperial navy. All officers and men loaned from the Imperial navy are being replaced by Canadians as quickly as the latter can be trained.

4. No information.

REVENUE FROM IMPORTS

Mr. CLARK:

1. What was the total revenue of Canada arising from duties on imports during the years 1919, 1920 and 1921?
2. What portion of the above revenue was represented by duties on (a) foodstuffs, (b) agricultural implements, and (c) manufactured articles exclusive of agricultural implements?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Total Customs Duty Collected:—

Fiscal Year 1919	$158,046,334
Fiscal Year 1920	187,524,182
Fiscal Year 1921	179,667,683

2. (a) Duty collected on foodstuffs:—

Fiscal Year 1919	$17,740,442
Fiscal Year 1920	27,499,267
Fiscal Year 1921	20,723,408

(b) Duty collected on agricultural implements:—

Fiscal Year 1919	$ 1,572,885
Fiscal Year 1920	1,126,137
Fiscal Year 1921	1,917,370

(c) Duty collected on manufactured articles: Information not available.

WELLAND SHIP CANAL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What construction work yet remains to be done on the new Welland Ship Canal, and what work has already been completed?
2. (a) What has been expended to date on this canal, and (b) when will it be completed and open for traffic?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to finish this canal as soon as possible?
4. What work will be done this year?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Approximately 70 per cent of the total work yet remains to be done. This comprises the completion of Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; the construction of sections 6, 7, 8 and 9; the lock gates, superstructures of bridges, and minor details.

Approximately 30 per cent of the total work has been completed. This comprises 63 per cent of the work on sections 1 and 2; 51 per cent of the work on sections 3 and 4; 72 per cent of the work on section 5.

2. (a) Gross amount expended to March 31, 1922	$30,588,026 07
Credit for cash received on account of plant and materials, etc., from contractors for sections 1, 2 and 5	1,149,761 25
	$29,438,264 82

Less further amount to be paid by Contractors for sections 1, 2 and 5 in accordance with their contracts on account of plant, etc. $952,883.11	
Less estimated value of plant, etc., to be taken over by contractors for sections 3 and 4. $2,151,655.88	3,104,538 99
Net expenditure upon work done to March 31, 1922..	26,333,725 83

which sum includes other redeemable assets.

(b) If ample funds are available for the prosecution of the work, it will be ready for traffic during the year 1927.

3. As soon as circumstances will permit.

4. Construction of locks on sections 1, 2 and 3; excavation upon sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

IMPORTED LIQUORS

Mr. SPENCER:

What was the amount of Excise Duties collected by the Dominion Government on imported liquors, by provinces, during the years 1919, 1920 and 1921?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: There are no excise duties on imported liquors.

CUSTOMS DRAWBACKS

Mr. EVANS:

1. On what raw material was the drawback paid in the last year for which a complete return is made?
2. What was the value of such raw material?
3. What was the value of the finished articles exported?
4. To what countries were they exported?
5. What was the value of the labour expended in the manufacture of such articles exported?
6. What is the total amount of revenue collected for the year ending March 31, 1922?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I would ask that this question pass as order for return, except clause 5, and that I ask should be dropped, as the department cannot answer it.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. CHURCH:

What amount of money has been spent by the Government of Canada each year from 1896 to 1921 on the following harbours:—St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Victoria and Vancouver?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. BAXTER:

1. What amount of bonds (a) of the Canadian Northern, (b) of the Grand Trunk Pacific were guaranteed by any of the provinces, and which province in each case?
2. Have the guaranteeing provinces been relieved of liability by the Federal Government taking over these railway systems?
3. What bonds or other securities in connection with railways in (a) New Brunswick; (b) Nova Scotia; (c) Prince Edward Island have been guaranteed or assumed by the Federal Government?
4. What are the terms under which the Department of Railways operates the Valley Railway, so called, in New Brunswick?
5. Is this railway operated as part of the Intercolonial or under what jurisdiction has it been placed?
6. Does its operation entail any loss to the Federal Government? If so, to what amount and of what does it consist?
7. Will the Government consider the taking over of the Valley Railway, so called?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, memoranda, telegrams and other documents, referring to the placing of the insurance upon the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, since the date of the placing of said insurance up to the present time.

Mr. LOVETT:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, reports to Council, Orders in Council, accounts and others documents, relating to the Indian Agency at Bear River, Digby County, Nova Scotia, including a list of all supplies of every description supplied for the use of Indians under the control of said agency. Also a statement showing a list of the supplies, consisting of clothing, food, seed and other materials, to whom supplied and what quantity in each case, during the period from the first of October, 1911, to and including the first of January, 1922.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

For a copy of the Order in Council dated April twenty-first, 1921, which provided for the distribution of the sum granted as a bonus to Civil Servants.

Mr. PUTNAM:

For a copy of all documents, contracts, agreements, correspondence, letters, memoranda and other documents, passing between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and between either of them with the various brokers and others who had to do with the placing of the loan made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for twenty-five million dollars during the year 1921.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, including the Orders in Council, relative to the appointment and dismissal and reinstatement, as clerk, at the Montreal Post Office, of Jean Jacques Caisse.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, rulings of the department, and all other documents regarding the claim for compensation to the owners of Crown Patents to lot two hundred and twenty-five, Hudson Bay Company's survey, in the Parish of St. John, Manitoba.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the changing of the mail contracts at Bonaventure, Quebec, from Sylvestre Bernard to J. A. Bernard.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Post Office at Carleton, Quebec, from Bernard Leclerc to Auguste Lefebvre.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Post Office at Bonaventure, Quebec, from Charles Forest to Firmin Poirier.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Post Office at Paspebiac, Quebec, from Isidore Laundry to Nicholas Arseneau.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Port Office at Paspebiac, Quebec, from the late Mrs. J. E. Leveque to Charles Legallais.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Shigawake, Quebec, Post Office, from John A. Legallais to Jas. Poirier.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all letters, correspondence and other documents, relating to the transfer of the Post Office at Avignon, Quebec, from Joseph Poirier to Mathias Blaquaire and Joseph Arsenault.

PROTECTION OF WORKMEN AGAINST ACCIDENTS

On the Order:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the fact that there has been a law in effect for some time protecting workmen against accidents while engaged in their work, it is desirable that same protection be afforded to all workmen contracting sickness while performing, or due to the performance of their work or trade.—Mr. Deslauriers (St. Mary).

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion the resolution as drafted affects the civil rights of the provinces as provided in clause 92, sec. 13 of the British North America Act. If the resolution had reference to public works of the Dominion alone there could be no objection to it; but I do not think that any resolution of this Parliament can bind the provincial governments as regards a purely civil contract.

I would rule, therefore, that the resolution be re-drafted or dropped.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSAL TO CONFINE TO UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be confined to Territories not included in any Province of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as there has already been some discussion regarding the work of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, I presume it will not be necessary to deal at length with this resolution. I would point out that the original operations of the police were confined to unorganized territories and had to deal with questions affecting the pioneer settlers, and I think we all recognize that excellent work was done under the rather primitive conditions which then prevailed in the Canadian Northwest. However, after the war was over, there came a transformation in the character of that police force, and they were asked to do the work of looking after those suspected of being alien enemies, and also, a little bit later, to watch those suspected of fomenting sedition or of being connected with industrial disputes. I think, probably, enough was said the other day to illustrate that there has been what I think we might almost call an abuse of power in connection with the activities of the force. For example, literature was seized on general warrants. I know of one instance, which I may mention by way of illustration, in which a library belonging to a gentleman—now an alderman in the city of Calgary, a very estimable citizen there,—a library which he had brought out from the Old Country some years before, was seized by the Mounted Police. He has been unable to obtain any definite information with regard to what was done with his books, much less to have them returned, and I am credibly informed that some of these volumes are now in the library of the Mounted Police barracks at Calgary. Books that were seized at the time of the raids on the homes of workingmen in Winnipeg were burnt by the cart load in the public incinerator in Winnipeg. A teamster, a very religious man,

rescued one of these books from the flames and brought it to me. It was a Life of Jesus. Curious that that should be one of the seditious documents taken presumably from the home of one of the workers. I know that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, during the war, entered a library at Regina and took out of that library a copy of Myers' "History of Canadian Wealth" a book which was widely circulated by the Grain Growers' Guide two or three years previously—a book written largely in the library of this Parliament. Its statements are supported by documentary evidence. I do not know whether it is considered undesirable for the people to know how these huge fortunes have been built up here in Canada.

I referred on a previous occasion to the surveillance that, according to the reports of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, has been maintained on labour activities. The Labour people throughout this country resent the fact that a police force is sent to spy upon their movements. I do not read that the police have ever been detailed to be present at the meetings of, we will say, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, or of the Bankers' Association, or of boards of directors of our railway companies, yet some of us might think that possibly these organizations are doing as much to stir up revolt in the minds of the common people of this country as the utterances of some obscure labour man in Prince Albert or Lethbridge. It is rather significant that, although there are so many men who have been demobilized in this country, the Government of Canada has had to pay for recruiting for this force in Great Britain. There is no doubt that the force has become one of the spending departments of the Government, nearly $4,000,000 being spent upon it last year. What province, I ask, really wants this force at the present time? I am quite sure that the provinces which I know best—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—are not very desirous of having it. The great majority of the people resent having the force within their provincial boundaries, and I am not at all sure that these eastern provinces have relished the idea of having a police force, operated from Ottawa, stationed in their various towns and cities. I hold in my hands a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Grand Army of United Veterans held at Toronto, February 11th, 1922, which reads:

> Motion:—J. F. Marsh—J. Vallentine, "That this Dominion Board forthwith make representation to the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Premier of Canada, and his Government, requesting the advisability of demobilizing the Royal Mounted Police as at present constituted, as it is the decided opinion of this Board, after full investigation, that there is no further necessity for the services of Dominion Police in organized territory and recommend the re-organization of the Royal Canadian Northwest Mounted Police at its pre-war strength." Unanimously Carried.

I very well remember when the mounted police first came over the mountains to British Columbia, and the effect upon the workers there. We had a despatch from Ottawa stating that there would be demobilization of a very large number of returned men at the coast, that this might very likely mean unemployment, that unemployment would lead to industrial unrest, and hence that a detachment of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were to be sent over the mountains to British Columbia. I think hon. gentlemen may imagine the feelings of the returned men at the coast when it was expressly stated to them that, since they, on their return, were likely to be out of a job, they were to be clubbed into submission by the Mounted Police. Last year nearly $4,000,000 was spent on this police force, and only a little over half a million on unemployment relief. I think it would not be asking too much to suggest that these figures should be reversed, and that the larger amount should be spent in trying to relieve unemployment, rather than in being prepared to club the desperate unemployed into submission.

The last point which I make is that, after all, according to the division of functions in federal and provincial affairs, it has generally been considered that the administration of justice lay with the provinces and not with the federal authorities, and I take it that we would be proceeding on safe ground if we did not further centralize power in federal government with regard to the administration of justice. Those of us who knew anything of the inside of the industrial dispute in Winnipeg in 1919 recognized very clearly that it was a very dangerous precedent when the then Minister of Justice appointed a deputy minister in the city of Winnipeg and proceeded to administer justice within the province of Manitoba. My resolution calls for the placing of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on their pre-war basis. The force was organized to deal with conditions in unorganized territory where there was no proper police provision. Since that time the Canadian Northwest has been organized into provinces and each province now

4 p.m.

has its own provincial police force. I would urge upon this House that the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police be again restricted within the bounds of territories not yet organized into provinces.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): This is a much larger question than may appear on the surface. My hon. friend has referred to the pre-war basis of the Northwest Mounted Police. The House will understand that prior to 1920 Canada had two forces, one known as the Dominion Police and the other as the Northwest Mounted Police. In 1920 these two forces were amalgamated under the title of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. They are, to all intents and purposes, at the present time, one force, but the Mounted Police proper does not comprise the full number of the men who now form the united organization. The passing by this House of a resolution demanding that the government restrict the activities of this force to the unorganized territories would hamper the government to a large extent in carrying out the policy which it hopes to make definite before many months. Speaking technically, on absolutely legal or constitutional grounds, my hon. friend is right that the provinces ought to look after the maintaining of order within their several territories. As I pointed out the other day, several of the prime ministers of the various provinces have suggested to the government that they do not go as far as this resolution would indicate, but that while agreeing to lessen the number of these forces, they would be loath to see the entire force of the Mounted Police withdrawn from their provinces, particularly from some parts of it. It is not easy just at the moment to take a definite stand as to these particular provinces. Even to-day I received a letter from the president of a board of trade in an important town in Ontario, begging me that, whatever else might be done, we should not withdraw the Mounted Police from that territorr and giving the reasons for it. I have a great many letters of this kind from mayors and private citizens. These are questions that we must carefully consider when the time comes for action in reference to this body known as the Mounted Police. I agree that constitutionally my hon. friend is absolutely right, but in working out the affairs, particularly of a new country, we are not always safe in adhering to the letter of the constitution. Sometimes we even have to violate almost the letter of the law, in order to be practical. I think the most practical magistrate I ever knew in my life knew the least law of any magistrate that had ever held office in Ontario. It was in a part of the country where every day common sense sometimes over-rode the law.

As to the amount of money spent on the Mounted Police, I can assure the house that the Government has in mind greatly reducing this amount of expenditure. We believe the time has come—and I think the House will agree with that conclusion—when the force known as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police can be greatly reduced, and if parliament had not urged strongly that the management of this force should be taken out of the Militia Department, I had hoped to have some suggestion to make along that line; but the House having taken this attitude, we will have to begin over again, and it will take a little longer. I might take the House into my confidence to this extent, to say that I have asked Deputy Commissioner Starnes to suggest a plan for the reduction of his force in order to bring it nearer into conformity with the present-day need. I would assure my hon. friend and the House that, so far as practicable, we intend to confine the activities of the force to the unorganized territory, but in some instances the work which I believe ought to be done will be greatly hampered if the House pass this resolution and tie the hands of the Government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I referred the other day to this question, and I say that I entirely disagree with the principle laid down, that the administration of the law is a matter for the provinces. As the Dominion increases in importance and in subjects that are within its jurisdiction, it must maintain order, peace and good government throughout its area. I entirely dissent from the statement that the provinces are to be the interpreters of the rights and the duties of the federal government. The special officers of the Attorney General of the United States, backed by the thousands of special agents, under them, were in Washington throughout the whole of the Disarmament Conference, and were responsible for the maintenance of peace and order while that conference lasted. The President, the Attorney General, and all his attorneys in the United States are thor-

oughly organized to preserve good government, and I should not be surprised to see the President, before this week is over, take charge of the mines of the United States if the disturbances increase. In the early history of the American Union the responsibility rested mainly upon the states to see that peace and order were observed. But in the one hundred and fifty years' experience of that country the federal power has been gradually growing, the number of federal courts has increased, the number of officers necessary for the enforcement of federal law greatly added to, and more and more responsibility has been placed on the Attorney General through the hundreds of officers and local attorneys under him. The jurisdiction of the federal courts has also been gradually extended, and it has been found absolutely necessary to have not only attorneys, and local courts, but all the machinery essential for the proper enforcement of federal decrees. The same thing is coming in Canada. We have taken over the railways, and our federal laws concerning those railways cannot be properly administered except through the aid of a federal force. All through the war, whenever any consignment of money was entrusted to the express companies, there were always two members of the Mounted Police force to take charge of it. I have myself seen these escorts on trains coming into Ottawa. We have an Attorney General in Canada who is responsible for the administration of federal law, and in the Old Country there is an Attorney General for Scotland and one for Ireland.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are no provincial governments there.

Mr. MACLEAN (York); Scotland and Ireland have their Attorneys General and local organizations. But here is the point: Scotland Yard is at the disposal of the Attorney General of either Scotland or Ireland for the preservation of law and order in their respective territories. The more I observe the trend of things the more am I convinced of the necessity for a police force of some kind for the proper enforcement of federal law. There are thousands of officers now in the United States who have been appointed for the sole purpose of enforcing the prohibition law; and so long as federal laws are being enacted, and new social problems connected with government are cropping up, the more responsibility will the federal power find itself compelled to shoulder. I should not like to see the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General, or the Prime Minister of Canada without an efficient police force at his disposal. I do not propose for one moment to justify what has been done in cases that have provoked criticism, and for that reason I shall say nothing regarding the use of federal officers for putting the law into effect in Winnipeg during the strike; I shall say nothing regarding the requests of various people scattered throughout the Dominion for a federal force; nor will I refer to the action of the federal force in the past. I do think, however, that there should have been more courage in the defence of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) in advocating the maintenance of the force. I agree with him that it should be cut down in the interest of economy. But, I repeat, you cannot have a federal power without some kind of police force to carry out its decrees. I do not suppose there were twenty federal officers in the United States in the early days of that country, but to-day there is an immense organization and secret service force at the disposal of the Attorney General, besides millions of money. If we in Canada desire to vindicate the British North America Act we must stand by the federal power and provide the necessary machinery to enforce the laws which the federal Parliament enacts. We have a Supreme Court, a Court of Exchequer, a Board of Railway Commissioners, and we have a minister in this House charged with the collection of customs duties and the putting down of smuggling and all illicit business of that kind. Let us, therefore, strengthen the hands of those who are charged with the enforcement of these laws. The provinces do not like to enforce federal laws, and there is the expense in connection therewith to be considered. The municipalities evade their responsibilities in some cases, and to-day in Ontario we find Mr. Drury putting through the legislature a law for the establishment of a provincial police with men scattered throughout the province for the enforcement of provincial law. That is only another form of the same problem we have here. If you undertake the responsibility, as the federal authority, of enforcing the decrees of your courts, you have also to assume the responsibility of maintaining peace and order and good government, if the provincial authorities fail to undertake that responsibility; and especially you have to assume this responsibility now in view of

the great developments along these lines which have taken place in the United States. I have already referred to the precautions taken by the United States Government while the Conference for Disarmament was being held in Washington, to prevent bombing outrages or any other attempts to disturb its proceedings. As a result of a long-drawn-out legal fight between the federal and state authorities, the States Rights party of the United States has absolutely broken down for all time.

That is the situation in the United States, and we are reaching pretty much the same state of affairs here. While I do not dispute what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Woodsworth) has said with regard to recent strikes, I do not think he has made out a case against the continued maintenance of the mounted police for the preservation of peace, order and good government. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) has not had the courage to state what his views are in relation to this question. But he must know that some such force is absolutely necessary for the purposes I have enumerated, and that it should be under the administration of either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) referred to the strike of 1919. In my judgment what happened there in that year is the best argument that can be advanced for the maintenance of the Mounted Police as an efficient force to uphold law and order. Let us recall for a moment what took place there. An incipient revolution broke out; the municipal authorities were unable to control the situation; the men who planned the revolution had the local police under their control—they went on strike. The provincial authorities were unable to restore order, and if it had not been for the Mounted Police and for the action taken by the federal authorities, we would have had Soviet government in Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is what was aimed at, Mr. Speaker; there cannot be any doubt about that. If the attempted revolution had succeeded, the aim of those promoting it was to extend it to every city in the Dominion. Well, if we should have a recurrence of a similar trouble, and if the municipality was unable to act because its police force was corrupted, and the provincial authorities were powerless to restore order, what would happen unless you had a force capable and well-trained to cope with such a situation? I know there are some men in this country who would abolish all police forces, and those are the type of men who are trying to destroy the municipal police as a force for the maintenance of order. Now, I do not believe that the men who talk in that way in the name of Labour represent Labour in this country at all. I sit in this House, Sir, for a constituency in which there are 80,000 working people.

An hon. MEMBER: It must be Toronto.

Mr. HOCKEN: I sit for a constituency in the city of Toronto a mile and a quarter square, with not a vacant lot in it, and scarcely a man there but works for his daily bread. So I claim that I can represent Labour on the floor of this House as well as any other member. I go further, Sir, I say that I am as good a friend of Labour as there is in this House. And I have a record as a labour man and as a friend of Labour that I will set against the record of my hon. friend any day. Further, in the city of Toronto, where my record is known, the labour men trust me as their friend. I have, I suppose, a larger number of foreign workingmen in my riding than are to be found in any other constituency in Ontario, if not in the Dominion. At least, from twenty-five to thirty per cent of my constituents are of foreign origin. A few of them talk red revolution and Sovietism, but they are only a handful and do not represent the working people of this country. And if there is a constituency which will send men here who believe in Sovietism and red revolution, why, that only emphasizes the necessity of maintaining the Mounted Police as an efficient force for the preservation of law and order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Does the hon. member imply that I stand for Sovietism and red revolution?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no such implication contained in anything I have heard falling from the lips of the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member "doth protest too much." He is too sensitive on that particular point.

I want to argue for the continuance of the Mounted Police as an efficient federal force, and, that the recent history of this country proves that the continuance of that force is absolutely necessary; and I referred to what took place in the city of Winnipeg in 1919 to confirm my argument.

As the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) has pointed out, a very large part of the work of this force is that of secret service. Perhaps my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg would say there is no necessity for a secret service; but looking over some of the events that have happened lately, I think such a service is essential, and if we are to have a secret service, what better type of men could one assign to it than the men who have been trained in the traditions of the Northwest Mounted Police? There is a force that throughout its history has won the confidence, respect and admiration not only of the people of this country, but of other countries as well, especially of the United States, where the administration of justice has come in comparison with the administration of justice in the Dominion. To confine the activities of this force to the Arctic Circle would be a very grave mistake, and I think it is absolutely necessary to have on hand as an efficient secret service, and as a force that can give the requisite service in cases of emergency, this Mounted Police force.

When my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg assumes to speak for Labour in this country, I do not think that he is representing it at all. He certainly is not representing what is known as international trades unionism, the only sane kind of unionism that we have in this country. I am an advocate of international trades unionism because it believes in the fulfilment of contracts,—they were the men in the city of Winnipeg who were forced by their international office to go back and keep the contracts that they had entered into. I say that labour operated under principles of that kind will strengthen the position of the workingmen, make him respected all over Canada, and give him a place and standing in the community that he can never have if he runs wild and follows the lead of Red agitators.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to ask the hon. member if the international trades union movement in Toronto has endorsed him as their labour representative?

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. HOCKEN: I say this in reply to that question: international trades unionism has not endorsed any candidate in this House, but I represent more international trades unionism in this House than my hon. friend does from his constituency. I will go further than that: if my hon. friend could take a poll of international trades unionism in Toronto I would get more votes than any man in competition. I would get them on my record, a record of friendship for the cause of Labour; because I know what it is to work for wages, to work longer hours than my hon. friend ever worked, and to make sacrifices that I am afraid my hon. friend never made. That is why, Sir, in my city I have the confidence of the men who are connected with the international trades unionism of Toronto.

I submit that the history of this country during the past few years proves that whatever else we have in the way of police and national defence, we have to maintain the Mounted Police as a numerous and efficient body—as numerous as the requirements call for, and as efficient as it has been throughout all its history.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Just before the question is put, I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to a point which may possibly have escaped his notice and also the notice of the House. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be confined to territories not included in any province of Canada.

In proposing this motion, the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has, no doubt, regarded the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as being identical with the old Royal Northwest Mounted Police. If so, I should inform him that two years ago, by Act of this Parliament, the nature and complexion of the force was considerably changed. The name was changed from "Royal Northwest Mounted Police" to "Royal Canadian Mounted Police"; and subsequently, under certain powers conferred on the Governor-in-Council by statute, the Dominion Police were welded in as part of the Royal Canadian Police. To-day, therefore, what was the old Dominion Police, the men who amongst other duties have to do with the policing of Parliament Hill and the Government buildings, are part of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and if the resolution were to be carried in its present form the police who appear round these

buildings would under its terms have to be abolished. I may say to my hon. friend that there were a good many who expressed doubt as to wisdom of the course the Government of the day was nursing in changing the headquarters of the Mounted Police to Ottawa and merging the old Dominion Police with the new organization.

As the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) explained this afternoon, the Government has under consideration certain changes in regard to this force. Many of us are strongly of the view that the old Dominion Police should be distinct altogether from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and that is one of the matters under consideration in connection with the readjustment of these forces. With that explanation, I think my hon. friend's purpose may have been served in the discussion which we have had. I do not think the motion should be allowed to carry in its present form without the House understanding that it would abolish the forces used for Dominion Police purposes, as well as those used in the provinces for the purposes of the Mounted Police generally.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I find myself in general sympathy with the purpose of this resolution, although I cannot by any means agree with some of the arguments that my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has advanced in support of it. I stated my position on this question the other day when the bill of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) to amalgamate the defence arms of Canada was before the House. I wish briefly to re-state that position: I consider it is no part of the business of the federal government to do police work in the provinces, and it is on that ground that I think the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be confined to the unorganized territories. I agree with the view expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King)—well, I shall not refer to it as his view, because I did not understand that he expressed it as the opinion of the Government; but it is my view—that the Dominion Police that formerly did the work of policing the Government buildings and carried out the secret service work of the Government, should be dissociated from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and restored to the position it formerly occupied.

The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has argued, with his usual vigour, that the federal government should make provision for federal enforcement of federal laws. That was not the understanding at the time the Dominion of Canada was formed; the enforcement of law was left to the provinces; and I think there it should remain. As to the part played by the Northwest Mounted Police in the Winnipeg strike or in connection with the other troublous periods through which we have passed, no blame can attach to them, for they simply carried out orders. The police must always carry out orders given to them by those charged with the responsibility of seeing that the law is enforced. I am not arguing on the merits or demerits of the Winnipeg case; I merely wish to lay that down as the consideration that should govern in the matter.

The item of expense is a very considerable one. We are asked to vote this year almost $3,000,000 for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and in view of this circumstance—I express my own personal view alone—I submit that the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, as they are ordinarily understood, should be confined to the unorganized territories and that the Dominion Police should be re-established to do the work that they have always done around Ottawa and as well the secret service work of the Government.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) raised the point that a police force of this kind was necessary to maintain law and order, to meet emergencies such as, he said, existed in Winnipeg in 1919—although my own view is that he has somewhat overdrawn the picture in respect to that occasion. But we had the means of meeting such emergencies before the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were located at Ottawa; the militia of Canada could be called out to maintain law and order in such cases, if the municipal or provincial authority was unable to do so. I do not like the idea of developing the notion throughout this Dominion that the federal government should be charged with the enforcement of law that hitherto has rested in the provinces alone.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my duty to point out that clause 4 of rule 21 provides:

> In all cases the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate, but it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to see that every Member wishing to speak has the opportunity to do so before the final reply.

So, if any other hon. gentleman wishes to speak before the mover closes the debate, he must do so now.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): I do not think it is necessary to debate the resolution very much particularly as there has been no very serious objection offered to it. The position of the Government, as it has been expressed, is towards the object of the resolution, I gather. I am also in agreement with the statement that has been made by the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Crerar).

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), however, presumed to state a case to the House and endeavoured to prove the absolute necessity for this particular force being retained in its present function and control. As that has been the only argument that has been advanced against the resolution, it might be well for me simply to point out—although I do not think it is really necessary, because I am sure the House saw for itself—that the hon. member failed absolutely to establish his case. He did tell us that there was an incipient revolution at Winnipeg at a certain time, but he failed entirely to prove it. I think I am as near the truth when I say there was no incipient revolution in Winnipeg, and still nearer the truth when I say that the trouble in Winnipeg, so far as prolonging the disorder was concerned, was actually due to the action of the Mounted Police. Therefore I claim that the point that the hon. member for West Toronto attempted to make was not established at all. His boasting about his ability to get votes may have some bearing on this subject, although I must confess I fail to see what, but inasmuch as he has introduced that point, I might say that it is not a conclusive proof of the intelligence of the men of the labour movement at Toronto that they should give the hon. member more votes than anybody else. I have my doubts, however, about his endorsation by the organized labour movement of that city and their anxiety to get votes for him. I have the honour to be one of the representatives of the organized labour movement of Canada, that sane labour movement to which he refers, and I believe that that sane labour movement would concur in the spirit of the resolution before the House, that there is no necessity for duplicating our forces, but that, on the other hand, it would probably lead to much conflict between the provincial and Dominion authorities, and that it would be better that the Mounted Police should fulfil its function of policing the territories that are not now under the provincial government.

[Mr. Speaker.]

One more thing and I am through. The hon. member for West Toronto also made another wise statement. He said that he knew of a great number of people who wanted to do away with all police whatsoever. If he knows people of that kind, they must be in Toronto; I do not know anywhere else where they could be. I want to dissociate myself from any such people. We recognize, of course, the necessity for maintaining law and order, and are just as ready to see that that is done as my hon. friend. There is no implication in this resolution that police forces should be eliminated. The resolution merely seeks to define what shall be the real function of this force, whether it shall be continued as a spy system on the labour forces of this country, or whether it shall be confined to its original and proper function of policing the unorganized territories of Canada.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn): I have listened to the debate with a great deal of interest. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) have, of course, a full right to their opinions and to their expression in this House, and I hope that they will accord to me and others the same privilege. I have lived in the West for twenty-three years and have seen quite a bit of the workings of the Northwest Mounted Police out there, having been a justice of the peace for a few years. I cannot agree with my friends who are representing Labour in this House in the accusations they have made against the Northwest Mounted Police. I have seen those men abused when they were trying to carry out their duty, but I have never seen them fail in the discharge of their duty. I have never seen them oppress people. I have seen them handled pretty rough and when they have had to fight back, but I think any man who is worth anything will fight back when he has to. I think the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg is prejudiced against the force because of his experience with it during the Winnipeg strike. My hon. friend says that there was no incipient revolution at Winnipeg. Now I have a card here that was issued at the time of the Winnpeg strike, and I want to read it so that everybody can judge for himself as to the nature of that movement. It was issued to the lumber camps throughout British Columbia and is the same as was issued in Winnipeg, I am told. It reads as follows:

Workers!

Your recent fight by means of the "strike" to secure an eight-hour day and better working conditions has failed. You know the reason. Lack of courage on the part of some mill men and the importation of scabs—spineless creatures. However, there is no need to be discouraged as the fight is not yet lost. You have another weapon, and a good one, sabotage. Lay down on the job. Sabotage by a hundred and one tricks resulting in the withdrawal of efficiency. You can win and kick the boss in the ribs at the same time.

The real loggers are leaving the G.T.P. and the boss can not make out with prairie chickens.

That was the name for the homesteaders who took the place of the strikers. It goes on:

Lay down on the job!

In a short time the boss will realize that it is better to give eight hours, clean camps, better conditions and good food all round and thus get the real loggers to stay, than to mush around with prairie chickens and bush-whacking homesteaders.

Lay down on the job!

Get fired. What of it? You don't own that job. It is lent to you only so long as you produce profits for the boss.

Lay down on the job!

It is your most potent weapon. Go to it. Most of the bosses along the line are not worth 30 cents. Bust'em! The one you can't bust you can get fired. Hutton for instance.

That is where I picked up this card.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the hon. member quoting from and when was it written?

Mr. MORRISON: If the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) will keep quiet and listen, he will find out.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not competent for an hon. member to interrupt unless with the permission of the hon. gentleman who is addressing the House.

Mr. MORRISON: The card goes on:

Lay down on the job. Sabotage!

Ask your fellow worker how the woods and mill mens' strike was won in Washington, Idaho, in 1917. Lay down on the job. Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing but your chains to lose and the whole world to gain.

Now those men were threatening to burn the sawmill with the consequent destruction of a million dollars worth of property, and we had to use force to quell the disturbance. We could not get the provincial police, we could not get the Mounted Police—they were all busy. I have quoted this card to show hon. members that this was an attempt at breaking down that law and order which most of us are standing up for and whose observance we are trying to maintain. It is all well enough to say that the local authorities can deal with a situation when it arises; but I agree with the hon. member from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) that there are times when the Mounted Police can control disorder much more efficiently than the local police, and they have done it on many occasions.

My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg said that most of the people do not want the Mounted Police. I do not know on what foundations he bases his claim to speak for the majority of the people, or where he obtains the evidence that they sympathize with his view. I think they do want the Mounted Police. There were four millions spent in 1921 on the force the hon. gentleman says, and less than half a million on employment doles. Well, it is too bad we have to spend such a sum as four millions, but as long as there are such disorders as those to which I have referred I would be willing to spend twice that amount in order to maintain order. I am friendly to Labour but I am not in sympathy with them when they take such a course as I have pointed out. I am a Labour man and to some extent a capitalist too; but I have to work and I would like the little money I have to earn something too. I do not want conditions to prevail under which there would be no security for a man's home or his business.

In Winnipeg, during the strike, defiance of law and order were manifested. The operation of public services of all kinds was stopped and there was even interference with the delivery of milk to the hospitals. If such a thing as that does not constitute a hardship for poor people I do not know the real definition of the term. I think the labour people have been very poorly led. If I submitted to the leadership of others for twenty-five years and at the end of that time found myself penniless whilst those leaders were in comfortable circumstances I would think I had been misled. To my mind the gentlemen who have been speaking for Labour are not in reality Labour's true friends; they are mistaken in the methods they advocate for curing the evils of which they complain. Most of us wish to see better conditions brought about for labour—most of us indeed labour ourselves—but there is a proper way to bring about that improvement. To protest against the police and to abuse them—and I am sorry to say that some critics are all too prone to follow that course—will never result in improved conditions. I think it is far easier to get those in authority to listen to reason than

ignorant labouring men such as are engaged in fomenting strikes of the character described. Personally, I stand for the maintenance of the Mounted Police in Canada.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I represent the constituency described in this resolution as "territory not included in any province of Canada," and I propose to speak to this motion although it is not of so much importance to me as it is to members representing provincial constituencies. As a Canadian, and as a resident of British Columbia, I wish to say that I would be very sorry indeed to see the Royal Canadian Mounted Police removed from that province. It is admitted I think, even by the mover of the present resolution, that the force should not be removed from unorganized territories. Having resided, for the past twenty years in a territory where there was no other police force than the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, I can speak with experience when I say that that force, at all times and under all circumstances, has discharged its duty in a manner which merits hearty commendation rather than criticism or abuse. The Northwest Mounted Police, as has already been said this afternoon, has excited the admiration not only of Canadians but of people throughout the length and breadth of the world as an efficient and admirable force. My experience of their conduct has been gained as a citizen and from practice in the courts where I have assisted, or have opposed, the police in various prosecutions; and I can say without hesitation that on all occasions they have conducted themselves in a manner that is above criticism. Even in cases where the evidence in their possession showed the accused to be a criminal they have invariably acted with perfect fairness; and I have never seen them hesitate to bring forward evidence tending to indicate innocence as well as evidence pointing to guilt—their submission of cases in the courts has been invariably characterized by fairness. After such an experience of the conduct of the force as that I am bound say that when I hear undeserved criticisms directed at the force it excites a suspicion in me as to the reason for such action. If we have in this Dominion forces that would upset legally constituted authority, or would proceed in other than a constitutional and legal way, and a Dominion force is required to prevent their activities I say that the operations of the Mounted Police should be continued throughout the length and breadth of Canada. After all, who is the best judge as to whether this force is needed or not? I say the Government of the day is the best qualified to pronounce upon that point; and if the Government, after advice from the Department of Justice, feels that it requires this force it is perfectly justified in maintaining it. Furthermore I have not the slightest doubt that if any one province of Confederation intimated to the federal authorities that the presence of the Mounted Police was distasteful the Dominion government would not hesitate one moment in removing the force from that province. I think the question can very well be left in the hands of the Government of the day regardless of what its political views may be. The Mounted Police throughout all the years of its existence has not been administered in the interests of any particular party. It has been the same fine force, all through the years of its history, regardless of the political views of those at the head of affairs of the Dominion, and I say we can very well leave this matter in the hands of the Government of the day. If the federal government thinks it needs the force it will continue it: if it thinks the force is not required it will remove it or cut its strength down to the number required. Personally I believe it would be unwise to handicap any government by passing such a resolution as this at the present time.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): I was in Winnipeg during the strike to which allusion has been made this afternoon and I think I can give unprejudiced testimony as to what happened. Living four hundred miles from that city and being there at the time on a visit I was not in the same inflamed state of mind as perhaps some of the parties to the controversy were. I want to say for the information of those who got their impressions of what occurred at that time through the press, that the disturbance in Winnipeg was subsequent to the action taken by the Mounted Police and not prior to it. As an unprejudiced, and I hope fair-minded, witness. I believe sincerely that there would have been no disturbance whatever had the Mounted Police not intervened.

I was in Winnipeg for two days, which included the time of the strike, and I never missed a single meal. I enjoyed all the comforts of life during that period, and I

never perceived at any moment anything like an incipient revolution. I agree with the statement of the labour member from Winnipeg, when he says that the labour men are not of the type that would be implied from the speech of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). These men are so much in earnest that they sometimes become extremists, yet I believe they belong to the type of sane labour representatives. I desire to give my personal testimony at this time to that effect. I am speaking without any prejudice. I have never had any association with labour and never in contact with it, and view it without prejudice of any kind. I always feel, however, that I must be on the side of the under dog. To that extent, perhaps, I am a little biased. I want the members of this House to disabuse themselves of the idea that was propagated by the newspapers that there was anything like a Soviet revolution in Winnipeg, because such was not the case.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I wish to associate myself with the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird). Although he has not spoken from real experience of labour conditions, I may say that I can speak from such experience to a certain extent. In my younger days I had something to do with labour organizations, and was among the actual labourers and realizing and knowing the conditions which are forced upon one, there is a memory and sting left that will never be removed, and until men live through these conditions and realize them, they will not know the story, and should not stand up in this House as authorities upon the subject. They must have the experience before they can speak on these matters. The hon. member for Nelson referred to the strike in Winnipeg, which was magnified by the press report. There was little trouble before the red uniform of the Mounted Police was seen on the streets of Winnipeg, with the avowed object of suppressing whatever movement was on foot, whether the movement had any justification or not. I state further that I believe it was the propaganda of the government of the day. At the time of the revolution, or of the trouble, in Winnipeg—revolution, so called by the papers—we were sitting in Regina, an organized body of farmers, who were supposed to be the authors and finishers of another Soviet or Bolshevist movement, according to the sentiments advertised and expressed throughout the country by the then government and word came to eighty-five of us, who were an executive representing the various electoral districts of Saskatchewan, "For God's Sake hold firm." That was the word that came to the executive who sat in Regina at that time. Oh yes, the government of the day were frightened. I might recall to the minds of the members who sat in this House two years ago the fact that the then hon. member for Calgary, when this or a similar question was being discussed, rose in his place, and said "What would this country do if red revolution broke out"? That was the sentiment behind the government when they brought into force the amalgamation or co-ordination of the Mounted Police and Dominion Police as explained by the present Minister of Militia and Defence, (Mr. Graham). I want to state that if the present Government is following out that principle, or accepting it as a principle, I do not agree with it. Further than that I recollect that when the debate which I have just mentioned took place in this House two years ago hon. gentlemen who now constitute the Government were rising in this Chamber and endorsing the principles as outlined in this resolution, but there is silence to-day and I think the country will ask the question: Where is the consistency? The knitted brows of the earnest workers are no longer in evidence. Where is it now? Do they believe or have they lost faith? That is the question as I see it.

5 p.m.

I might state that I have lived in that western country for 31 years. I have been in close association with the Mounted Police. I have known of their activities. They are human. The human element enters into them as well as all others. They are a body of men who individually and collectively will go out into the waste areas of the West and they will bring in the recreant or Indian. They will go out into the vast country alone, being away months, they will perform great feats of valour, but I say that history will record a distinct mark between the time of the amalgamation of the two forces. The old Northwest Mounted Police do not like to hand down the traditions which they erected as a body, and let the newly organized force share with them the halo and glory which is theirs. This new force has to establish a record before the old Northwest Mounted Police will allow the glamour and glory that attached to the old force

to be shared by the present organization. I believe that as a body of men they should be again organized under the old name, with the same work to do. Whether in organized territories or whether under provincial jurisdiction or new jurisdiction, those men will go back and perform the work the authorities ask of them.

The old Northwest Mounted Police—I have heard them express this sentiment many times—do not wish to be incorporated with a body of men who have to go into urban centres and suppress disturbances, because their conception was that they were established, as I have related, to go into the wider areas, to hunt what might be termed the horse-thief or the recreant, or even the Eskimo, to administer justice and to keep order. That is why the term "mounted" was applied to them. They have done their work well. I think there is a work to be performed yet in that regard, and my sentiment would be that the unorganized territories of this vast country alone require police of that nature. I think that another force of a Dominion character might be created in this country, but do not associate them with the old Northwest Mounted Police.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I think it is very unfortunate that we have had two questions confused. It will be very difficult for some of us to vote intelligently on this matter, in view of the confusion of these two issues. I think, as the Prime Minister pointed out, that probably the resolution is more far-reaching than the mover intended, and I believe it would be in the interests of all concerned that it should be withdrawn. If there was a resolution that was directed against some of the orders that were issued to the Mounted Police in those days I would myself heartily support it. I think, however, it might be well if this House would forget some of the things that happened in war time. There was a spirit of hysteria abroad. Undoubtedly the Mounted Police had duties committed to them that were not pleasant for them to perform. I may say that the present police force has some duties committed to it that are rather degrading to a police force. The suppression of race track gambling is degrading to such a force. If we could clearly separate the two issues that are placed before us, I think it would be very much easier to vote intelligently on this resolution. For my part I have no hesitation in condemning some of the orders that were issued to the police. As I said, things were done that would reflect no credit on those responsible for the issuing of the orders in those days. But just at the present time it is not possible for us clearly to distinguish between those who were responsible for issuing the orders and those who were charged with the responsibility of carrying them out. I should not like now to cast any reflections on the Mounted Police as such. Undoubtedly they did things which were disagreeable and distasteful to them; but I submit that in view of the confusion of those two issues it would not be possible for us to vote intelligently and I think the resolution should be withdrawn.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St John and Albert): I am not sure that in the interests of the country it is well to have the resolution withdrawn. It is perhaps as well for the chamber to take a vote and to stand up either for the Reds or against them. In the course of this debate there have been some expressions from hon. gentlemen which, whether so intended or not, were in my judgment nothing more or less than a simple pandering to the forces that seek to disorganize our social conditions as they exist. It is not a question of three or four million dollars; we can deal with that on the Estimates, as also with the question as to the number of the men and their location, It is not a question of administration, because the force could be administered separately from the other branch of the force, the Dominion Police, as we know them. I believe we had better go straight to the part of the resolution that is simply intended to emphasize a remark that fell from an hon. member recently, that the rioters in Winnipeg rioted because of the sight of a Mounted Police uniform. In the name of all that is common sense, what reason has a decent British subject, a Canadian subject, to revolt or riot at the sight of His Majesty's uniform? I do not know any decent, law-abiding citizen or man who ought to be outside a gaol who would find good cause, in the appearance of that uniform, for rushing into riot, fray, revolt, or any other species of law breaking. Let us have no pandering to those who would subvert our social organization. Treat the resolution in the sense in which it is intended, to withdraw the forces, which are capable of protecting organized, peaceable, decent society, from the places where they can combat riot, revolution and disintegration. That is the question, and I

shall have much pleasure, and feel I am doing my duty, in voting straight against any such proposition.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I cannot very well see my way to withdraw the resolution. It seems to me that the dicussion has been extended much more widely than the resolution itself would justify. A good deal has been said with regard to the Winnipeg strike, which was introduced incidentally by myself. I do not very much blame hon. members who have referred to the strike for the way in which they have done so, because I know the information that went out through the press at the time. Those of us who live in Winnipeg, whether members of labour organizations or not, learned in the course of the long-drawn-out trials, how false those newspaper representations were. I may be permitted to call attention to the fact that I myself was one of the men charged with sedition at that time. And I was returned to Parliament not from a purely labour constituency by any means, but from Centre Winnipeg itself, which was represented here last year by Major Andrews, and I received a majority of some 3,740 over the man nearest to me. That in itself, I think, is sufficient to refute a great many of the charges that have been made by hon. gentlemen who have lived at a distance and have not known the details of the events in Winnipeg. As to the character of the charges that were made at that time, and the tactics pursued by those who were prosecuting, I do not think I can do better than quote one charge of sedition made against me personally. I shall read one count only, and you will see how Red I am:

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

4. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

"Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; to turn aside the need from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey and that they may rob the fatherless.

"Isaiah (10: 1-2)"

"And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands.

"Isaiah II (65: 21-22)."

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to be the only man in the history of British court procedure who has been charged with sedition for quoting from the King James version of the English Bible. I read this charge simply because it would be incredible to any one who was not familiar with the viciousness of the attack which was made upon labour people at that time, and with the misrepresentations which were circulated throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Labour men were charged with conspiracy. I think that one of these days we shall be in a position to show where the real conspiracy was. I have ventured to speak even thus far with regard to this question simply because there has been in the past either no representation, or a very slight representation, of the labour position on the floor of the House, and I think that is one reason why the country at large has been so misled regarding the real aims of labour.

The charge has been made that some of us do not represent International Labour. I may say that the only labour organization with which I was ever connected, and from which I received a withdrawal card, was the International Longshoremen's Association, Local 38-52. I would ask the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) whether he is in as close touch with labour as that. I do not know, I merely mention it. The political end of the labour organizations is in most cases entirely distinct from the industrial end. So it is natural that we do not represent some particular craft; we come here to represent the great body of labour. I think the fact that we are here surely gives us the right to speak on the floor of this House for at least a section of labour.

I would call attention to this fact, too, which is not generally understood: that it was the president of the Trades and Labour Council (International) of Winnipeg who gave the strike order; it was the secretary of that council who sent out that strike order. These men were then Internationals, they are Internationals still. At the time that strike was ordered there was no thought that it was anything else than an International movement, although undoubtedly there had been a movement towards the formation of a more efficient organization.

I might say further in regard to that strike—into details of which I have no thought of entering—that the trials clearly showed that while there were charges of an attempt to set up a Soviet government, an attempt at revolution by force of arms, yet notwithstanding all the searches of the

Mounted Police from coast to coast the authorities failed to discover one single gun. Labour men may be fools, but certainly if they had intended an armed revolt one would suppose that they would have had at least a few guns in their possession. Nothing could have been further from the thoughts of these men. I say most emphatically that that strike arose as an industrial dispute over questions of higher wages and an interpretation of the principle of collective bargaining. It is quite true that under the old law of conspiracy—which had been almost obsolete in Great Britain for a hundred years, and which admitted a very wide range of evidence,—the procedure dating back to the Star Chamber days—it is quite true, I say, that under that almost obsolete law six of the men on trial were committed to gaol. But I would point out that there was such a revulsion of public opinion in the city of Winnipeg that the day these men were liberated three of them walked into the provincial legislature of Manitoba. Another man charged, Mr. F. J. Dixon, the leader of the Labour group in the Manitoba House, was given the most overwhelming majority ever accorded to any man in the city of Winnipeg. Surely this is evidence sufficient to show that the great mass of the people were misled as to the real character of that strike.

I do not know that any connection at all was shown by the hon. member between the document he read, purporting to emanate from the lumber camps of British Columbia, and the Winnipeg strike; hence it is not necessary to discuss its contents.

I confess that this matter is somewhat involved, as the Prime Minister has shown. The Dominion Police force was amalgamated with the Royal Canadian Northwest Mounted Police, it is true; but we have to deal with the situation as it is to-day, we have to deal with the Canadian Mounted Police. Now, my resolution would confine the activities of that particular force, as now constituted, to the unorganized territories. If it is found wise by the Department of Justice that a new Dominion police force should be organized, that can be done, but that does not interfere with the policy with regard to this force. So I think we must decide on the policy to be adopted by the people in relation to this matter.

The very attitude taken by some hon. members is what influences me very strongly to plead that this force should not again be used as it has been used in the past. The fact is that Labour has been misunderstood and spied upon, and that in industrial disputes armed force has been used to quell labour opposition. The hon. Minister of Militia called attention to the fact that he had resolutions from certain boards of trade advancing reasons—which he did not give—why this force should be retained. Well, I can very readily understand that the Winnipeg Board of Trade most decidedly would advance reasons why the Mounted Police should be retained. It was the representative of the Citizens' Committee—a body which was really a creature of the Board of Trade—who was at the time of crisis appointed Deputy Minister of Justice. The House will appreciate the resentment of labour when the man who all along had been acting as spokesman for the Citizens' Committee—the employers' committee—was suddenly clothed with extraordinary powers to administer "impartial" justice. There was the difficulty, and it was that action which provoked resentment in the minds of labour towards the administration of justice at that time.

I would call attention to the fact that, although it has been stated that an attempt was made to set up a Soviet republic, yet, at that very time negotiations were being carried on between the provincial government and the workers, and had it not been for the precipitate action of the Mounted Police, or the authorities that ordered out the Mounted Police, we would not have had that shooting in the streets of Winnipeg. This is the reason why we should have another way of dealing with such a situation. The fundamental difficulty at that time was that an industrial strike had arisen on a larger scale than ever before had been known in this country. If a Soviet was established in the Labour temple—I say, if—if a body there assumed somewhat larger powers than it should have done, there was also another Soviet in the board of trade rooms which had also assumed governmental powers. In this contingency the municipal and provincial authorities stood helpless. The federal authorities remained inactive until a crisis developed, and then they came in with a club and made things all the worse. That was really the situation.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would plead that we have reached a point in the history of Canada where industrialism has developed to such an extent that we shall have to deal with these disputes as they

arise, not by brute force but rather by reasonable methods—when instead of spending $4,000,000, as has been suggested, in order to crush labour, if necessary, I would say: Let us rather spend $4,000,000 in studying this problem and in placing our industrial relations upon such a basis that we will have no need to call in the Mounted Police to settle any of these disputes. To-day we face the need for reconstruction, and I plead with the members of the Government to give us a lead along these lines. The Prime Minister has already in his book, Industry and Humanity, outlined some of the principles which might, if adopted, prove a solution. I do not know that we all agree with his proposed solutions; but I say: Let us give those principles a chance, and let us in any case seek to do this work in a constructive fashion.

But, after all, this is rather beside the original purpose of the resolution. We are past the war period; we are, I hope, past the period of hysteria inspired by the war. With the provinces thoroughly organized, I do submit we ought to be in a position to revert to the previous arrangements, and to confine the activities of this force as it now exists to the unorganized territories. I firmly believe that we are on good constitutional grounds, as the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) admits, when we say that the administration of justice should be left with the provincial authorities. If they find at any time that there is a situation which they cannot control, it is then for them to call in the aid of the military authorities, not before. The very presence of a body of this character, is, as I stated the other day, an irritant. I think I can speak for a very large number of labour people at least when I say that if this force were taken out of this work of espionage, of this work by which they enter the homes of workingmen and seize literature, by which they act as agents provocateurs, it would go a long way toward establishing a better condition of affairs in the industrial life of Canada.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman a question? Would his resolution, if adopted, commit the Government to immediate action, and has he made allowance for the point mentioned by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) as to inclusion or exclusion of the Dominion Police? I think it is necessary that he should answer this question before we can vote on the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman can be allowed to answer only by leave of the House. He has exhausted his right to speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer:

The House divided on the proposed resolution (Mr. Woodsworth) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Bancroft,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Brown,
Caldwell,
Carmichael,
Coote,
Crerar,
Denis (St. Denis),
Deslauriers,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Fortier,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Gould,
Hoey,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kellner,
Lanctôt,
Lucas,
Macphail,
McDonald,
McMurray,
Milne,
Neill,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Reed,
Rinfret,
St. Père,
Savard,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Vien,
Wallace,
Ward,
Woodsworth—47.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Béland,
Black (Yukon),
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carroll,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Forrester,
Fournier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gordon,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Halbert,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Hocken,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Jones,
Kennedy (Essex),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Léger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald,
MacKelvie,
Mackinnon,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McConica,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,

McKillop, Robb,
McMaster, Robinson,
McQuarrie, Ross (Simcoe),
McTaggart, Senn,
Malcolm, Sexsmith,
Manion, Sheard,
Marcil (Bonaventure), Simpson,
Meighen, Sinclair (Oxford),
Michaud, Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Millar, Spence,
Mitchell, Stansell,
Morrison, Stein,
Morrissy, Stewart (Humboldt),
Motherwell, Stewart (Lanark),
Munro, Thompson,
Murdock, Thurston,
Murphy, Tolmie,
Pacaud, Turgeon,
Papineau, White,
Putnam, Woods—108.
Raymond,

ST. JOHN TERMINAL FACILITIES

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of providing terminal facilities at the port of St. John, New Brunswick, to enable Canadian grown potatoes to be shipped during the entire year from a Canadian port.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion this motion is out of order, as it calls for an expenditure of public moneys.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (leader of the Opposition): Before your opinion is given, Mr. Speaker, with all deference to yourself, I think the House should carefully consider the question raised on the point of order. In the last session, and I think the session before, but undoubtedly in the last session, holdings were given the other way. I think at the time I argued that the holding which you, Mr. Speaker, indicate you may now give was the correct holding. I was, however, over-ruled, and I think the arguments presented by what was then the Oppostion weighed very heavily in over-ruling my view of the rules of the House at that time. While I thought that, I feel it would be very unfair that under the late government the members of the Opposition should have been permitted to move such resolutions as these, and that on a change of government a different ruling should prevail. It seems to me to be a case where precedents ought to obtain. The reason of the holding last session was this: It was held by Mr. Speaker that inasmuch as the mere passing of the resolution itself, did not impose any charge upon the treasury, the resolution should be looked upon as a mere pious affirmation of opinion, and consequently that the House should be allowed to debate and dispose of it as it might see fit. I argued, quite frankly, that the contrary view should prevail, but I was overruled, and that having been done, it appears to me we would be well advised to follow the course of procedure then adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did I understand my right hon. friend to say the Government was opposed to its being proceeded with?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, my hon. friend has quite misunderstood me. I am arguing the point of order, hoping that I may not be too late, and in support of my argument I am merely saying that the contrary was ruled last session against my argument. I admit taking the view that Mr. Speaker has indicated just now, but I was overruled, and I just expressed the view that the Speaker over-ruled me because of the weight he attached to arguments advanced by the then Opposition.

My position is that this practice having obtained last session, and, I think, the session before—indeed it obtained all through the last Parliament, but it was distinctly affirmed by Mr. Speaker last session—it should be followed in this case, and these resolutions should be considered as mere affirmations of opinion, as indeed they are, and as in no way effecting in themselves a charge.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I can clear the atmosphere. There was an error made in that the first resolution placed on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) was wrongly drafted. Accordingly the hon. member amended it, and as it now appears on the Order Paper it is properly drafted and is certainly in order. The mistake arose through handing me the original resolution which in my judgment was not in order, but no reason now exists for raising a point of order and the mover may proceed with it.

At six o'clock the House took Recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my reason for putting this resolution on the Order Paper and bringing it before this House is to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that, although the Government of

Canada has spent a large sum of money at the port of St. John to facilitate the export of the western wheat which comes down there for export, we have to ship the crop we grow in New Brunswick, namely potatoes, through the port of Boston when we export to a foreign country. This is a condition I do not think should obtain. I took up this matter with the Government last year through the then Minister of Customs, who was the member for St. John at that time, and he was very anxious that facilities should be established at St. John to take care of the export of potatoes, in order that our national port might get the benefit of the trade and that our potato growers might get a remuneration for the crop they grew that would enable them to make even the producing expenses, which they have not done for the last two years. I was very strongly supported in this last year by some of the largest shippers in New Brunswick. I have a letter under my hand from which I wish to quote, to show something of the conditions existing at St. John, and I wish to go back to last year, to enable the House to understand the conditions as they exist to-day. This shipper writes:

> We have been shipping to the Havana market for the past twelve years and during this time practically all our shipments have been through the port of Boston, where we have facilities and a large frost proof warehouse on the dock and regular sailing from Boston to Havana each Thursday, so we know just when our goods are going forward and our customer in Havana knows just what time he can expect the arrival of same, which is very important in the Havana market, as you are no doubt aware the weather is very hot and potatoes will not keep long in Havana so they only buy from week to week what they can use. Now we have been paying freight on these potatoes from this section to Boston in American funds, also ocean freight in American funds to Havana.

I wish to refer to that paragraph of the letter. Due to a ruling of the Railway Commission, freight on goods shipped to an American port, or through an American port to Cuba, must be paid in American funds, and from the point of shipment to destination, which meant that our shippers had to pay last year—the conditions are not the same this year—$1.16 in Canadian money, for $1 of Canadian freight over a Canadian railroad. At the same time our Railway Commission made this ruling, the Interstate Commerce Commission of United States made a ruling with regard to international freight, which was that for freight destined to points in Canada from the United States, the freight must be paid in American funds to the American boundary only, and the American shipper had an advantage over the Canadian shipper. He could pay the freight from the American boundary to destination in Canada in Canadian funds, which was sharp discrimination against the Canadian shipper. To resume my quotation, the letter continues:

> Twelve years ago when we started to ship potatoes to Havana our railway freight to Boston was 17c per 100 lbs., our ocean freight was 50c. per sack of 180 pounds, Boston to Havana, which made a total freight delivered C.I.F. Havana around 80c. per barrel. To-day the cost of shipping one barrel of potatoes from this section to Havana, Cuba, via Boston is $3 per barrel payable in American funds.

Which meant $3.48 in Canadian funds at that time. A month previous to the time this letter was written these shippers were compelled to discontinue the shipment to Cuba, due to the fact that the price in Cuba had fallen to $4 a barrel. The freight was $3 in American funds, which meant $3.48 in Canadian money, so that the shippers could not pay anything, practically, for potatoes in New Brunswick. If we had had facilities at St. John and a regular sailing from that port to Cuba, they could have shipped those potatoes to Cuba at $1.20 a barrel instead of $3.48, and they would have been able to pay the farmers at least $2 per barrel for the potatoes, a price which would have enabled them to ship the potatoes. The fact is that last spring there were thousands of barrels of potatoes dumped in New Brunswick because we could not pay the freight to Cuba, and ship them through Boston. I took this up last year, through the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine, with the Government, to see if we could not get a warehouse established at the port of St. John and regular sailings. The Minister of Customs reported to me from time to time that he had taken it up with his colleagues and they had agreed to go ahead and establish a warehouse at St. John. I have a letter here from the Department of Marine stating the reason why they were not putting on vessels. The letter says:—

> Our steamship manager advises me that they have done their best to cultivate a potato trade with New Brunswick but without success. It is true that the port of St. John is not fitted with a frost proof warehouse adjacent to the loading steamer, and this has no doubt discouraged the movement of potatoes through the port of St. John during the winter.

This letter goes on to state that due to the fact that there were not enough potatoes coming through St. John they could not

put on a steamer. They also state that they did not think the trade in Cuba would warrant putting on a steamer anyway, and they were basing their statement on the fact that there were practically no potatoes going through St. John. This shipper in the same letter tells me that, up until a month of the time the letter was written—that is January 1921—this one firm was shipping ten to twelve thousand barrels to Cuba through Boston. They were not going through St. John, because they had no facilities at that port to handle potatoes in cold weather.

I have a report of the shipments of potatoes as they were received at the port of Havana for a few weeks last year. I went to the Minister of Trade and Commerce as well, because I believed that that department would know what the export to Cuba of commodities from this country was, and they reported that there were not enough shipments going forward to warrant putting steamships on that line. I want to give the House the quantity of potatoes received at the port of Havana for a few weeks last year. In the week ending October 31, 1920, there were shipped 14,558 barrels and 5,397 sacks. These sacks hold more than the barrels; they contain 180 pounds. In the week ending November 6, the total shipment was 16,005; November 13, 30,988; and December 11, 30,489 sacks and barrels.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where were they shipped from?

Mr. CALDWELL: Part of them were shipped from New Brunswick and the rest via the United States. I shall read a part of the letter I received from this shipper, who says that they have captured the Havana trade:

> Last winter we tried to ship via St. John to Havana, and we gave the Canadian Government Merchant Marine a cargo of potatoes and sent two or three of our best men to oversee the loading, but we could not induce the management of these boats at St. John to load our potatoes in any kind of shape, and handled same as so much junk which resulted in a loss for which we have now entered action against the Canadian Government Merchant Marine to recover, so we gave this up and went back to shipping through Boston, and have been shipping through this port some ten to twelve thousand barrels each week during this season, up until one month ago, when the potato market in Havana dropped to $4.00 per barrel, then we were shut out, the potatoes costing us at that time $1.25 here, $3.00 freight to Havana left us a loss of 25c. per barrel.

Possibly a hundred shippers in New Brunswick send their potatoes to Cuba;

and at that time this firm, as the letter states, was shipping from 10,000 to 12,000 barrels per week. When the House prorogued last year I went home in the full expectation that the government would establish this frost-proof warehouse at St. John before the following winter, but I learned during the summer that nothing had been done in the matter. I had several conferences with the shippers to ascertain what could be done, and failing any action on the part of the government, this firm, from whose letter I am quoting, and two other shippers in New Brunswick formed an export company, leased a warehouse at the port of St. John and fitted it up at their own expense, and shipped through it during the past winter. Now, that will not benefit the potato growers of New Brunswick. These shippers practically have a corner on the potato export business of New Brunswick. They pay the same price for potatoes as other shippers pay who ship through the port of Boston. No shippers, of course, can use the warehouse at St. John except the three who own it, and everyone who has any potatoes to ship must ship them through Boston and pay the excessive freight rate due to the long haul, instead of getting the advantage of the short haul to St. John.

Now, it is quite probable that some hon. member may say that there is now in St. John a frost-proof warehouse. Well, I know there is, and I mention the fact merely to anticipate anything that may be said in that respect. There is a warehouse, but as I have said, it does not benefit the potato growers of New Brunswick who have to ship through Boston. The average cost of producing potatoes last year was $2 per barrel and the growers are to-day getting 60 to 80 cents. The reason is, we cannot get our potatoes into Cuba without paying an excessive freight rate, or else an exorbitant profit to the company who have the shipping facilities in St. John. The Government should establish a warehouse at that port open to all shippers of New Brunswick. They might give the firm who own this warehouse an option of selling to the Government for the money they put into the business. I do not want to see this firm suffer, and I am not finding fault with them for establishing that warehouse and making a profit out of it. They need a big profit, because they were put to considerable cost in establishing and equipping this warehouse. If the Government

decided to establish a warehouse of their own at St. John this firm could be given the opportunity of selling out to them, and the shippers of New Brunswick would then be able to export to better advantage than they can to-day. They would save in freight rates and would be in a better position to grow potatoes at a profit. I do not wish to take up any further time, and as I shall have the right to close the debate I shall reserve until then anything more I have to say on the subject. But I trust I have made clear the necessity for a public warehouse at St. John.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): I endorse the resolution of my hon. friend from Carleton and Victoria (Mr. Caldwell). In New Brunswick to-day the farmers have thousands of dollars' worth of potatoes that they cannot ship. Formerly our potatoes had a good market in Winnipeg, Boston, and even in this city, but unfortunately, owing to the higher freight rates to which our products have been subjected, we have been unable to compete with the state of Maine and with other provinces of the Dominion. Our potatoes are of excellent quality by reason of the adaptability of the soil, and to-day we are to some extent specializing in this industry. But we have no facilities for shipping our potatoes, and it will be impossible for us to continue this line of farming unless something can be done to reduce the freight rates we have to pay. The state of Maine is to-day providing practically all of the New England states, except New York, with potatoes. They have a considerable advantage over us. As my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) says, our American friends can compete successfully against us because of the disadvantage with which we have to contend in the matter of shipping, and, in the past, in regard to the exchange. St. John is advantageously situated as a shipping point for our potatoes, because it is a seaport, and Cuba for the last few years has been a good market for us. We have been shipping potatoes practically all the year round, but since the establishment of the private warehouse in St. John we have been handicapped in competition with the shippers of Maine. I hope the Government will look into the matter at an early date and make it possible, even before the close of the present season, for us to export our potatoes to outside markets if we have not adequate markets in this country.

Mr. RICHARD B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I desire briefly to support the resolution. It is quite in line with the promise of the Government to extend our marketing facilities, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and I would suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) that this is a matter in respect of which he could do a very real service to the farmers of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I include the Island farmers. It is true that the New Brunswick farmer in days gone by has been very seriously handicapped, for while we have had free trade with the United States in potatoes, whenever it suited them to do so they declared an embargo against our product and shut us out as effectively as they have now done under the Fordney tariff. The result was that our nearest market was closed to our potatoes in more ways than one. The Cuban market has been rather erratic in the past, and a very real difficulty has been experienced by shippers by reason of the fact that until within a comparatively recent period there has been no direct steamship communication from our own ports. But through the enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company round trips have been made this season by their ocean steamship service, and the very satisfactory accommodation to the potato trade has demonstrated beyond a doubt that their service out of St. John can more than compete with that provided by the United Fruit Company's boats out of the port of Boston.

I would not have the House think that our only crop in New Brunswick is potatoes, but our farmers have been actuated, I think, by the example of their neighbours in the State of Maine, who confine their efforts almost exclusively to the production of these tubers, and in the northern counties they have gone very extensively into potato production—rather unwisely, perhaps, because, I am of opinion that they would be much better off if they engaged in mixed farming, following the example of their brothers in the eastern part of the province in days gone by.

I was not aware that the frostproof warehouse established this year at St. John is a private enterprise. I was under the impression that shippers on payment of a toll could use that warehouse, and I believe that was done this past winter to some extent, although I speak subject to correction.

Mr. CALDWELL: Three shippers.

Mr. HANSON: There was a community of shippers,—how many I am not aware.

In the opening of this trade, which has lain dormant for the reasons mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), the Government by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum of money could confer a very substantial benefit on the locality affected. I commend this particularly to my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, (Mr. Copp), who, I know, is just as much interested in this matter as we are, and I hope he and his colleagues will give it their very earnest and favourable consideration. It will be a step in the right direction to attempt to relieve what is now a really bad situation in the province, and the establishment of these terminal facilities would be a great help during the cold weather towards obtaining a new market for our surplus potatoes, which, as has been rightly said, have no superior on this continent.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): I rise to support the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) urging the Government to provide proper terminal facilities at the port of St. John to place the potato growers of New Brunswick in a position to command the West Indian and other markets. For the past two years I have on frequent occasions called the attention of Parliament to the hardship imposed upon our products from the East—products of the farm as well as of the forest—by reason of the very high freight rates. In many cases these excessive freight charges have in effect put an embargo upon the products of New Brunswick,—our old markets have been closed to us, and we are left to find other outlets, which has been very difficult and in some cases impossible of accomplishment. Although the county which I have the honour to represent is the most distant from the port of St. John, still if we had such terminal facilities as have been suggested the farmers there could take advantage of them as well as the farmers of southern New Brunswick. I hope that the Government will without delay concede the request of my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), who must still have some sympathy for his native province, will contribute his energy as well as his sympathy to that end, and that the Supplementary Estimates will contain an item sufficient to provide these facilities for next season's crop.

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, there is another phase of this question which has not been touched upon, and in my judgment one which places a very great handicap upon the potato growers of western Canada at least. The constituency which I have the honour to represent has become quite a potato growing district, but the growers are at a decided disadvantage in that the railway companies do not permit potatoes to be unloaded at a given point other than the point of destination, and stored there until the market will absorb those potatoes. For example, last fall there were five thousand carloads of potatoes standing in the Chicago railway yard on which there were no bids, largely due to the fact that the railway companies do not allow through rates on potatoes diverted in transit. At Dauphin we have no warehousing for vegetables, and our local growers, who ship from fifteen to twenty carloads of potatoes a year, are compelled to load their product within a month and ship them direct through to Chicago, New York, or some other large centre, thus bringing about congestion, which naturally causes a very great slump in prices, such as took place on the Chicago market last fall. I think this question of diversion in transit should be taken up along with the warehousing question and have the serious consideration of the Railway Commission.

Mr. G. B. JONES (Royal): I rise to support the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton. We lost our American market because of the American tariff put into effect last year, and therefore I think the Government should give our potato growers every assistance. Formerly we had a very good market in Quebec and Ontario, but the excessive freight rates from the maritime provinces have cut off that market, and last year our farmers had to feed their cows large quantities of potatoes left on their hands. The section I represent is largely devoted to dairying, and I think everyone knows that potato feed does not conduce to milk production. Consequently the farmers in the constituency of Royal have met with very severe losses. I hope the Government will see fit to do something to meet the situation, which has been so well put before the House by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton and others who have spoken in support of his resolution.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City): There seems to be nothing to add to the arguments advanced by hon. members who have preceded me, and I am sure that you,

Sir, and the House will be pleased to see such a manifestation of unity from the province of New Brunswick. We are all one on a subject of this kind. I shall not attempt to add anything to what has been stated, except to suggest to the Government that whether it be in the form of a potato warehouse or any other development of a Canadian port, it is work along the right lines. The country is pretty well served with railways at the present time, but you have to have a spout, so to speak, through which the produce of the country can be sent on its journey overseas; and the equipment of our ports is the urgent problem of to-day. Advocated as it is from within the ranks of the party to my left, I trust that the efforts of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) may be successful in bringing about among his party a broadness of spirit which will recognize that there are claims for reasonable consideration on the part of the people of the East as well as on the part of the people of the centre of this Dominion. It may be wheat one day, but it can very well be potatoes the next; it may be railroad rates one day, but it can very well be equipment of our ports the next; and unless the House is prepared, unless the groups in this House are prepared, to give equal consideration to all these problems, it is scarcely possible to expect that any of them by itself will be successfully solved. I congratulate the hon. member on having brought this matter to the attention of the Government. They are pressed, it is true, with the urgent need of economy, but this expenditure would be so small and the service rendered so great that I trust the Prime Minister will see fit to have provision made for it in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in concurring in the sentiments which have been expressed by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), and in supporting his resolution with regard to the providing of terminal facilities for the export of potatoes from New Brunswick at all seasons of the year. I have, however, one request to make, and it is that he be good enough, at least impliedly, to embrace within the four corners of his resolution an equal request that similar terminal facilities be provided for the city of Halifax, in order that the people of western Nova Scotia, particularly of the county of Hants, may have an opportunity of exporting their potatoes.

The county of Hants, I need hardly remind you, Mr. Speaker, is one of the finest agricultural districts in the Dominion; we raise potatoes in that constituency which are the equal of those produced in any other part of Canada. We are not entirely confined to the growing of fruit; we regard the raising of potatoes as one of our basic industries. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton advocates the interests of the potato growers of New Brunswick; I wish to reiterate his remarks and to make the same plea for the potato grower of the midland and western counties of Nova Scotia. I believe it is in the best interests of the farmers of the maritime provinces who are concerned in the growing of potatoes that ample terminal and shipping facilities be provided for the export of their product. If our people are going to be kept on the farm it is false economy for us to endeavour to save a mere pittance where the welfare of the farmer is concerned. In order to make our country more prosperous, in order to improve industry, it is essential that some money be spent, and while there is no doubt that Canada to-day is in dire financial straits, our condition is not such that we can afford to follow the policy of "let well enough alone." We should rather adopt a policy having for its object the development of industry, and if we expend a reasonable amount of money in the development of our industries, then, of necessity, better financial times will come.

I therefore have much pleasure in concurring in the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton. If there is one class of people that we want to help in this country, it is the farmers. I happen not to be of the farming class; I am a member of that much abused profession of law. But every possible effort must be made—and particularly is it the case in Nova Scotia—to keep our people on the farms, and we can do that only by encouraging them all we can and providing them with the best possible facilities for the export of their products.

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why this House should not concur in this resolution. For the information of hon. members who are interested in the matter, I would say that officials of the Department of Public Works are now

making inquiries in the hope of finding that we have facilities at the port that may be utilized for this purpose, or, if possible, to bring about conditions at the port—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Louder, please.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): —to bring about a condition at the port that will provide this accommodation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I tried to listen, but I am still without information as to the Government's attitude. Might I ask the minister if he would repeat those two sentences?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government is going to do what is asked—agree to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Does the right hon. gentleman wish me to repeat?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister to say they were making inquiries whether there was room for the warehouse. Perhaps I am wrong.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I stated that we were inquiring into the present facilities at the port to see if we could not use those facilities, or some of them, in order to give this accommodation.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): While the resolution only asks that the Government should take this matter into consideration, because that was as far as I could go under the rules of the House, I would really like to have a stronger assurance from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. J. H. King) or from the Government that this matter will be taken up and that a warehouse will be actually established. A pious wish does not get you anywhere in exporting potatoes; I have learned that to my sorrow. If the Government will give me an assurance that they will—I do not know just how to put it without getting out of order; but while one may not as a private member propose a motion involving the expenditure of money, it is possible for him to urge quite strongly that the Government spend this money and build this warehouse.

I am grateful to the minister for having taken this matter up so promptly. I spoke to him some days ago about it and he very kindly consented to consult his officials at St. John and see what the possibilities were. I would like to warn the minister in one respect: I have no doubt that the very shippers who urged me so strongly last year to get the Government to establish this warehouse and who have since established one of their own, will oppose this very strongly, because they certainly have the best thing in New Brunswick in the shape of a money-making organization. They have a corner on the exports at St. John in the way of potatoes; it is a crop we grow largely for export, and it is the largest export crop in the province. These people would object to the Government establishing a warehouse that would give to every shipper in New Brunswick a chance to ship through the port of St. John. It means a matter of $1.50 to $1.75 a barrel by way of profit to them if no one else can ship through St. John, because if the other shippers are compelled to ship through Boston, the St. John shippers only have to pay the price that any shipper pays who ships through the port of Boston. I hope I have made that clear. I could furnish a volume of communications which I have received from these shippers last year urging the building of this warehouse, as showing the necessity for it and the benefits that would thereby accrue to the farmers of New Brunswick. I would like the minister to give us some further assurance that the Government will not be too easily put off. I am not betraying any confidence, I think, when I say that I believe the report from St. John was that there was no room to provide further facilities at that port. I can hardly agree with that statement because I have been at the port of St. John a good deal and while the facilities for exporting grain and other produce are considerable—there are grain elevators provided by this Government, and rightly so—there is still plenty of room to establish a warehouse where we could unload both out of the cars into the warehouse and out of the warehouse into a boat. That of course is essential because we have to ship a large part of our potato crop in the winter. It is not harvested until the cold weather is upon us in the fall, and anyone who knows anything about the growing of potatoes knows that you must market them before the next summer; so the potatoes have to be marketed in the cold weather. If we had summer the year round we could ship our potatoes from St. John without the facilities asked for, but as it is, it is impossible to collect a load of potatoes at the docks and let them stand in cars on the track, and if that were possible you could not keep them from freezing in the cold weather. If the Government will

give me the assurance that they will go ahead and establish a potato warehouse, I shall be pleased to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Government promises to do all my hon. friend requests in his resolution, will my hon. friend be content?

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not satisfied with this resolution as it stands, and the only reason I put it in this form was because I could not put it in any other. A pious wish does not provide facilities for exporting potatoes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We cannot do more than accept the resolution.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think I can depend on the good faith of the minister to go ahead. I know that if he inquires into the matter he will find it necessary to establish a warehouse at the port of St. John, so I have much pleasure in withdrawing the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be and the said Standing Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to investigate and consider fisheries conditions in British Columbia, and more particularly, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing, the depletion of the salmon fisheries of the Fraser River district, and to make suggestions for the restoration and conservation of the same; also to investigate and consider fish hatcheries, including the proper system to be adopted, their value as a means of propagation, the methods of operation and the results obtained therefrom; with power as to all the hereinbefore mentioned matters to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

He said: Having disposed of the potatoes, I presume it is now in order for us to start on the fish. I am told they go very well together. One of the principal reasons why I am a member of Parliament to-day is the condition of the fishing industry in British Columbia. While I cannot claim to be a fisherman, or even an expert on fisheries, I have had the privilege of living in New Westminster, on the banks of that once great salmon stream the Fraser river, for upwards of thirty years, and during that time I have studied very carefully fisheries conditions. I think I may safely say that I at least know the fishermen; I know their work and the difficulties they have to contend with. I know the importance of the fisheries industry to the community as well as to the country at large. I also have had something to do with the canning industry, having worked in a cannery for a short time. I have seen the salmon industry at its best. I have seen the big runs when the canneries, although large and numerous, were unable to handle the fish that was supplied to them. Those were the good old days when everybody was happy. The fishermen, the cannery men, and merchants were all prosperous and contented.

I have also unfortunately seen the dark side of the picture which presents itself to-day in most alarming form, when the canneries are practically all closed down, when pessimism is rife, and when the fishermen are cold and hungry. The big salmon run on the Fraser river is practically a thing of the past, and if conditions get any worse, it is evident that in a comparatively short time king salmon will be as scarce in the waters of the Fraser river as is the buffalo on the prairies, and the sockeye, that great canning fish, will be a curiosity entitled to a place in the Victoria Museum. If I can do anything to assist even in a small way in restoring this great industry, I shall consider that I have done something worth while.

In rising to propose this resolution, I do not do so with the object of securing an opportunity to make a speech, but with the sole and only purpose of getting action. I intend to make my remarks as brief as possible, but hon. gentlemen will no doubt agree that it is advisable, indeed necessary, that I should at least outline some matters which I think should be taken up by the committee if this resolution should pass.

To put myself right, I might be permitted to explain that in moving this resolution I have no intention of embarrassing the Government in any way. I do not wish to attack the administration or its officials, or, for that matter, any person or corporation. I believe the officials have been doing their best and that there are in the department capable and conscientious men who have been doing good work. What I complain about is that we have not been getting results. I am not looking for political advantage or trying to make party capital. While I am a party man, I am firmly convinced that when we come to consider matters of national importance we

should put aside party ideals, party standards, and party differences and all work together for the common good of the Dominion of Canada as a whole. I can frankly say that if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) will take up this subject with the intention of investigating it fully, and will do something to improve conditions and clear up the situation, as I believe he will, I shall co-operate with him to the best of my ability. While this is a question which primarily affects the Pacific coast it also materially concerns the whole Dominion. If there are similar problems on the Atlantic coast, or elsewhere in Canada, I shall be most anxious and willing to co-operate with the members from those districts who bring any such matter before the House. I am asking for the co-operation of hon. members in this most important matter. We have a committee on Marine and Fisheries which is composed of men who presumably have some knowledge of fisheries, and it is my object to invoke the aid of the hon. members on that committee, and I am hopeful that good results will follow. Let us study the question from all angles and see if we cannot do something to improve conditions. Let us hear all sides with open minds, and let us devise some solution of this difficult and complicated situation. I am not one of those who desire to attack the canners. It is true that I am much interested in the fishermen, or I should say the white fishermen, and one of my most prized possessions is a membership card in the British Columbia Fishermen's Protective Association, but at the same time I appreciate the fact that the canners have a large amount of capital involved in this industry, and I think they should receive every reasonable consideration. Let us treat all the interests fairly and equitably and do the best we can in dealing with this problem.

Now the British Columbia fisheries despite all drawbacks, impediments and mismanagement—or I should say lack of control—constitute to-day nearly one-half in value of the fishery resources of the Dominion. In 1920 those resources amounted to $49,241,339 and the British Columbia fisheries to $22,329,161. You will see from that how important the fisheries of the Pacific coast are, and I would say without any hesitation that it is quite possible, with proper encouragement, to increase the amount derived from the British Columbia fisheries—I would say it could be doubled, or trebled or perhaps quadrupled. Now the revenue that we receive from British Columbia also constitutes a very important part of the whole amount derived throughout the Dominion. The revenue for 1920-21 for the Dominion was $318,455.73, and for British Columbia it was $233,282.04. Therefore, if conditions are improved and the fisheries become more profitable, then, of course more revenue will be obtained for the Government. I have pointed out that the expenditures in connection with the operation of our fisheries are very heavy and that the disbursements in British Columbia constitute an important part of this outlay. The expenditures for 1920-21 for the whole Dominion, including fisheries protection, were approximately $1,758,925.06 of which about $250,000 was for fisheries protection. The expenditures in British Columbia were $710,412.14 of which $176,770 was on account of fisheries protection. Now I think that is one matter which might be taken up by the Marine and Fisheries Committee. Where there is a great expenditure of that kind it seems to me the committee might very well consider whether the money is being properly expended or whether it could be devoted to a more useful purpose.

Now with regard to the Fraser river. I do not wish to worry the House with a lot of figures. I have here the complete returns for a number of years, showing the packs on the Fraser river and elsewhere, but I intend to refer only to a few of them. I might point out to hon. members that every fourth year we have, or are supposed to have, a large run of fish. That condition has existed for a great many years. The explanation of this I am unable to furnish nor do I think anybody else is. It has so happened, however, that for a great many years every fourth year has witnessed a big run while the runs of the intermediate years are smaller. Some people are inclined to think that this fact is due to some artificial cause, but in looking through one of the reports I have here and will later refer to I find that Simon Fraser, the discoverer of the Fraser river, and after whom it is named, in a report which he made in 1806-11 refers to the fact that at that time they had these large runs every four years, so that condition has prevailed for a great many years.

I will now refer briefly to the big runs every four years, and I will start with twenty years ago. In 1901 the pack on the Fraser river was 990,252 cases, and I would say that the great proportion of that

pack was made up of sockeyes which are the best grade of fish for canning. In 1905 the pack was 877,136 cases; in 1909, 567,203 cases; in 1913, 732,059 cases; in 1917, 377,988 cases; and in 1921, 103,918 cases. Now you will note that the difference between the pack in 1901 and that in 1921 amounts to 886,334 cases. I might also point out that in 1921 there were only 35,900 cases of sockeye. Now what does that amount to in money. Taking the value of a case at $15, which I think is a conservative figure, we find that this country has lost $13,295,010, representing the difference in the value of the packs in these years. That I think is a matter that might very well be considered. The question, of course, is whether the fisheries on the Fraser river can be restored or not. As to that I would simply point out that a few years ago on the Columbia river in the United States they had pretty nearly the same condition that we have to-day. However, they went into the matter thoroughly and to-day the yield of the Columbia river has been restored. Last year we were fortunate in having one of the men responsible for bringing back the Columbia river fisheries make an investigation of our fisheries on the Fraser river—I refer to Mr. Camsell, one of the greatest authorities in the United States. Mr. Camsell, in his report, which I have here, says that it is quite possible, quite feasible, and not at all difficult to restore the Fraser river fisheries. I simply quote a short extract where he says:

> Unlike those of the Upper Columbia River Basin where the development of the industrial projects has tended towards their destruction, the immense spawning beds of the Fraser River watershed are still unimpaired, being practically in the same condition as formerly. All those who have studied the matter agree that, up till a few years ago, the spawning beds were abundantly seeded at least during the "big" years. Hordes of parent sockeyes then visited the upper river and to-day the conditions are as favourable for their reception as they ever were.

Again he says:

> It is apparent that in the past many of those sincerely anxious to restore the Fraser River sockeye fishery have been working more or less at cross purposes. In my judgment, if success is to be assured, all past differences must be set aside and all join whole-heartedly in finding a means for overcoming the present conditions. It is the desire of everyone concerned to rehabilitate the fishery. The only difference lies in the method by which this can be brought about.

He advises co-operation between the Dominion, the provincial, and the state authorities, and he says that if we have that co-operation we will bring the Fraser river fisheries back to what they were in 1901, without the expenditure of a great deal of money. He goes on to point out the millions of dollars that have been spent in reclaiming the arid lands of the United States, and he says that it is just as profitable an investment for the country to restore the fisheries as it is to reclaim lands of that kind.

Now the resolution calls for an investigation as to the methods of propagation, including hatcheries. I had the privilege last year of making some remarks along these lines, and I am not going to repeat them. I simply say that there is a great difference of opinion as to whether we should have any artificial propagation, or whether we should rely upon and encourage only natural propagation. That is a matter that this committee might take up. Then we have the enemies of the salmon. I have made a list of some of the enemies of the Pacific Coast salmon, and at the head of the list I have put down "the United States Senate." Hon. gentlemen may consider that that is a rather rash statement, but possibly when I explain myself hon. members will agree with me. We have a peculiar conditions on the Pacific coast, in the southern part, where the Fraser river runs out to sea, inasmuch as we are situated very close to the international boundary line. The waters of the Fraser river permeate some of the waters of Puget sound, which is in American territory. As a matter of fact, the Americans should never have had the boundary line placed where it is. Of course, that was not our fault. Other people were doing the negotiating for us. When our business was handled by other people we always seemed to get the worst of it. However the boundary line was placed where it is, and the result is some of the fish which are hatched out in the hatcheries on the Fraser river come back to Puget sound. We have regulations of all kinds on our side, close seasons and all that kind of thing. We have hatcheries and other means of propagation. We have fishery protection and so on. They have nothing of that kind on the other side of the line, and they simply catch fish. That is what they have been doing for a long time, and that is one reason why the run has become depleted, as it is to-day. That is recognized by the authorities of the state of Washington and by other United States authorities. In 1919 a treaty was nego-

tiated between Canada and the United States, or between Great Britain and the United States, to meet the situation, to provide for an appointment of an international committee which would study and investigate conditions and provide means for bettering those conditions, and also to provide certain restrictions and prohibitions which would tend to the correction of the unfortunate situation. That treaty was signed on the 2nd September, 1919, by the various authorities, by the Hon. R. C. Lindsay, chargé d'affaires of his Britannic Majesty, the Hon. Sir John Douglas Hazen, Chief Justice of New Brunswick, and a member of the Privy Council for Canada, the President of the United States, and by the Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State for United States. I have that treaty in my hands. It is my opinion, and the opinion of a great many others, that if that treaty had passed it would have gone a long way to help the situation. It went up to the United States Senate where it suffered the fate of a great many other treaties and agreements, and it was thrown out. It was thrown out by the Senate because of a lobby which had been put up by selfish interests, by men who were so small, mean and contemptible that they would place their own interests before the interests of their country, men who thought only of the present and cared nothing about the future. It is just possible that we did not do everything that we could have done on that occasion to have that treaty ratified by the United States Senate, I do not believe that the Senate understood conditions at that time, and, so far as I know, we had no one there. We made no effort to see that the facts were placed properly before that body.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did anybody represent Canada before that committee.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Not so far as I am aware. That is a matter which might be taken up, and it might perhaps be considered advisable to re-open negotiations with the United States. They tell me that since that time there have been many changes in the United States Senate, if not in policy possibly in personnel, and it is just possible that if negotiations were renewed that treaty might be put through. If we cannot negotiate with the United States, then I say we can play with them at their own game, if it is possible to do so. The question is how can we do that? A way out has been suggested to me. Whether it is feasible or not I do not know; I would not care to express an opinion. But the proposition is this: The Fraser river has three channels. The North arm, the main channel, and the South arm, otherwise known as Woodward's Slough. The waters of the main channel and the North Arm go out into the Gulf of Georgia, directly in front of our own territory. The waters which pass through Woodward's Slough go down in a southerly direction and permeate the waters of Puget sound. As it is, the waters from the Fraser river go about three-quarters of the way over to Vancouver island. The line of demarcation is very clear, the colouration is distinct, and anyone who goes across can see where the Fraser river waters end. Now, the salmon is a peculiar fish. He goes out to sea when he is a fingerling or smaller and stays away four years, after which he comes back to the place where he was spawned. If not hampered he will come back to the precise spawning ground from whence he came. I do not know how he does it. Of course, the salmon have no compasses or other instruments such as navigators have to assist them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Have they a chart?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, but they have what is just as good, an infallible instinct that leads them back home, and our salmon if not interfered with would come back to the Fraser river to their own spawning grounds. The first obstruction they encounter is Vancouver Island, which is about 280 miles long. They proceed down along the shores of the island looking all the time for fresh water. When they reach the southerly end of the island they separate, some going north and others continuing south but all looking for the Fraser river. Those that go south strike fresh water that leads them on to Puget sound where they are caught in the traps that are set there. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) will know what I am talking about. There are miles of traps built at Puget sound and our fish are caught by the Americans, our fisheries being depleted to that extent. If we block up the south channel of the Fraser river—Woodward's Slough—it is said that the volume of water would be sufficient to carry the waters of the Fraser river right over to Vancouver Island, and when the salmon comes back he would strike that fresh water leading him directly to the Fraser river. Thus the Americans would get practically no fish at all. Now, that

sounds like a fairy tale, but I am told that there is something in it, and if we cannot negotiate with the Americans we might at least try to beat them at their own game.

Another enemy of the salmon is the seal. This is another fish story. The seals are good for nothing. At any rate, we do not make use of them, although the Japanese do; they carry on an industry and make leather out of the hides of the seals. One seal will eat between four and five salmon a day, and salmon are worth 60 cents each. It is estimated that one seal destroys some $500 worth of salmon per year. It is estimated that in the Fraser river there are to-day between 5,000 and 10,000 seals. Taking the minimum, 5,000, in the Fraser river alone, the seals destroy $2,500,000 worth of fish a year. We will take it for granted that the average life of the seal is ten years, and I believe some of them attain a very ripe old age. However, put it at ten years, which is a conservative figure, and in that period the seals in the Fraser river will destroy $25,000,000 worth of fish. Now, what is being done to combat that menace? Practically nothing. Ever since I came to the House, and even before that, I have endeavoured to get something done; I have tried to have bounties placed on the seals. If cattle were being destroyed in this way on the prairies, certainly no expenditure would be too great to eradicate the evil. This is a matter that should be considered by the House.

The trout also is an enemy of the salmon and is very destructive in British Columbia. The most attractive bait for a trout is salmon eggs, and the trout kill millions of prospective fish every year. Yet nothing is being done in this direction either. On the contrary, we have encouraged the propagation of trout, for in the streams and lakes which are connected with the sea trout eggs have actually been placed, and there is a close season in connection with the catching of trout there. Now, I am a sportsman and believe in sport. I have no objection to creating a sportsman's paradise, but I am opposed to doing this where it will interfere with a commercial enterprise such as this.

Then there is the question of orientals. I will not say much on this subject, but in British Columbia to-day the Japanese practically control the fisheries. I have the figures given me by the department the other day and I will quote from them. In 1919, in district No. 1, which is the Fraser river, there were 837 Japanese gill net licenses issued, as against 55 licenses issued to Indians and 409 to others. In district No. 2 there were 1,139 licenses issued to the Japanese, 630 to the Indians, and 721 to others. In district No. 3 there were 267 licenses to the Japanese, 279 to Indians and 226 to others. The figures are similar for the other years. I will give those for 1921:

	Japanese	Indians	Others
District No. 1.. ..	873	68	490
" No. 2.. ..	1,110	967	968
" No. 3.. ..	107	46	132

It will be seen therefore that the Japanese are pretty much in possession of the fisheries of British Columbia. I understand that they are absolutely in control of the fisheries of the Hawaiian Islands, and if we allowed them to do so they would take complete possession of the fisheries of this country. Now, you will ask: How do these men get licenses if they are Japanese, because only British subjects are eligible for licenses? Well, as a matter of fact, the Japanese who get licenses are naturalized citizens of this country. Most of them were naturalized many years ago, and the peculiarity is that a naturalized Jap never dies—at least, one has never been known to die. I am told that when a Japanese fisherman is about to give up the ghost there is standing beside him on the boat, ready to take over the tiller, another Jap who steps into his place and takes possession of his naturalization papers. Fortunately, I am thankful to say, it is not so easy now for the Japanese to secure naturalization; in fact, the naturalization judge in the city of Vancouver has absolutely refused to naturalize any Japanese. He states that they are not entitled to naturalization, because they cannot be expatriated, for notwithstanding their naturalization they must still acknowledge allegiance to their emperor, and in case of war, if they fail to respond to the order to serve their native country, they will be shot as traitors. It has been suggested that it would be a good thing to take finger prints of the men to whom licenses are granted, so that there would be no question of identity. I submitted that suggestion to the department last session, but unfortunately the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not think it advisable to take action along that line.

There are other enemies of the salmon but I am not going to mention them to-night. They could, however, be referred to the consideration of this committee.

At one time we had a very profitable sturgeon fishing industry, but it is practically of no account to-day. In this connection I could relate a real fish story—but as newspapers never tell anything but the truth, I will read to this House this extract from the Vancouver Province of April 22nd, 1921.

> The old saying that there are as good fish in the sea as ever came out of it is apparently equally applicable to fresh water, judging by the specimen that was displayed on Monk's wharf, New Westminster, yesterday afternoon.
>
> "It's a whale," more than one visitor asserted, but they were wrong. It was a sturgeon. From the tip of its tail to its snout it measured just thirteen feet, and it weighed 988 pounds. This monster fish was taken with a drift net in the Pitt River by Coquitlam William, an Indian fishing for Monk & Company.

At ten cents a pound that fish would be worth $98.80. At one time there were a great many sturgeon in the Fraser and Pitt rivers and Pitt lake. Only a few of them are left, but if we could re-establish the sturgeon it would be worth while.

Then we come to the regulations. It is claimed by the fishermen that the regulations are unfair, and I think that that remark applies to some of the regulations. For instance, if a fisherman is found guilty of a trivial offence such as throwing out his net a few minutes before the appointed time, he is not only fined but his net and boat are confiscated. That seems to be too drastic. If a motorist breaks the speed law, his automobile is not confiscated. The fishermen say: Fine us; the first time make it a small fine, for the second offence increase the fine, and ultimately make it so heavy that it will be an effective deterrent; but do not confiscate our nets and gear. I think there is something to be said in favour of their view.

Then with regard to cannery licenses, for which a large fee is charged, of course the big companies can well afford to pay those fees, but some fishermen would like to can their own fish. This is impossible to them so long as they have to pay such a large sum for the privilege, and they suggest they should be given the opportunity of canning their own catch if they wish to do so. That is a matter that might well be considered.

Then I come to the dual license fees. In British Columbia the provincial government exercises certain rights over the fisheries. Recently I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he had received a request from the provincial government as to taking over the fisheries, and he answered in the negative. I think if he will look up the records of his department he will find that some years ago a proposition was made by the Hon. William Sloan, Minister of Fisheries for British Columbia, that the province should take over the fisheries. If that is so, is it not worth while considering the advisability of meeting the desire of the province? Being on the spot, might not the provinciai authorities be better able to administer and control the local fisheries than the federal government can from Ottawa?

In my opinion the subject matter of this resolution is of national importance and worthy of concerted effort on the part of this House. The Fisheries Committee as far as my experience has gone—and I was a member of the last Parliament—has never considered the question of the Pacific coast fisheries. All I am asking is that that committee get to work and study the question so that it may be ascertained if anything can be done to improve the fisheries conditions in British Columbia.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that I am also interested in, in view of the fact that possibly the second largest river in Canada flows through the province from which I come, and it is fairly well stocked with salmon. I was a little disappointed to find that this resolution was not made broad enough by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) to take in all our fisheries, as I think it is a subject that might very well engage the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe).

We have a small fish hatchery on the St. John river. We have a very good run of salmon on that river, but of course not developed to anything like the extent that obtains on the Fraser river. Nor have we any canning factories. However, it might be made a very paying industry on the St. John river. And in supporting the resolution before the House, I would urge the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not to confine his attention solely to the Fraser river. In fact, as the hon. member proceeded with his argument I was under some doubt as to just how we were going to get over the anomaly there that we supply the fish and the Yankees catch them. But we will not be in that unfortunate position on the St. John river, because while the river is at no very great distance from the international line, it is bounded by Canadian territory on both sides until it reaches the

northern end of New Brunswick, and although it rises in the United States, the very high falls prevent the salmon from leaving our waters. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take this particular matter into consideration while he is dealing with the British Columbia situation.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) has pointed out, the condition of the salmon fisheries on the Fraser river is rather serious. But the causes of the decline in the run of salmon are rather international in their character, and therefore cannot be affected by anything which Canada can do alone. The salmon making for the Fraser river have to run the gauntlet of American fishing equipment before emerging into Canadian waters just below the entrance to the Fraser river. The result is that of the total quantity of fish caught when making for the Fraser river, sixty-six to seventy per cent goes to the Americans. Anything that can be done must be done by both countries, although the future of the fisheries in the Fraser river depends exclusively on the extent to which the spawning grounds in that river are properly sealed. This question has been dealt with by both countries at various times. A treaty was agreed to in 1908 but was not ratified by the United States Senate—one of the enemies of the salmon, as my hon. friend says. Another treaty was entered into in 1920, but it also failed of ratification by the Senate, and the United States government last year informed the department at Ottawa that it would not be possible for the Senate to ratify that treaty. Negotiations, however, are still in progress with a view of inducing the Senate to ratify it.

As my hon. friend has said, there is the peculiar phenomenon in connection with the salmon in the Fraser river that there is a big run every four years, the run in the other three years being not so good. It is surmised that in former days there was a slide from the mountain which blocked the river and prevented the salmon from getting to the spawing beds, and that it was three years before the obstruction was washed out. The Fraser river fish is what is called a four-year fish: it takes four years to mature; then it goes on to spawn, and dies. The last big year was in 1913. In that year the Canadian Northern was constructing a line in the vicinity of the river and the works there caused a slide which blocked the way to the salmon; the fourth year afterwards, 1917, was a very poor year on that account, and 1921 was also a bad year. Generally speaking, in the other British Columbia waters the salmon industry is improving. The years 1919 and 1920 were very good years, though last year was a poor year. The extent of the run depends largely on causes and influences exerting themselves in the sea, and of which we can know nothing.

I do not know whether the work of the committee as suggested will bring about an improvement of conditions, but I have no objection to such work being undertaken. The only possible objection would be that rather large expenditure in witness fees might be involved. However, the committee can start to work, hear the experts of the department at Ottawa, and be the judge whether other witnesses from British Columbia should be summoned. I have no objection to the resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, the resolution as introduced by the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) is, in my opinion, one of the most important resolutions which will be considered at this session of Parliament. Like my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), however, I regret that the hon. gentleman did not make his resolution broader. But in my opinion the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton should not have criticised the hon. member for New Westminster; he should have taken the beam out of his own eye before he sought to get the mote in the eye of the hon. member for New Westminster. You will notice, sir, that my hon. friend's potato resolution related only to terminal facilities at St. John, although it is just as important that we should have terminal facilities at other ports in this country. However, in regard to the resolution of the hon. member for New Westminster, I may say that I do not think it is in the interests of the fisheries—though my hon. friend may deem it his privilege, and his duty, perhaps, to put the proposal in its present form—to bring before Parliament a resolution which confines itself to one of the fisheries of this country. I had the honour and the privilege a few years ago to speak before the members of this House on matters pertaining to the fisheries, and although I come from Nova Scotia, in the

few remarks which I made at that time I did not confine myself to the fisheries of my own province, or even of the maritime provinces; I dealt with the inland fisheries and those of the Pacific as well as those of the Atlantic coast. There is no question about it Sir, that the fisheries of the Pacific are very important indeed. In my opinion, the fishing industry has never had a fair show, whether on the Atlantic coast or on the Pacific coast, and if there has been one sinner greater than another, it was the government that was in power from 1911 to 1921. They did nothing for the fisheries of this country, and nobody knows that better than the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would not exactly agree to that. As a matter of fact, the late Minister of Fisheries did more for the fisheries of the Pacific coast than any minister who preceded him.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member has a perfect right to support his minister, but if I had been called down and asked to withdraw a resolution which I had placed on the Order Paper, I would not think much of the minister who asked me to do it. The hon. member was in the House for four years, supporting the government of the day, but did not propose any resolution of this kind, and it is rather strange that he now asks this Government and our present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) to give this matter the attention it deserves. I am proud indeed, Sir, to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that he is quite willing to place this matter in the hands of the committee on Marine and Fisheries; that is more than was done by the other minister who, the hon. member for New Westminster tries to make out, was the best Minister of Fisheries we ever had. Why, two years ago, after the people on the Pacific coast had been crying out for perhaps two years for refrigerator cars to move their halibut, they could do nothing with the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Railways, and though there were thirteen hon. members interested in the subject who supported the then Tory government, not one of them rose in his place in the House and endeavoured to get the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Railways to better the conditions prevailing in connection with this industry. It fell to me, Sir, a very humble member from a Nova Scotia constituency, to show the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Fisheries the importance of the halibut fisheries of Prince Rupert, with the result that the refrigerator cars were put on and the fish were moved to the eastern cities of Canada and of the United States.

The member for New Westminster as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred to the large catch of salmon every four years. Well, that is nothing strange to those of us who have some slight knowledge of the fisheries. It is well known that not only in the salmon industry but also in the other fisheries, the fish come on the coast in greater quantities some years than they do others. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) referred to the fish having no chart. It is quite true that the fish have no chart or no compass to guide them, but I would not be surprised to learn that the reason for their staying away from British Columbia during the last four years was because, like the people of this country, they had no confidence in the Union government or in the National Liberal and Conservative party. It is also quite possible that the reason they come every four years is because every fourth year is a "leap year," and the salmon are fish which are in the habit of leaping out of the water as they come up from the ocean to the spawning ground.

The hon. member for New Westminster also referred to the revenue which was obtained from the fisheries of this country and told us that out of a total fisheries revenue of $380,000 for the whole Dominion the large sum of $233,000 came from British Columbia. I want to say that I am opposed to collecting any revenue from the fisheries of this country. The fisheries of this country are carried on by men who cannot afford to pay for licenses except in British Columbia where the great canners are able to pay a fee and prevent the poorer man from packing salmon. In my opinion we should derive no revenue from the fisheries of this country and furthermore, I think a larger expenditure should be made by this Government to develop the fisheries. I repeat I am opposed to gathering revenue from this source; I think it is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, and I say to the minister that one of the first things he should do is to reduce the license to the minimum both in the salmon and every other fishery or else cut it out altogether. As I said a moment ago the greater part of the men who are engaged in this great industry are poor men, not capitalists who can invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in the busi-

ness, but men who own their fishing boats outright or co-operate and own a vessel on shares, and if we ever expect any real development in this great industry, and I have a good deal of faith in this Government's desire to develop the fisheries, one of the things we should do is to cut out the canneries' license, because under the present system the rich man can pay $500, while the poor man, who is not able to afford the fee, is not allowed to pack fish.

Mr. McBRIDE: Would you cut out the licenses for orientals in British Columbia?

Mr. DUFF: If I had my way, I would not give the orientals a license at all. It is a strange thing but if you look at the statistics you will notice, as the hon. member for New Westminster has pointed out, that most of the people who fish in British Columbia are orientals. If there were no orientals fishing, there would not be nearly as many fish caught. I do not believe in oriental fishermen. I believe that we should have white fishermen, and if the late government and perhaps other governments before it had taken the proper steps, we would not now have so many orientals fishing in British Columbia. We do not have orientals fishing on the Atlantic coast, but white men, and from the Atlantic coast we usually return sixteen Liberals to represent the province of Nova Scotia. Perhaps if the people of British Columbia would send Liberals to this Parliament instead of Tories, as they have been doing the last few years, there might not be as many orientals fishing on the western coast as there are at the present time.

The hon. member for New Westminster gave some very good reasons why this question should be referred to the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. He pointed out that there were certain reasons why the fisheries in British Columbia did not yield as high a return last year and for the last two years as they had done in former years, in 1911 and 1901, I think he said. It must not be forgotten, however, that perhaps the main reason why the fisheries were not prosperous last year to the same extent as before was that during the war or shortly afterwards it was impossible to sell the great catch of salmon which the packers had on hand. There are other reasons why the fisheries are not as productive as they were before, and I am very glad that the hon. member for New Westminster mentioned some of them. He spoke of the destruction caused to the salmon by the seals. There is no question that the seals which come into the rivers and bays of the Pacific coast destroy a great many salmon, and I would suggest to the minister that steps be taken to do away with this pest. I think that the people on the Atlantic coast also have sent petitions to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) asking him to take steps to do away with the seal menace on the Atlantic coast. We have the same trouble from seals in connection with our mackerel. The seals follow the mackerel into the nets and make holes in the twine, and the mackerel escape. I hope that something will be done to combat this menace both to salmon and mackerel.

I also agree with the hon. member for New Westminster in his remarks as to the unnatural—shall I say?—propagation of fish which has been carried on in this country. I am opposed to that practice. I do not think it is any good to take the spawn from the female fish, because there can be only one result; most of the spawn die. I think the only proper way is for the fish to propagate naturally. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been wasted in the last number of years in this country in an endeavour to keep up hatcheries, which in my opinion do not do a very great deal of good.

In conclusion, I do not believe it would be a wise policy to pass over the control of the fisheries to the provinces. I believe the federal government is able to look after the fisheries a good deal better than the provincial governments, and it is more the business of the federal government, because the fisheries do not relate to any one province alone but to the whole of Canada. The whole country is interested in this industry, and the federal authorities, in my opinion, are far better able to look after it than the different small provinces. The small provinces have enough to do already and I would be very much afraid if the control of the fisheries passed into their hands that very little would be done to make this industry what it should be.

I have great faith in the fishing industry in this country, and I would like to see this Government in the next two or three or four years do everything possible to encourage people to go into this business. As the hon. member for New Westminster has said, and I want to repeat it myself, the fisheries of this country have not advanced in the last twenty years. We have either stood still or gone back. That is

not because there are not lots of fish in the sea; there are more than ever there were. Nor is it because there are less salmon coming into the harbours and rivers of British Columbia that salmon are scarce. It is because the federal government, not this Government or its predecessor, but the governments of this country for the last twenty-five or thirty years have never taken the interest in fisheries that they have in farming and other industries. I do not object to millions of dollars being spent on the encouragement and development of agriculture, but I do say that the fisheries, if not to the same degree, are just as important as agriculture, and this Government should take every step to encourage people to go into this great industry.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I only wish to speak a few words on this subject, because it is getting late. Whenever a subject comes up in connection with the maritime provinces the discussion has not gone on for more than three minutes before it gets down to the sins of the late government. The discussion may begin with any subject under the sun but it always ends up with the sins of the late government, and I notice that when anything comes up in connection with British Columbia it always ends up with the Japanese question. This evening the debate began with the fisheries and we very soon drifted off to a discussion on our Japanese wrongs. I will not deal with this question now because I understand there is a resolution coming up on the subject, and will therefore keep to the question of fisheries in the few remarks I want to make.

My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) spoke about the penalty. He said the penalty was too drastic, that if a man committed some trifling offence the only penalty provided was the entire loss of his gear and boat, a tremendous penalty for possibly a trifling offence. One of the fishery guardians brought that to my attention. He said, "You cannot owing to a trifling offence take a man's whole property from him." I took the matter up with the fishery officials down here and they told me it was necessary to have that provision in extreme cases of deliberate poaching by American boats. It therefore was necessary to impose such a penalty but they gave instructions to their fishery officers and in the case of minor offences such as I have indicated provision has been made by which, on a fisherman giving security that his boat would be forthcoming when it was required, he would be allowed to go on fishing and in the meantime he can put in an appeal, which will always be granted, for cancellation of the confiscation. That put the fear of the law upon him without actually subjecting him to the extreme penalty; and they claim it is necessary for the reasons which I have indicated, that the extreme penalty should be there.

The hon. member for New Westminster also mentioned the subject of taking over the British Columbia fisheries. That is a question that has engaged the attention of fishermen in British Columbia, but when we heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell us the other day he was agreeable to our taking over the fisheries provided we assume the cost of running them which amounts to something like $400,000 a year, that rather dampened our enthusiasm for taking these fisheries over. I think our idea in British Columbia was to take over the issuance of licenses and let the Dominion government finance the other end of the bill.. Possibly the minister will not see the matter in that light. The idea in British Columbia was this—that if the issuing of licenses was put in the hands of British Columbia officials they would be easier—I will not use the term "got at," because that is a nasty suggestion—but they would be easier of approach and we would get quicker action when quick action was necessary. If the proposition means the taking over of the whole of the British Columbia fisheries and the expenditures attendant thereupon I am afraid it is beyond our powers. We have got a little project called the P. and G. E. railway which will engage our financial attention almost exclusively for some time to come.

The hon. member for New Westminster also talked about the question of small licenses. He said it was not fair that a man should pay $500 for a canner's license if he only wanted to put up a small quantity of fish. That question has already arisen and has been dealt with. Last year in my district there were one or two dozen, perhaps, gill net fishermen who combined together, and they got some kind of a domestic cannery outfit that would put up three dozen tins possibly at a time. They asked permission of the fishery officials in Vancouver to get a license, without having to pay $500, and to allow them to operate in this small way. The superintendent there very liberally met their wishes and gave them a license for a very small sum. The officers here tell me that if that occurs

again this year they will also get consideration; that where a few fishermen want to put up fish in a small way they will not be compelled to put up such a large amount.

In connection with the subject of hatcheries I can endorse a great deal of what the hon. member for New Westminster has said. At one time they were regarded in British Columbia as being almost a failure; it was believed they were not doing any practical good. Various reasons were given for that. One was what the hon. member for New Westminster has alleged: They propagated trout; they protected the young trout in the very same lakes where the hatcheries were situated, the consequence being that they were breeding salmon on the one hand and propagating trout to eat them on the other. I have also heard it stated—I do not know what truth there is in the statement—that the hatchery had this effect—they made the young salmon too tame. The man who told me—and he is a man of experience—told me that if you go into any water where salmon are developed under natural conditions before you can even get a glimpse of them almost they are out of sight because nature or instinct has taught them to be wary. On the other hand, the young salmon that are brought up in hatcheries become almost as tame as cats, and do not show any fear of the attendants when they move around. When they are turned into the creeks to shift for themselves and the trout come along they stand, so to speak, with their mouths open and let themselves be destroyed. I do not know what truth there is in this story, there may be some basis for it in the same way as hand raised pheasants are less alert than wild ones. There is no doubt however that when propagated under these artificial conditions they are not so alert as they are under natural conditions. I understand the department now has a new system which they employed last year for the first time and which they claim does give very satisfactory results. They keep the young salmon a great deal longer than they used to and they find the percentage which escapes from their natural enemies is far greater. They put the young salmon into sort of natural ponds where they are perfectly free from enemies and keep them there six or eight weeks longer than heretofore, and they claim that in time this system is going to give very good results.

As regards the fishery protection service of British Columbia, I again endorse what my hon. friend from New Westminster has said. There is a large sum now spent on this service and I think a good deal of it might be saved. The money at least might be spent in a much more economical way. There is a protection boat which costs $45,000 or $46,000 with mahogany fittings, plate glass mirrors and a large crew. There is no necessity for boats of that kind in the district which I represent. When I canvassed the district in the middle of winter I did it in a launch which cost only $1,100. I got around without being seriously incommoded and I did not have a $45,000 or $46,000 dollar boat with a crew of eight.

When my hon. friend from New Westminster was talking about the enemies of the salmon he did not mention one that is very prevalent, on the west coast at all events and that is the sea lion. My hon. friend talked about how many salmon the hair seal will eat. Why the sea lion will eat more salmon in ten minutes than a seal will eat in a week. By the way an expert was sent out from somewhere some years ago to investigate the sea lion. He came back and wrote his report. That report said the sea lion was perfectly inocuous, and declared that the sea lion lived on seaweed. The expert had operated on a sea lion and found some seaweed in his insides, and therefore he declared they lived on seaweed. I suppose if he had found a horse collar inside he would have said they lived on horses. I expect the truth is that the seaweed had been covered with herring roe and had been eaten by the sea lion for that reason. I have seen sea lions gamboling with salmon in the water; one animal would playfully toss a fish in the air and another sea lion would catch it. There is no doubt they live very largely on the salmon. I took the question up with the Department of Marine and Fisheries and they promised to take the necessary steps to deal with the sea lion; they promised somebody would be sent to the rookeries where they breed to kill off the young ones. If that was done for three or four years it would soon put an end to the depredations of the sea lion. The only way to kill them off is by shooting or clubbing the young at their rookeries, There are certain islands where they are known to exist and if the patrol boats visit those islands they could destroy large quantities of them. The objection to offering a bounty is that if an adult is shot in the water it immediately sinks and there is nothing to produce to claim the bounty.

As regards the subject of negotiations with the Americans over the Fraser river fishery, I understand that Canadian and American fishery officers held a conference last year and they came to an agreement on the basis of limiting the fishing and totally closing the traps and nets in the Fraser river for a period of years, but the negotiations fell down on this subject: The Americans said: "We will close the river for five years." But when it came to the point of opening up again the American canners wanted to hog the whole thing and would make no provision for allowing the British Columbia fishermen engaged in the Fraser river to get any fair proportion of the results. They would agree to a long closed season but at the end of the closed period the Americans proposed to go in, put out their traps and deplete the run as they did in the past. It was on account of that fact that the negotiations fell down. I suggest it might be well to take the matter up again and see if a treaty could not be negotiated along those lines.

A great many people in British Columbia are of the opinion that the appointment of an Advisory Control Board for the fisheries in our province would be highly advisable. Many have expressed that view, both canners and fishermen. The board would be composed of local men and it would be a great advantage, even if they only acted in an advisory capacity. I see the same thing has been done in the state of Washington. They have appointed a board with compulsory powers, and in a short time they brought about a marked change. They understood the local conditions, and they were not in any way hampered by lobbies or regulations made at Washington and they will do a great deal to re-establish the Washington state fisheries. They closed up a lot of creeks, and prohibited fishing less than three miles from the mouth of any river, whereas we have a provision which says that you cannot fish within half a mile of the mouth of a river.

There was one thing that my hon. friend did not mention, which surprised me. I am afraid he was thinking too much of his own district, and perhaps the question does not arise in his district. He talked about the enemies of the salmon. What is eliminating the salmon, and what will in a very few years entirely exterminate them in the British Columbia waters, is the use of traps and seine nets. I know I will be talking heresy in the view of many people, because they believe otherwise. The cannery man has not a great deal of conscience regarding salmon. It has been said that the canning men will not kill their own industry, but experience has told us that many times they will. They will skin the fish supply, clean them out, let their cannery go to pieces and move somewhere else. You can trust a canneryman's word in many things, but you cannot trust him not to tackle salmon whenever and wherever he can get them.

For the information of members who may not understand the difference, I may say that the gill-net is a small net operated from a gas or row-boat and trailed more or less behind the boat. Two or three fishermen would be employed, and they might take 30 or 40 or 50, perhaps 60 salmon in a night. But the seine net is so many fathoms long, it takes in a large area and they scoop around an eighth-of-a-mile or something like that and have been known to take 6,000 salmon in one haul. They can repeat the operation three times in the course of 24 hours, or perhaps in 12 hours, and you can imagine the rate of progress you will make in eliminating your fish if you are taking 30 or 40 or 50 in a gillnet on one hand, or if you are taking 6,000 with one scoop of the seine-net on the other. That is why the seine-net is so beloved by cannery-men, and they operate in places most fatal to the salmon industry. They operate at the mouths of the creeks and rivers, they cannot operate anywhere else to the same advantage, because that is where the fish gather together preparatory to going up the creek. The salmon bunches up about that time, they lie there in the bay, and the fishermen come along with the seine-net. The regulations say they must not use it within half-a-mile of the mouth of the river, but the man who mapped out the mouth of the river is a hundred miles away, people's memories are perhaps short and these men go in after the fish and get them. They leave no tracks behind them, and you cannot see them. They have gone in at the mouth of the river, and grabbed every salmon in sight. They go back again every 24 hours, and that is the sort of thing that is going to destroy the fisheries of British Columbia.

I know this is not the case in the Fraser river where they do not use the seine-nets and never did, but the conditions there are different. The muddy water allows gill-nets to be used. The American traps and

our own traps off the coast of British Columbia have depleted the run. The member for New Westminster told you about the American traps, but he did not tell you that we have a large number of traps, which we should not have, off the coast of Vancouver island, where cannerymen take heavy toll of the fish, and although we have this fishery committee to investigate the matter, if this state of affairs continues, and until the seining of salmon is done away with we will never have a solution of the situation. If they keep on using seine-nets for a few years more you will not require to bother about a committee to discuss the subject because there will be no subject to discuss.

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin): This is a question in which I am also interested. Listening to the discussion to-day one would think that salmon was the only kind of fish produced in Canada. I come from a district in which one lake has produced in the last 20 years 5,000 carloads of fish, and these fish are just as great a delicacy as the salmon or any other fish in Canada—I refer to the whitefish. Lake Winnipegosis produces a very fine quality of whitefish, pickerel, goldeyes and many other good varieties of fish. In that district, Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform hon. members, the fishermen, after producing 5,000 carloads of fish in 20 years, find themselves almost destitute. In my judgment the reason that they are in this position to-day is because our inland fishing industries of Canada are entirely in the control of American capitalists. The fish industry, both on lake Winnipeg and lake Winnipegosis—a district with which I am thoroughly well acquainted—are absolutely in the control of two large American fishing concerns. The Canadian fishermen who fish in these lakes have no say whatever in the setting of the price or in the sale of the fish. They simply do the fishing, place the fish on the market, and are at the mercy of these American capitalists who control the entire inland fish industry and will not make them any bids on their fish. They have to ship the fish to Chicago or some other market and rely on the grace of God or the goodness of luck to get enough to pay freight, and I might say in this regard—that the same thing applies here as applied in the case of the potatoes, to which I referred a few minutes ago—these fish are shipped in probably ten, fifteen, or twenty carload lots direct to Chicago, and when they get to Chicago they are simply sold to the highest bidder. The company that is handling the fish, for whom the fishermen are fishing, is the same company who buy the fish at the other end. The fishermen is fleeced at the point of production and he is again fleeced when his product reaches the great markets. I think this matter should receive the serious consideration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe). Last winter the jackfish from lake Winnipegosis were selling on the lake for 1½ cents a pound. Any fisherman knows that fish cannot be taken out of the lakes and put in boxes at 1½ cents a pound. At the same time jackfish was selling in Winnipeg at 10 cents a pound. Whitefish was selling at lake Winnipegosis at 5 cents a pound and in Winnipeg at 15 cents a pound. Whitefish is about as great a delicacy in the form of fish as we have in Canada, and I think it has not received the consideration in the past from the Department of Marine and Fisheries that it deserves. I would like to draw attention to another fish known as the goldeye. I am convinced—in fact one gentleman who is very familiar with the fishing industry said that he believed—that the national debt of Canada might be paid off in the course of ten years by developing the goldeye industry of Canada. They are just as great a delicacy as the speckled trout of eastern Canada ever was, and I believe we might develop a remarkable trade in the United States and probably other countries if we were to develop the goldeye industry of Canada and put this fish on the market as a delicacy. We could get a very remarkable price for it. I make these remarks for the benefit of the minister.

Motion (Mr. McQuarrie) agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—PENSION RIGHTS AND STATUS.

On the notice of motion of Mr. Boys:

That in the opinion of this House, immediate steps should be taken by the Government to restore the pension rights and status of all employees and ex-employees of the Grand Trunk Railway who were deprived thereof owing to participation in a strike on the system in the year 1910, to the end that all such may secure their just rights pursuant to the terms and true intent of the settlement made between the parties.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The hon. member in whose

name the resolution stands (Mr. Boys) is not in the House. I regret his absence, because I desire to make a statement on the subject of the resolution.. However, he will be able to read my remarks in Hansard and that will perhaps serve the same purpose. There is no need for this resolution inasmuch as the Government has already taken steps in the direction proposed. The Government has been negotiating with a view to seeing that a long standing injustice should be remedied without further delay: If it is not possible to effect by negotiation what we hope and believe will be attained by negotiation, then the Government will bring in the necessary legislation to see that the injustice that was done to employees of the Grand Trunk Railway involved in the strike of 1910, in virtue of the terms and conditions of its settlement not having been complied with, is duly remedied.

PENSIONS TO IMPERIAL FORCES

On the notice of motion of Mr. Ladner:

That, in the opinion of this House, no change should be made in the practice adopted by the late Government, of paying at par in Canadian currency pensions payable to former members of the Imperial Forces with pre-war domicile in Canada.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The hon. member in whose name this proposed resolution stands is not present. The policy laid down with regard to payment of pensions to the members of the Imperial forces with pre-war domicile in Canada has been continued with the understanding that the matter is now engaging the attention of a committee of this House; and until that committee decides otherwise, we have given direction that the pensioners shall receive the benefit of the payment with favourable exchange. So that what the resolution asks for is being done now, subject to the report later on of the Committee on Pensions.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg, Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. 16, to amend the Immigration Act.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine): Before this motion is carried, I may say that this bill is rather of an important character and seeks to amend the Immigration Act in a very radical way. I myself last year introduced a bill to amend the legislation which was passed during what was known as the panicky session of 1919 while the strike in Winnipeg was on. There is no doubt that provisions were enacted at the time which were of a very serious character, especially when British subjects could be deported from this country without the right to be tried before suffering such deportation, which is the right of all British subjects under British law. Two years ago the then Minister of Labour introduced a bill in the Senate to amend that legislation of 1919 and to enact that a British subject could not be deported summarily in that way without having a trial in due form. That bill was rejected by the Senate and never reached the House of Commons during that session. Last year I took that very bill and introduced it in the House. It was accepted by the Government, and a provision of the Immigration Bill which was introduced by the then Minister of Immigration embodied the amendment which I had presented. Now, I should not like to oppose the principle of this bill, because it embodies what I myself proposed last year and what was then accepted by the government, and passed by the House, although it was blocked in the Senate again. This bill, however, goes a good deal further. It contains provisions which I could not accept, although I agree with that portion of it that embodies the principles of the bill I introduced last year. In view of the very important features of this bill, I think it would be wise for the House to refer it to a special committee which could carefully study its various characteristics and amend it if necessary and report to the House. The work could more easily be done before such a committee than in the House. I suggest that it be read the second time and sent to a special committee for consideration.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should be glad to have a special committee consider the matter and bring in any amendments that are found to be necessary. Certain classes of labour are suffering disabilities at the present time, and I can readily understand that a discussion in committee would bring out details more clearly than could be done in this House. I shall be glad to have this procedure adopted.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bill is now before the Committee of the whole House. At a later stage, when the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) is pres-

ent, we shall move to take it out of Committee of the whole House and refer it to a special committee.

Mr. FIELDING: Without remarking on the merits or demerits of the bill, I think it is exceedingly complicated, and for that reason objectionable. No one can readily discover what it means, and I think it would be a sounder policy to repeal the whole section and re-enact what is desired. However, I call this to the attention of the law officers of the House, and do not offer any opinion on the merits of the bill. If the House desires this legislation it could draft it in much simpler form.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. 17, to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I suggest that the same procedure be adopted with regard to this bill as was followed in connection with the previous bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I hardly understand this procedure—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; this motion is not debatable.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I have not moved—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; this motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not familiar with the procedure, but I understood a moment ago that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had suggested that this bill be referred to a special committee, to which I agreed. I want to bring this whole matter before the attention of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I assure my hon. friend that that is exactly the procedure we are adopting now? In order to do that, it will be necessary to move to-morrow or later that the bill be taken out of Committee of the Whole and referred to a special committee, giving at the time the names of the members of that special committee. The Government would like to consult my hon. friend before those names are given.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I thank the Prime Minister. I did not understand the procedure.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Tuesday, April 11, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

THE GRAIN TRADE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) presented the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, as follows:

That the question of the constitutionality of the reconstruction of the Wheat Board, with the powers conferred thereon by the orders in council establishing or extending the same be referred to the law officers of the Crown for their reasoned opinion.

On motion of Mr. Kay the report was concurred in.

CHARTERED BANKS, ETC.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in conformity with the requirements of the Statute, I beg to lay before the House the following papers:

List of Shareholders of the Chartered banks of Canada; Statement of unclaimed balances; Statement respecting the Quebec Savings Bank.

In former times these papers were printed for the information of the House, but several years ago the late Government, as evidence of its great economy, decided not to print them. As I do not want to be less economical, I am submitting the papers in this form.

THE GENOA CONFERENCE

DOCUMENTS OF CANNES CONFERENCE TABLED BY THE PRIME MINISTER

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yesterday my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) asked me to bring down certain papers relating to the proceedings at the Genoa Conference as outlined originally at Cannes. I therefore beg to present:

1. Copy of Memorandum on Anglo-French relations and of the draft of the proposed treaty with France presented by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to Mr. Briand at the meeting of the Supreme Council at Cannes, January, 1922.

2. Copy of Resolutions adopted by the Supreme Council at Cannes, January, 1922, as the basis of the Genoa Conference.

My hon. friend asked that these documents should be incorporated in Hansard, so that hon. members might have an opportunity of perusing them during the Easter vacation. With the unanimous consent of the House I move that these documents be so incorporated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that there is unanimous consent for the motion made by the Prime Minister?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

(The documents referred to are as follows):

ANGLO-FRENCH RELATIONS

Memorandum by the British Government

The British Government strongly desire that the Cannes Conference shall lead to definite results which will be approved by French and British sentiment and also by the opinion of Europe as a whole. In their judgment the indispensable condition of such success is a close preliminary understanding between the French and British Governments.

Public opinion is undeniably anxious and disturbed both in Great Britain and in France. Questions in which both countries are deeply interested are rightly believed to be at stake. There is a general feeling that some of the fundamental problems of the peace still await solution, and the critical temper of the public in both countries has given rise to public controversy. The suspicion and uncertainty thus produced have been reflected throughout Europe and even beyond Europe with unhappy results.

The failure of the Cannes Conference would therefore re-act with very bad effect on the relations of the two countries. Indeterminate or provisional decisions would be regarded as tantamount to failure, and would inevitably accentuate the divergence between French and British sentiment which has lately made itself felt. Europe would regard any such consequence with dismay, since its peoples realize that a close understanding between the British Empire and France is essential to European welfare and the peace of the world. The British Government desire to make it plain at the Cannes Conference that the British Empire and France stand together as firmly in the issues of peace as in the ordeal of war.

In their opinion this is not to be secured by any piecemeal treatment of the questions by which the Conference is faced. On the contrary, they consider it absolutely necessary that the problem should be treated as a whole; and with this object in view, they desire to state the position of both countries, as they see it, at the present time.

In their opinion there are two principal reasons for anxiety in France.

In the first place, French opinion is disquieted on the subject of reparations. France is endeavouring to repair her devastated area, and is obliged to advance great sums, which make a formidable gap in her budget, for that purpose. This expenditure should and must be met by Germany; but, in spite of settlement after settlement, satisfactory reparation by Germany is always postponed.

In the second place, French opinion is naturally anxious about the future safety of France. She has been invaded four times in a hundred and twenty years, and in spite of the losses of man-power suffered by Germany in the war and under the peace, France has still a population twenty millions less than that of the German Empire. Germany, moreover, possesses five million men trained to arms, and amongst them a very powerful corps of officers and non-commissioned officers. It is true that Germany has been deprived of nearly all her arms and equipment, but France cannot overlook the possibility that this deficiency may, by one means or another, be made good. It is therefore essential to her that the discrepancy between French and German man-power should be made up in such a way as to guarantee her soil from another devastating war.

In Great Britain there is also grave cause for anxiety and discontent. Britain is a country which lives by its exports, and its trade has been devastated as terribly as the soil of France. The consequences in human suffering and privation are very serious. Nearly two millions of the British working-class are unemployed, and their maintenance costs the country nearly £2,000,000 a week. This burden falls upon a community more heavily taxed than any other in the world and more hardly hit than France by the economic consequences of the war.

The hard ordeal through which the British people are passing is not, however, peculiar to them. France is in some ways the most fortunately situated of European countries. Owing partly to the large proportion of her population which lives upon the land, partly to the stimulus given to internal production by the needs of her devastated area, and partly also to the fact that the arrested condition of emigration to extra-European countries affects her population much less than those which sent large numbers of emigrants oversea before the war, she is suffering less than others from unemployment and from the collapse of international trade. In Italy and Belgium, however, the unemployment is serious. Belgium is a food-importing country, dependent upon the European markets for 80 per cent of her export trade. Italy is also very dependent upon foreign trade, and has a greater population to employ than before the war.

In Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe the collapse and confusion of the normal processes of economic life are even more marked. Millions are living in conditions of bitter privation and misery. Even where inflation has given employment and good wages to the working-class, the relief is temporary and reaction certain, unless measures are taken in time. The educated and the professional classes are suffering more terrible even than the working-class. The civilization of Europe cannot long survive such conditions. In its present state it is moving fast towards social and economic catastrophe.

Profoundly, therefore, as her own interest is engaged in the economic reconstruction of Europe, Great Britain appeals in no selfish spirit for the co-operation of France in that great human cause. It must be undertaken here and now. There is an awful aggravation of human misery, and in some parts of Europe an in-

creasing menace to civilization itself, in every month of delay.

The problem before the countries is how to meet their respective necessities by common action. These must be met as a whole. Complete frankness between the statesmen of both countries is essential, if the problem is to be effectively solved. Great Britain fully recognizes France's ground for anxiety, but she cannot agree to postponing the question of the reconstruction of Europe, while meeting France's desires in regard to her reparations and her security. In order to give satisfaction to French needs, the British Government must be able to tell the British people that the two countries are marching together to restore the economic structure of Europe and the general prosperity of the world.

With regard to reparations, His Majesty's Government are prepared to abide, so far as they are concerned, by the arrangement reached in London under which France would reap considerable advantages while Britain would make considerable sacrifices. They believe that this arrangement will meet the essential claims of France until such time as a wider financial settlement can be attained—perhaps in two or three years.

With regard to the safety of France, Great Britain is prepared to give her a guarantee that in the event of unprovoked German aggression against French soil the British Empire will put its forces at her side. There will be double value in this guarantee, since it will not only safeguard France in the event of German attack but will make any such attack extremely improbable. It is not likely that Germany would have attacked in 1914, had she realized the great forces which the British Empire would throw into the war. In 1914 Germany credited Great Britain with only six divisions; she knew little or nothing of the character or the resources of the British Commonwealth. She is wiser now, for she knows that, instead of six divisions only, the British Empire was maintaining 400,000 men in the field in France by the end of the first year of war. These numbers rose rapidly afterwards, and during the last two years the Empire had a strength of 2,000,000 men in France and Flanders despite a heavy drain of casualties. Great Britain called out a total of nearly 7,000,000 men for military service by land, sea and air. The self-governing Dominions called out more than one million and a half. The Indian Empire called out nearly the same. The total strength thrown by the British Empire into the war, was therefore over 10,000,000 men. The losses in killed, wounded and missing were 3,500,000.

It is inconceivable that Germany should forget these facts or their significance as a guarantee of French soil. What the British Empire did once for civilization, it will, if need be, do again. Germany, it is true, has great reserves of trained officers and men; but those of the British Empire will be available as long as those which Germany preserves from the old military regime. If, therefore, she is certain that the British Empire will stand by France in a future war, she will not be tempted to keep alive any dreams of revenge. It is of great importance to divert the German mind from any such ambitions as well as to provide for the defeat of those ambitions should they mature. The British Government believe that both objects would be met by a British guarantee to France against invasion of her soil, and that such a guarantee must ripen and strengthen the friendship of the two nations as years go on.

There are two ways in which the guarantee could be given.

The first is by means of an offensive and defensive alliance. Though such an alliance might seem desirable to France, it would in reality not serve her interests well, because such alliances are contrary to British tradition. The British people understand the claim of France to be guaranteed against invasion of her soil; but they would not willingly be committed to military liabilities for breaches of the peace elsewhere, and they would not undertake responsibility of any kind for the defence of countries in Eastern or Central Europe, in which their interest is necessarily small. An alliance involving, or even appearing to involve, any such responsibility would not carry the whole-hearted concurrence of the British people. On the contrary, it would be strongly opposed by large sections of the community in all parties, and would therefore not be as valuable to France as an understanding in another form.

The second alternative is a definite guarantee that the British Empire would stand by her in the event of unprovoked aggression by Germany against French soil. This alternative was discussed at the Imperial Conference last summer, and it is probable that the opinion of the Empire would support that of Great Britain in giving such a guarantee to France. It would therefore have far greater weight, for it would, the British Government believes, carry with it the whole-hearted opinion, not of Great Britain alone, but of the Dominions, which put a million soldiers of first rank into the field during the war. The real danger to France is from German invasion. She cannot be invaded by any other Power. A guarantee against German invasion secures her safety beyond doubt. This, therefore, is the alternative which His Majesty's Government prefer to adopt. They propose the draft Treaty between Great Britain and France attached to this memorandum as the form of engagement best calculated to protect the common interests of both Powers in Western Europe.

In order, however, that effect may be given to it, it is necessary that the guarantee should be accompanied by a complete Entente between the two countries. This was the basis of the agreement of 1904, which gave France the support of Great Britain in the war, and it is equally essential now. For such an Entente to be achieved, three questions must be cleared away. These need only be indicated here.

The first is the settlement of the Eastern question and the attainment of a just peace between Greece and Turkey.

The second is the question of Tangier.

The third is the question of submarines. His Majesty's Government make no condition of this, and they fully understand that the divergencies of French and British views on the subject may be due to different ideas of the uses which submarines can serve. The British opinion, however, based on four years' war experience, is that submarines are effective only against merchant ships and are ineffectual otherwise as instruments either of attack or defence. British opinion would inevitably insist on a heavy programme of anti-submarine craft, if the French submarine programme were carried out, and the two countries would thus be launched in a course of competitive naval construction. The British Government cannot disguise the fact

that any such development would react very seriously on British sentiment towards France. Her sea communications are to Britain what her eastern frontier is to France. Naval competition in any form between herself and France would corrode goodwill.

The fourth and last essential to the proposed Entente is that France should co-operate wholeheartedly with Great Britain in the economic and financial reconstruction of Europe. The British Government desire the agreement of France to the immediate summoning of an Economic Conference at which all the Powers of Europe, including Rusia, would be represented. The economic collapse of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe is now the most serious factor in the paralysis of European trade; and it cannot be remedied unless the produce and the markets of Russia are once more made available to the world. The presence of the real leaders of Russia is therefore necessary, in the opinion of the British Government, to the success of such a Conference. No useful object is served by discussing the Russian question with secondary representatives of Russia, or by forwarding conditions in writing to Moscow. It is most important to deal, if possible, with the heads of the Russian Government, and the Conference should be held as soon as possible at the most suitable centre for that purpose.

In order to trade with Russia, certain assurances and guarantees are essential. Those may be briefly set forth here. The British Government would not propose to present them to the Russian Government in advance of a Conference, but to discuss them at the Conference itself in conjunction with the counter-proposals for recognition which they would undoubtedly call forth.

In summary, they may be stated thus:—

(1) Nations can claim no right to dictate to each other regarding the principles on which they are to regulate their system of ownership, internal economy and government. It is for every nation to choose for itself the system which it prefers in this respect.

(2) Before, however, foreign capital can be made available to assist a country, foreign investors must be assured that their property and their rights will be respected, and the fruits of their enterprise secured to them.

(3) The sense of security cannot be re-established unless the Governments of countries desiring foreign credit freely undertake:

(a) That they will recognise all public debts and obligations which have been or may be undertaken or guaranteed by the State, by municipalities or by other public bodies, as well as the obligation to restore or compensate all foreign interests for loss or damage caused to them when property has been confiscated or withheld.

(b) That they will establish a legal and judicial system which sanctions and enforces commercial and other contracts with impartiality.

(4) An adequate means of exchange must be available, and, generally, there must be financial and currency conditions which offer sufficient security for trade.

(5) All nations should undertake to refrain from propaganda subversive of order and the established political system in other countries than their own.

(6) All countries should join in an undertaking to refrain from aggression against their neighbours.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

These are the four questions of which His Majesty's Government particularly desire a solution in connexion with the Treaty which they propose. They have indicated them because they consider agreement upon them to be indipensable to that complete Entente between Great Britain and France which they desire to maintain. The time has passed when statesmen could pledge their countries to engagements without full regard to the popular sentiment which they represent. In order that the Treaty of Guarantee proposed should be of lasting value to France, it is essential that the democracies of the British Empire and the French Republic should feel assured that they are guided by similar purposes and harmonious ideals. All questions, therefore, should be cleared away which may be capable of dividing the sentiment of the two countries and marring their accord. His Majesty's Government are confident that the four questions which they have indicated here can be solved in a manner satisfactory to both Governments, and that the Treaty of Guarantee between the two nations may thus be sealed and confirmed by a complete and durable Entente.

It is, moreover, their particular desire that this Entente between Great Britain and France, so far from excluding other nations, should form the basis of a larger scheme of international co-operation to ensure the peace and stability of Europe as a whole. The sixth clause of the stipulations put forward for discussion at the Economic Conference which they propose lays down a simple condition of international accord—"that all nations should join in an undertaking to refrain from aggression against their neighbours." Such an undertaking they are willing to give and to promote by all means in their power. It would lead, as they hope, not only to a temporary improvement of European relations, but also to a universal reduction of armaments and this, in their belief, is the only certain means of building up that sense of safety amongst nations, great and small, which Europe through the many centuries of its political history has never yet attained.

Cannes.
9th January, 1922.

Draft of Treaty between the Governments of the British Empire and the French Republic.

Whereas the soil of France has been twice invaded by Germany within living memory, and is still suffering deeply from the devastation wrought by the enemy; and

Whereas the peoples both of France and of the British Empire have paid heavy toll of their manhood and their wealth in overcoming the German armies of invasion and

Whereas the welfare of the European peoples and the economic structure of the world have been profoundly disturbed by the protracted ordeal of war through which they have lately passed and

Whereas guarantees of the security of France against any future invasion by Germany are indispensable to the restoration of European stability, the safely of Great Britain, and the peace of the world; and

Whereas the following safeguards contained in the Treaty of Versailles

"Article 42. Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right

bank to the west of a line drawn 50 kilo. to the east of the Rhine.

"Article 43. In the area defined above the maintenance and assembly of armed forces, either permanently or temporarily, and military manœuvres of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilisation are in the same way forbidden.

"Article 44. In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of Articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the Powers signatory of the present Treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world," may not sufficiently provide for the defence of the essential common interests of the High Contracting Parties and the maintenance of peace in Western Europe:

His Britannic Majesty and the President of the French Republic having etc., etc., etc., have agreed as follows:—

Article I

In the event of direct and unprovoked aggression against the soil of France by Germany, Great Britain will immediately place herself at the side of France with her naval, military and air forces.

Article II

The High Contracting Parties reassert their common interests in Articles 42, 43, and 44 of the Treaty of Versailles, and will consult together, should any breach of them be threatened or any doubt arise as to their interpretation.

Article III

The High Contracting Parties undertake further to concert together in the event of any military, naval or air measures inconsistent with the Treaty of Versailles being taken by Germany.

Article IV

The present Treaty shall impose no obligations upon any of the Dominions of the British Empire unless and until it is approved by the Dominion concerned.

Article V

This Treaty shall remain in force for a period of ten years, and shall, if approved by both parties, be renewable at the end of that period.

Cannes.
13th January, 1922.

Resolutions Adopted by the Supreme Council at Cannes, January, 1922, as the Basis of the Genoa Conference.

I.—Economic and Financial Conference.

(a) Mr. Lloyd George's Resolution.

The Supreme Council agreed at its meeting, held at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 6th January, 1922, to accept in principle the draft resolution proposed by Mr. Lloyd George in regard to an Economic Conference. The resolution was considered in detail at a further meeting of the Supreme Council held the same day at 3.30 p.m., and was finally approved as follows:—

The Allied Powers in conference are unanimously of opinion that an Economic and Financial Conference should be summoned in February or early March, to which all the Powers of Europe, including Germany, Russia, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria, should be invited to send representatives. They regard such a conference as an urgent and essential step towards the economic reconstruction of Central and Eastern Europe, and they are strongly of opinion that the Prime Ministers of every nation should, if possible, attend it in person in order that action may be taken as promptly as possible upon its recommendations.

The Allied Powers consider that the resumption of international trade throughout Europe and the development of the resources of all countries are necessary to increase the volume of productive employment and to relieve the widespread suffering of the European peoples. A united effort by the stronger powers is necessary to remedy the paralysis of the European system. This effort must include the removal of all obstacles in the way of trade, the provision of substantial credits for the weaker countries and the co-operation of all nations in the restoration of normal prosperity.

The Allied Powers consider that the fundamental conditions upon which alone this effort can be made with hope of success may be broadly stated as follows:

1. Nations can claim no right to dictate to each other regarding the principles on which they are to regulate their system of ownership, internal economy and government. It is for every nation to choose for itself the system which it prefers in this respect.

2. Before, however, foreign capital can be made available to assist a country, foreign investors must be assured that their property and their rights will be respected and the fruits of their enterprise secured to them.

3. The sense of security cannot be re-established unless the governments of countries desiring foreign credit freely undertake—

(a) That they will recognize all public debts and obligations which have been or may be undertaken or guaranteed by the state, by municipalities, or by other public bodies, as well as the obligation to restore or compensate all foreign interests for loss or damage caused to them when property has been confiscated or withheld.

(b) That they will establish a legal and juridical system which sanctions and enforces commercial and other contracts with impartiality.

4. An adequate means of exchange must be available, and, generally, there must be financial and currency conditions which offer sufficient security for trade.

5. All nations should undertake to refrain from propaganda subversive of order and the established political system in other countries than their own.

6. All countries should join in an undertaking to refrain from aggression against their neighbours.

If in order to secure the conditions necessary for the development of trade in Russia the Russian Government demands official recognition, the Allied Powers will be prepared to accord such recognition only if the Russian Government accepts the foregoing stipulations.

(b) Place and Date of Conference.

The Supreme Council agreed at its meeting, held at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 13th January, 1922, that the Genoa Economic and Financial Conference should assemble on the 8th March, 1922, subject to any later adjustment.

(c) Invitation to Russia.

The Supreme Council at its meeting held at 6.15 p.m. on Tuesday, the 10th January, 1922, agreed that an invitation should be addressed to Russia in the following terms:

On behalf of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers I have the honour to transmit to you a copy of a resolution passed by the Allied Powers in conference at Cannes on the 6th January, 1922.

In accordance with this resolution and with reference to M. Chicherin's telegram, dated the 8th January, 1922, I hereby formally invite delegates from Russia to attend an Economic and Financial Conference to be opened at Genoa early in March, 1922.

I shall be glad if you will inform me of the names of your delegates and their staff, and on receipt of this information and a statement of the route by which your delegates propose to travel I shall communicate with the interested governments and inform you of the arrangements made in order to afford them all necessary facilities and safe conduct.

The Supreme Council, conscious that you recognize the importance which it attaches to the assurances nad guarantees which it has laid down as indispensable to the useful co-operation of the Allied Powers with Russia in the task of the economic and financial reconstruction of Europe, learns with satisfaction that you propose to send representatives with full powers to take decisions.

(d) Invitation to the United States of America.

At its meeting held at 3.30 p.m. on Friday, the 6th January, 1922, the Supreme Council agreed that an invitation to be represented at the conference should be addressed to the United States of America.

(e) Invitations to other Countries.

The following lists show the countries to be invited to the Genoa Conference in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Council taken at its meeting held at 6.15 p.m. on Tuesday, the 10th January, 1922:

I. The following countries to be entitled to appoint delegates without limit:

1. The Allied Powers represented at the Cannes Conference.
2. United States of America.
3. Germany.
4. Russia.

II. The following countries to be entitled to appoint two delegates each:

5. The various dominions of the British Empire.
6. Spain.
7. Portugal.
8. Norway.
9. Sweden.
10. Denmark.
11. Finland.
12. Switzerland.
13. Esthonia.
14. Poland.
15. Czecho-Slovakia.
16. Latvia.
17. Austria.
18. Hungary.
19. Roumania.
20. Jugo-Slavia.
21. Greece.
22. Bulgaria.
23. Holland.

III. The following country to be entitled to appoint one representative:

24. Luxemburg.

(f) Outline Agenda.

The following outline agenda was approved by the Supreme Council:

1. Examination of the methods of putting into practice the principles contained in the resolution reached at Cannes on the 6th January, 1922.

2. The establishment of European peace on a firm basis.

3. Essential conditions for re-establishment of confidence without injury to existing treaties.

4. Financial subjects.

(a) Currencies.

(b) Central banks and banks of issue.

(c) Public finance in relation to reconstruction.

(d) Exchanges.

(e) Organization of public and private credit.

5. Economic and commercial subjects.

(a) Facilities and guarantees for the import and export of commercial products.

(b) Legal guarantees for the re-establishment of commerce.

(c) Protection of industrial property and copyrights.

(d) Status of consuls.

(e) Admission and position of foreigners in regard to the conduct of business.

(f) Technical assistance to industrial reconstruction.

6. Transport.

(g) Detailed Agenda and Resolutions.

The Supreme Council at its meeting held at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 13th January, 1922, appointed the following Committee to prepare the detailed agenda and draft resolutions for the Genoa Conference:—

Belgium, Viscount Davignon.
British Empire, Sir Maurice Hankey.
France, M. Seydoux.
Italy, Signor Jung.
Japan, M. Tokugawa.

(h) Press Notice.

A Ministerial Committee issued to the press on the 11th January, 1922, a notice explaining the objects and proposed procedure of the Genoa Conference. This press notice is reproduced in the Appendix to this paper.

II.—International Corporation

(a) Resolution of the Supreme Council.

The following is the text of a resolution passed by the Supreme Council at its meeting held at 6.15 p.m. on Tuesday, the 10th January, 1922:—

The Supreme Council approves the establishment of an International Corporation with affiliated National Corporations for the purpose of the economic reconstruction of Europe and the co-operation of all nations in the restoration of normal prosperity, and agrees that a Committee shall be immediately constituted, composed of two British, two French, two Italian, two Belgian representatives and a Japanese representative, with power to add representatives of other countries:—

(1) To examine the project in detail;

(2) To conduct any necessary preliminary investigations;

(3) To proceed with the organisation of the proposed Corporation and affiliated Corporations with a view to its beginning operations at the earliest possible moment;

(4) To report to the Genoa Conference on the progress made;

(5) To make any recommendations to any of the Governments concerned or to the Genoa Conference which, in their view, are likely to assist the purposes of the Corporation or of the Genoa Conference.

The Governments represented on the Council undertake to provide immediately in equal shares £10,000 for the work of the Organising

Committee, and to give all the support and assistance in their power to the Organising Committee and to the Corporation when formed.

(b) Preliminary Meeting of the Organising Committee.

The Supreme Council at its meeting held at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 13th January, 1922, came to the following decision:—

That a preliminary meeting of the Organising Committee of the International Corporation for the re-establishment of better economic conditions in Europe should be held in London in eight or ten days' time, invitations to be issued by the British representatives. The names of the representatives (Belgium, France, Italy and British Empire, two each, and Japan one) to be communicated to the British Secretary 2, Whitehall Gardens, London, S.W.1.

APPENDIX

Press Notice regarding the Genoa Conference.

The Supreme Council have to-day agreed upon the subjects to be discussed at the Conference which is to be called at Genoa early in March, in order to facilitate the economic revival of Europe.

General Objects and Conditions

The published resolution of the Council of the 6th January explains the reasons which in the unanimous opinion of all the nations represented on the Council make necessary a united effort by all European countries to restore the economic life of Europe and to remove the obstacles which at present impede it, and the fundamental conditions of such a combined effort. These include the recognition by all countries of their public debts, and compensation for loss or damage caused by the action of Governments; financial and currency conditions which offer reasonable security for trade and peace amongst nations. Among the essential objects of the Conference will be the consideration of the practical measures required to give effect to these principles, and in particular to secure, without injury to the provisions of existing treaties, the essential conditions for the re-establishment of confidence between nations without which international commerce cannot revive.

Peace

The first condition which is of prime importance in the reconstruction of Europe is to establish the relations of all the countries on the basis of a stable and enduring peace.

Financial Subjects

The Conference will also discuss the financial conditions which impede revival and the financial measures which might assist it, in particular the financial situation in the several countries in relation to the task of reconstruction: the rapid variation in the amount and purchasing power of the national currencies; the violent fluctuations in the relative value of the currencies of different countries as reflected in the exchanges, and the bearing upon these problems of the position and status of central banks and banks of issue. The Conference will examine the conditions under which public or private credit can best be made available for the work of reconstruction.

Economic Subjects

The obstacles to revival, however, are economic as well as financial. The Conference will therefore consider how the existing impediments to the free interchange of the products of different countries can be removed, in particular by the abolition, as rapidly and completely as possible, of such new impediments as have resulted from post-war conditions. The improvement and development of the transport system will engage special attention; and among other questions which might be usefully examined are the security afforded by the laws and by the legal systems and commercial documents in the different countries; the provision of expert and technical assistance by countries specially qualified to give it; the position of consular officers; the protection of copyrights; and the regulations governing the admission of foreigners for the purpose of carrying on business.

January 11, 1922.

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER, REPORT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg to lay on the table of the House a copy of the report of the Chief Electoral Officer. I move, seconded by Mr. Fielding;

That one thousand copies in English and five hundred in French of the report of the Chief Electoral Officer, transmitted on March 1st 1922 to the hon. Speaker of the House of Commons, pursuant to Section 74 of the Dominion Elections Act, and laid on the table of this House on March 14th, 1922, be printed forthwith, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the name of Mr. Neill be substituted for that of Mr. Hubbs on the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, and that the name of Mr. Hubbs be substituted for that of Mr. Neill on the Select Standing Committee on Mines and Minerals;

That the name of Sir Henry Drayton be substituted for that of Mr. Garland (Carleton) on the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines, and that the name of Mr. Garland (Carleton) be substituted for that of Sir Henry Drayton on the Joint Committee of both Houses on the library.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION —EXAMINATIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I beg to bring the following matter to the attention of the House. I am informed that the Civil Service Commission, after leaving the public under the impression that civil service examinations would be held in the spring, has now decided that no such examinations shall be

held. I am also informed that many students have prepared themselves for these examinations. In view of these facts, I should like to know if the Government intends to take such steps as may be necessary to force the Commission to hold such examinations.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I have no definite information with regard to the matter, but I will make inquiries and let my hon. friend know what is being done, at the next sitting of the House.

SIR MONTAGU ALLAN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the Government to a press report which states that Sir Montagu Allan is leaving Canada. Now, the affairs of the Merchants Bank have keenly interested the public quite recently, and under the circumstances I am wondering what right this gentleman has to leave Canada. If he persists in staying away, will extradition proceedings be instituted to bring him back to Canada?

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): I have no information on this question. I will inquire of the attorneys representing the Government and will inform my hon. friend at the next sitting of the House, or before, what has actually happened.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Before the Orders of the Day are called, may I ask the Prime Minister if it would be possible to fix a day for the discussion of the resolution dealing with oriental immigration, which stands on the Order Paper in my name, and to give it the right of way? I have been asked by a number of hon. gentlemen when the resolution is to come up, and I think it would be convenient if a day could be fixed. I suggest, if I am in order in doing so, Monday, the twenty-fourth.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I certainly shall seek to meet the wishes of my hon. friend, but without knowing the order in which the several motions come, it is a little difficult to say offhand what day could be fixed. I will endeavour to arrange the matter with him, however, and in time to give the House due notice of the day on which the resolution may be taken up.

[Mr. Parent.]

PRIVILEGE—MR. KAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the Halifax Herald of last Friday, the 7th of April, I find an article which is malicious false, and untrue. It is headed:

> Wheat Board is cause of big political war among Liberals.

I will read the part of this article which refers to myself. Speaking of the Government, it says:

> One of its main tactics is to raise the cry that the establishment of a national Wheat Board would be an interference with provincial rights and contrary to the British North America Act. Thus, when the question came up in the Agricultural Committee meeting yesterday, Mr. Kay, a friend of Mr. Robb, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, moved that the question be referred to the Supreme Court for a verdict upon its validity. The idea in Mr. Kay's mind, and in the mind of the Government, is that with the question before the Supreme Court, it would be safely shelved for the present.

It is hardly necessary for me to state, Mr. Speaker, to the House that as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I could not make a motion. The facts of the case are that the Committee on Agriculture passed unanimously a motion asking this House to refer the question of the constitutionality of the re-establishment of the Wheat Board to the Supreme Court of Canada. In my capacity as chairman of the committee, I presented that report to this House.

I may say, Sir, that my mind is absolutely unbiased as to the pros and cons of this very important question. And may I be allowed to say that the only suggestion which I have received from any member of the Government is that the Committee on Agriculture should be urged to give a free and full hearing to any parties interested in this most important question and to speed up and expedite in every way the report of the committee to the House. There is one word of truth, Sir, in this article,—which article I have declared to be malicious, false and untrue,—and that is that I am a friend of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb). To that allegation I plead guilty.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Civil Government—Railways and Canals—salaries and contingencies, $221,470.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (North Essex, Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Chairman, when the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals were presented to the House on a recent occasion, at the request of the former minister (Mr. J. A. Stewart) and the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) I withdrew them for the moment in order that I might later present the annual statement. I am now in a position to present to the House the annual statement of the Minister of Railways with respect to the operation of the nationally-owned railways of Canada.

The period under review is the twelve months which ended December 31 last, the calendar year now being the fiscal year of all Canadian railways, including the Government lines, whose year formerly ended on March 31. Although a year of depression in trade, with decreased tonnage and less travel, and with reduced rates when contrasted with the previous year, the nationally-owned roads were able, largely owing to drastic curtailment of expenditures, to make an improved showing over 1920.

As the Government-owned railways are still being operated in two groups by two separate boards, though with such co-ordination of operation as has been possible under separate management, it is again necessary to make separate statements concerning the operations of the Canadian National lines, and of the Grand Trunk lines. But before dealing with the separate reports, I would like to say that seemingly the outstanding feature of 1921 operation was the improvement in the position of the Canadian National-Grand Trunk combination. Those roads comprise approximately 52 per cent of the railway mileage of Canada, and in 1920 they did 52.21 per cent of the railway business of the country as reflected in the gross earnings of the transcontinental lines. During 1921, a year of depressed trade and falling railway revenues, the Canadian National-Grand Trunk lines increased their percentage of gross earnings from 52.21 to 54.22 per cent. Applying these percentages to gross earnings of the transcontinental lines, it means that the nationally-owned lines increased their proportion of the available railway business and improved their position as carriers during the year to the extent of about eight and a half million dollars.

Canadian National Railways

The operated mileage of the Canadian National lines at December 31, 1921, was 17,338. During 1921, 123 miles of new line were turned over to the operating department for permanent operation and, in addition, 65 miles were turned over for operation on behalf of the construction department, a total of 188 miles.

The mileage comprises the following units:—

Canadian Government Railways		
Intercolonial Railway	1,670	
Prince Edward Island Railway	276	
Branch Lines, including the leased St. John and Quebec Railway	515	
		2,461
Transcontinental Railway including Lake Superior Branch	2,007	
Hudson's Bay Railway	214	
		2,221
		4,682
Canadian Northern System		9,900
Grand Trunk Pacific		2,756
Canadian National Railways		17,338

The average mileage operated in 1921 was 17,236. The gross earnings amounted to $126,691,455.72, being an increase of $1,049,703.41 over the previous year, notwithstanding decreased traffic to the extent of four million tons of freight and 1,715,625 passengers. The National system is said to be the only transcontinental system in America whose earnings in 1921 from the increased freight and passenger rates established in September, 1920, were not entirely offset by the loss in tonnage and passengers.

Operating expenses amounted to $142,784,357, being a decrease of $19,700,365, leaving loss on operation of the system of $16,092,901 for the year, as compared with $36,842,970 for 1920, or an improvement in the operating result of $20,750,068. It is claimed on behalf of the management that this reduction was not made at the expense of the property, and that deferred maintenance and betterments made during 1919 and 1920 were reflected in 1921 by providing more economical operating conditions, while increased efficiency of the working forces enabled more work to be done by fewer employees.

The year saw a big slump in railway traffic following the decline in trade which set in during the closing months of 1920. There was a decline in the movement of all commodities with the exception of wheat. The grain movement of that season con-

tinued into January and February and kept the national lines as a whole from very seriously feeling the loss in total traffic until March, when instead of the increase which this month usually shows over January and February, there was a serious decline in car loadings. The drop continued through April, reaching the lowest levels in the first two weeks of May. June and July showed very little improvement, and it was not until half way through August that any pronounced upward tendency was shown. That month a surplus of $47,231 on operation was recorded. In September it grew to $504,174, in October to $1,036,-130, and in November it was $734,149, In December the loss was $1,114,794. What seems to have happened is that, as there was no car shortage, the grain crop of last season was handled as it was harvested and traffic was restricted to the fall months which ordinarily was spread over much of the winter. This would seem to account for the light traffic of the first couple of months of the current year.

As hon. members will no doubt be interested in knowing the loss on individual lines, I am handing in with other detailed figures at the conclusion of my remarks, a statement showing the individual deficits for 1921, as contrasted with 1920.

From this it will be seen that the Canadian Northern was able to cut its loss by about ten millions, the Intercolonial by two and a half millions, the Grand Trunk Pacific by six millions while the Transcontinental, loss on which has been almost three millions, has a deficit of less than half a million. The increase in deficit of certain of the branch lines, especially those more recently acquired, was due to the necessity to bring these roads up to Canadian National branch line standard.

The greatly improved showing of the Grand Trunk Pacific is attributed to the fact that for a full year it has been operated as an integral part of the Canadian National System, and is one of the results of co-ordinated operation of these western lines under one management. By that co-ordination, the loss of ten millions on a gross of 14 in 1920 was turned into a loss of four on a gross of sixteen millions in 1921.

Conforming to standard railway accounting, this year's statement shows tax accruals, which swell the net operating deficit by a million and a half, after which non-operating income (car rentals, rental of joint facilities, express, mails, elevators, etc.) is taken into account. This in turn is affected by deductions from gross income —hire of equipment, joint facilities, etc.— which brings us to the net deficit, $15,-896,018 before taking fixed charges into account.

In the case of the Canadian Northern it will be seen that the fixed charges are split to show those due the public, who invested in securities before or since the taking over of the roads, and those due the Government on loans and advances. The difference between these two classes of fixed charges is that the interest due the public is paid—by the Government—and the interests due the Government is not paid, but becomes an added liability of the railway to the Government. It is, however, not compounded.

The Grand Trunk Pacific fixed charges are shown as those due the public, interest due the Government, and in addition, interest which has accrued on Receiver's certificates and interest due the Grand Trunk. Those due on receiver account are for advances of all kinds rendered necessary to meet deficits and other obligations since the Minister of Railways was appointed receiver in March, 1919. Those due the Grand Trunk are on account of loans which that company made to the Grand Trunk Pacific and subsidiaries, and also on account of interest on loans by the Government to the Grand Trunk Pacific and guaranteed by the Grand Trunk, all of which are interest charges against the Grand Trunk Pacific.

It has been submitted by the management that, inasmuch as large sections of the National lines serve the newer portions of the country, and thus assist in their development, and as a considerable portion of the advances made by the Government has been for maintaining the property and carrying it through what might be called the pioneer stage, interest on such advances should be suspended for a certain definite period, and that the fixed charges be limited for the present to interest payable to the public. On the other hand, it has been alleged that our railway accounts are misleading because in the case of the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental, interest on capital account has not been charged up and compounded annually.

Matters of this kind will be referred to the incoming administration for consideration and report to the Government.

The total increase in fixed charges, both Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk

Pacific, from $33,194,243.96 in 1920 to $40,777,915 in 1921. reflects the increased interest charges during the year, to which I shall refer in a moment. After these fixed charges are taken into account, the total deficit for 1921 will be seen to amount to $56,989,978 as against $67,851,075 for the previous year, and which was erroneously stated at the time to be $70,331,734, owing to the fact that available figures were incomplete when the minister made his announcement. I have endeavoured to have the figures I am using to-day as exact as possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was a correction made to $69,593,441. I understand that now it is given as only $67,000,000 odd.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I am now giving the correct figures. The minister in his statement last year gave the figures as $70,331,734, which was later corrected to $67,851,075. That is due to the fact that the figures were incomplete at that time, and that was also one of the reasons why I asked the hon. gentleman to wait for my statement.

The auditors, Mesrs. Geo. A. Touche & Co., have completed their work on the Canadian Northern Railway accounts and the management have their certified balance sheet, so that the figures with respect to the Canadian Northern are final and complete.

Messrs. Marwick, Mitchell & Co. are still working on the Grand Trunk Pacific books, and Messrs. Geo. A. Touche & Co. on the Canadian Government railway accounts at Moncton. However, they expect to complete their audit in a few days, and the management feel that the accounts as submitted may be regarded as final.

During 1921, advances were made by the Government to the railways in the national system as follows:

Canadian Government Railways.		$ 5,792,896 48
Canadian Northern Railway..	$64,649,245 24	
Less repaid from proceeds of securities, (to which I shall refer in a moment)..	27,927,119 40	
		36,722,125 84
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway..		9,270,500 33
A total of..		$51,785,522 65

The advances for the year were applied on Construction and Betterments, Equipment, Repayment of Loans, including Equipment Trust obligations, operating Deficits and Fixed Charges.

The total advances to Canadian Northern Railway Company and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to December 31st, 1921, are as follows:

	Total advances to December 31, 1920	Advances during 1921	Total advances to December 31, 1921
Canadian Northern..	$214,366,123 04	$36,722,125 84	$251,088,248 88
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co...	73,209,803 33	9,270,500 33	82,480,303 66

The above figures represent cash advances only and do not include accrued interest due the Government, which, in the case of the Canadian Northern, amounts to $35,191,210.81, and, in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, to $14,729,238.80, of which sum $6,741,381.26 was prior to the appointment of the Minister of Railways as Receiver, in March, 1919, and $7,987,857.54 since.

During the year, an issue of $25,000,000 Canadian Northern Railway 6½ per cent twenty-five year sinking fund bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada was disposed of, the proceeds going to the Government in repayment of advances. These bonds, which, plus exchange, brought $26,228,163.03, together with a balance of $1,466,044.16 from the bond issue of December 1920, and a payment of $232,912.21 on account of Series "B" Equipment Trust Issue, make up the $27,927,119.40 referred to a moment ago as having been repaid the Government. There were also retired during the year $2,000,000 five per cent Duluth, Rainy Lake and Winnipeg Railway Bonds guaranteed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company and £3,650,000 Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent guaranteed notes. These were provided for out of an issue of $25,000,000 Canadian Northern Railway 7 per cent twenty year bonds, sold in the New York market in December, 1920.

I would now like to refer briefly to certain features of the year's operations. Wages and fuel still remain the principal charge upon railway revenues. The total pay-roll last year was $88,755,060, of which $82,381,597 was chargeable to operation; the balance, being for betterments, was chargeable to capital. The National railways used 3,544,200 tons of coal, about 300,000 tons less than in 1920, and the coal

bill was $21,391,215. When operating revenues amount to $126,691,455, and wages and fuel combined require $103,772,812, the balance, roughly, 23 millions, is of course insufficient to meet other operating charges totalling 39 millions. For that reason, the operation ratio in 1921 was 112.70 In other words, it took 112.7 cents to earn a dollar. In 1920, the ratio was 129.32. That year wages took 78.61 cents of every revenue dollar, locomotive fuel 18.79 cents, and other expenses 31.92 cents. In 1921, the distribution was, wages 65.03 cents, locomotive fuel 16.88 cents, and other expenses 30.79 cents.

Out of every dollar spent in 1921, 23.61 cents went into maintenance of way and structures and 22.17 cents into maintenance of equipment. Transportation by rail—superintendence, train movement, station employees, yards terminals, telegraphs, etc.—absorbed 50.15 cents, and transportation by water, .08 cents. The Traffic Department, soliciting, etc., 1.79 cents, general—general officers, law, insurance, etc.—2.15 cents, while transportation for investment, the cost of moving the railway's own materials for betterments, new construction, etc., amounted to 1.39 cents.

Operating costs were high in January and February, due to the higher wage scale which was adopted in September, 1920, retroactive to May 1st, the result of the Chicago Award. When traffic commenced to fall away forces were reduced and by the end of April the staff showed a reduction from 60,500 in 1920 to 51,000 in 1921. This staff reduction was maintained until the end of the year. It ran nearly 10,000 below 1920 through the months of May, June and July, averaged about 6,000 less in August, September and October, and about 5,000 less in the last two months of the year.

The reduction of operating expenses by 20 millions is a welcome change, as in recent years it has been all the other way. Operating expenses of 1920 increased by more than 37 millions over 1919; those of 1919 increased by 27 millions over 1918.

Total Pay-roll, including betterments, was $88,755,060, as against $105,109,808 in 1920, a decrease of $16,354,748. The reductions in number of employees and of the rates of pay from July 16, 1921, is estimated to account for $12,775,000 of this, and the balance would be betterments. It has been customary to quote for comparative purposes the increase in the average railway wage which grew from $713 in 1915 to $1,633 in 1920. Last year the average wage was $1,471.33, but the comparison is of little use in contrast with full employment years as in 1921 decreased train service caused lessened mileage per man in the running trades, and part-time work in shops with permanent force rather than full time with reduced force materially decreased the average wage of the mechanical staff, while rigid curtailment of overtime was another factor. While this explanation shows the 1921 average wage to be of little use in comparison with other years, the fact remains that on reduced time, the average wage last year was still double what it was in 1915.

In accepting the reductions which the Canadian railways, acting in unison, made effective from July 16th last, the railway brotherhoods recognized the present labour situation and also accepted the principle of following in the deflation stage the United States precedents which built up the war time wage scale. At the present time negotiations are under way looking to a modification of some of the working conditions that the railways feel to be difficult of application, resulting in excessive wages in some classes and the placing of expenses on the railways which are claimed to be unduly burdensome. It is recognized that railway wages must provide for a proper standard of living, but they should have reasonable relation to the importance and value of the work performed, and to wages generally. The management inform me that the labour situation has greatly improved; that the spirit of railway labour is better than it was; that labour has become more efficient and is doing more work and better work. I am glad to give expression to the views of the management in that regard.

A problem which in recent years has confronted railway managements is the question of providing suitable service on branch lines at a cost not out of proportion to the earnings and capable of meeting in many cases motor car competition. For this the self-propelled gasoline car seems to be the most suitable. The Canadian National Railways have been active in obtaining experience with this plan of operation. Much will depend upon the attitude of railway labour towards the self-propelled car, which could take care of branch line services, if expenses of operation are not made too costly in the matter of wages. In this effort to cut excessive costs, and yet pro-

vide reasonable service, the co-operation of railway labour is invited. As a matter of fact, these branch lines suffer not only from heavy costs of operation, but from the competition of the motor car and motor truck, a competition which is increasingly felt each year by all railways.

While the trend in prices of materials and supplies is generally downward, the movement is slow, and prices continue greatly in excess of pre-war figures. Of course a drop in prices is not immediately reflected in operating expenses, due to the necessity to keep on hand large stocks of fuel and other supplies, which have to be charged out at purchase price until new stock begins to be used. The management estimates the reduction in tie expenditure last year to have been $1,550,000; reduction on account of materials and supplies generally $1,300,000 and on fuel $2,216,175. Average price of coal, which was $3.65 in 1916, and $7.40 in 1920, was $6.10 last year. Coal purchases during the year amounted to 3,483,085 tons. Of this 2,505,389 tons were Canadian coal, costing on the average $5.71, or $14,320,504.53; and 977,696 American coal, at an average price of $6.47, and totalling $6,324,450.94.

The management state that in 1921 they did not purchase for the Intercolonial railway or ship to the Intercolonial railway east of Montreal any American coal; that on the other hand, they took delivery of coal produced in the maritime provinces in 1921 to the extent of 1,184,015 tons. In addition to the coal taken by rail in the maritime provinces, they moved 281,959 tons of Nova Scotia coal up to Levis by water. They also took in through the port of Quebec, by water, 90,865 tons of Nova Scotia coal, and railed some of that coal as far west as Cochrane. The coal taken in by water at Levis and Quebec is included in the total of 1,184,015 mentioned. The total quantity of American coal purchased for use at Toronto and east during 1921 was 160,000 tons. Coal consumption on the Intercolonial in 1921 was about 20 per cent less than in 1920. They have now accumulated nearly four months' stock of coal, and eastern officials have been instructed that sufficient reserve has now been secured and the railway is, therefore, no longer in the market except for daily requirements.

After the very heavy purchases of rolling stock and motive power in 1918, 1919 and 1920, it was not necessary to go into the market for equipment of any kind during 1921.

No work was done on eastern lines in the construction of new branches during 1921. All such work during the year was confined to western lines. A number of branch lines and extensions were under way prior to the war, on which work was suspended, and the Government has since provided the National Railways management with money to go ahead with certain of these lines along which settlers were in bad way for railway facilities. A detailed statement of this construction work will be included with those which will appear as an appendix to these remarks.

The construction and betterment programme for 1922 is necessarily curtailed. There is in the west alone construction projected which would entail an expenditure of $25,000,000 to bring to completion. In view of the financial condition of the country and the impending general re-organization of National Railway direction and management, it is felt to be better to confine construction and betterments for the present to the minimum and leave to the new board to advise as to what is essential or necessary in the matter of extensions. Briefly, this year it is proposed to finish active lines, up to the point to which track has been laid, at an estimated expenditure of $1,286,164, with ballast, fence, telegraph line and buildings, but to make no extensions to any of them beyond the point where track is already laid. Details of this work will be given in connection with the estimates.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

I will now deal with the Grand Trunk Railway System. This system extends from Portland, Maine, to Chicago, with an operated mileage of 4,776, of which 3,612 miles comprise what are known as the Grand Trunk Canadian Lines. The New England lines, as the Eastern United States lines are known, extend from Portland, Maine, to Norton Mills, Vt., on the International boundary, with an operating mileage of 172, while 992 miles embrace the operated mileage west of the Detroit and St. Clair rivers, in the states of Michigan, Illinois and Indiana, between Port Huron, Detroit and Chicago.

In addition, there is operated under separate management, but controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Central Vermont Railway System, with an operating mileage of 613, extending from New London, Connecticut, to Montreal, of which 463 is operated in the United States.

	1921	1920
The Operating Revenues, all Lines (including the Central Vermont) were	$109,097,557 58	$113,223,934 52
The Operating Expenses were	104,725,039 93	108,884,828 58
Leaving a net revenue from railway operation of	4,372,517 65	4,339,105 94

After taking into consideration railway tax accruals, uncollectible railway revenue, hire of equipment, joint facility rents and non-operating income items, the gross income, before deducting fixed charges, was in 1921 $3,573,443.34, as against $7,498,393.30 in 1920. The fixed charges for 1921 were $19,245,583.68 as against $14,025,637.07 in 1920, making a net loss for the year 1921 of $15,672,299.34, as against a net loss for 1920 of $6,527,243.77.

The net deficits for 1921 and 1920 are apportioned as follows:

	1921	1920
Canadian lines	$7,386,170 97	$3,155,892 06
Western lines	4,797,177 55	1,935,155 94
New England lines	1,881,093 84	990,869 03
Central Vermant	1,607,856 98	445,326 74
	$15,672,299 34	$6,527,243 77

The increase in the net income deficit of 1921 over 1920 of $9,145,155.57 is due principally to variation in amount received under the guarantee of the United States government following the return of the American units of the system to corporate control on March 1, 1920, and to an increase of $5,219,946.61 in interest on funded debt. The increase in fixed charges was caused by the inclusion of a full year's interest on the guaranteed stock, which ran from May 21 only in 1920, and increased interest on government loans and new issues.

In addition to the results as shown for the system comprising the Canadian lines, the Western lines, the New England lines and the Central Vermont, there are certain stock controlled subsidiary companies, the net results of whose operations do not wholly enter in the system net income. These companies are:

Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Co.
International Bridge Co.
Montreal Warehousing Co.
Terminal Warehouse Registered.
Oshawa railway.
Rail & River Coal Co.
Thousand Island railway.
Montreal & Southern Counties railway.
St. Clair Tunnel Co.
Grand Trunk Milwaukee Car Ferry Co.

The net income of all these companies for 1921 was $453,118.68, as compared with $613,639.66 in 1920. The amount taken into the Grand Trunk accounts as dividends from these subsidiary companies was $127,000 in both 1921 and 1920.

The accumulated undistributed surplus of these subsidiaries was $918,986.21 in 1921, as compared with $934,423.49 in 1920.

At December 31, 1921, there was on hand locomotive and car stock, owned by the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont, as follows:

Locomotives of all kinds	1,503
Passenger service cars of all kinds	1,210
Freight service cars of all kinds	47,312
Company's service cars of all kinds	2,545

The outstanding obligations as at December 31, 1921 and 1920 respectively, of the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont railway, bearing interest were as follows:

	1921	1920
Government loans	$ 73,702,154 42	$ 21,340,808 62
Other obligations	354,583,462 32	338,434,369 72
Total	$428,285,616 74	$359,775,178 34

Because of the fact that the operations of the units of the railway system in the United States were subject to a guarantee by the United States government in operating results for eight months in 1920, no proper comparison can be made for the system with the results of the operations for the twelve months of 1921.

Comparisons, however, can fairly be made of the operations of the Canadian lines for the two years. These will be found in detail in the statements which form an accompanying appendix.

Revenue passengers carried on the Canadians lines in 1921 numbered 11,609,762, as compared with 12,206,977 in 1920, or a decrease of 4.89 per cent. Revenue tons of freight handled in 1921 amounted to 21,687,749 compared with 26,322,423 in 1920, a decrease of 17.61 per cent. The loss in tonnage was distributed over all commodities, excepting products of agriculture, but was most noticeable in coal, both anthracite and bituminous, which together constitute between twenty-five and twenty-eight per cent of the total tonnage.

The average number of employees on Canadian lines in 1921 was 29,127, as compared with 32,260 in 1920, and 24,457 in 1917. The average wage in 1921 was $1,574.66, as compared with $1,661.54 in 1920, and $914.80 in 1917. Of the total

operating expenses of $71,179,292.80 in 1921, $42,149,952.50, or 59.22 per cent, was the amount of the payroll. The 4 p.m. corresponding figures in 1920 were; operating expenses, $76,213,815.16; payroll, $49,567,436.72; per cent of operating expenses, 65.04.

Total hours worked, including betterments, ordinary and joint facility operations, in 1921, was 68,545,640, as compared with 82,178,337 in 1920. At rates in effect prior to the McAdoo award, the employees would have received, in 1921, $23,374,063.24, as compared with $45,865,171.10 actually paid, an increase of 96.2 per cent.

The decision of the United States Labour Board, known as the 12½ per cent decrease, which came into effect July 16 last, produced to December 31, 1921, on Grand Trunk Canadian lines a saving of $3,035,112.06. Had the decision been effective throughout the full year, the difference in wage charges would have been $6,306,198.88.

The Grand Trunk Railway system, exclusive of the Central Vermont, contracted for 2,795,000 net tons of coal during the coal year ending March 31, 1922, the aggregate cost, including freight and duty, being $15,288,900, or, $5.50 per ton. Of this amount, 2,675,000 tons had been delivered to March 31. The amount purchased for Canadian lines was 2,030,000 tons at an aggregate cost, including freight and duty, of $11,672,700, or, $5.75 per ton.

During the year ending December 31, 1921, there was added to the investment account of the Grand Trunk system $26,772,057.15, apportioned as follows:—

Canadian Lines..	$24,790,901 01
Western Lines..	1,550,513 95
New England lines.. ..	44,277 94 (Cr)
Central Vermont..	474,920 13

Of the above total $20,550,000 was for new equipment; $2,100,000 for improvements to equipment; $1,150,000 for increased weight of rail; $800,000 for sidings, yards and spur tracks $350,000, investment of Grand Trunk and Central Vermont in affiliated companies, and the balance, $1,500,000, in miscellaneous roadway, buildings, structures, etc.

The accounts of the Grand Trunk Railway system for the year ending December 31, 1921, have not been audited by an outside firm of chartered accountants, as is the case with the rest of the roads embraced in the National system. The auditing has been done by the Company's own auditors.

THE ESTIMATES

As to the Estimates, it is not necessary to do more at this stage than outline the requirements of the railways so far as the Estimates are concerned, and to leave detailed explanation for the consideration of the various items in committee.

Briefly, the amount to be voted on account of the railways for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1923, as provided for in the Estimates, is $97,220,000, compared with $179,065,760 last session. This includes both Grand Trunk and Canadian National lines.

For operating deficits $21,123,827 is provided for 1922, as against $23,129,369 for 1921. The actual operating deficit on the Canadian National lines in 1921, as already stated, was $16,092,901.

Interest charges due the public require $33,571,438. Last year this item was $35,871,195.

For betterments the sum of $30,261,286 is provided, as against $60,077,828 last year. Pending the organization of the new board and adoption of its policy as to necessary extensions, and also having in mind the general financial position of the country, the construction and betterments program has been restricted to minimum requirements.

Refunding securities in the hands of the public, for which $39,241,700 was necessary last year, calls for $11,129,910 this year. This refunding does not add to corporate capital indebtedness but changes the form, the usual practice being to retire a maturing issue with a fresh issue bearing the Government's guarantee. Where securities are retired by Government loans, the liability of the railway is transferred from the public to the Government.

It is not necessary this year to provide for refunding securities in the hands of the Government, for which $11,148,533 was included last year.

The actual cash for operating deficits, interest charges to the public, and betterments, which is required to be provided for the current year is $84,956,552, as against $119,078,392 last year.

FREIGHT RATES

In the Speech from the Throne it was stated that conferences had been arranged between the railway authorities with respect to the reduction of rates upon basic commodities. A number of these conferences have been held, but, because of the uncertainty of the entire rate situation, the executives of the various railways feel

that it is inadvisable, at this time, to reduce rates on basic commodities in view of the fact that the suspension of the Crow's Nest Pass agreement ceases on July 6 next, and the Crow's Nest Pass scale of rates again becomes effective on the commodities named in the Crow's Nest Pass subsidy legislation of 1897; further, general order No. 308, of the Railway Commission, dated September 9, 1920, does not extend beyond July 1.

The Government feels that the matter is of such great moment and of so much importance to the people of the country—who are not only interested in lower freight rates, but concerned as owners of more than 22,000 miles of Canadian railways—that the entire question should be placed before the members in such a way as to enable them to obtain the fullest possible information. With this in view, I propose, at an early date, to ask the House to appoint a special and representative committee to examine into the question of rates, with power to summon the executives of the various railways and others to place before the committee all available information for the consideration of its members. It would then be for the committee and for the House to take such action as, having regard to all the circumstances, shall commend itself to the wisdom and judgment of Parliament.

REORGANIZATION

The first step in the reorganization of the railways will be the establishment of a single representative Board of Directors for the unified control and co-ordinated operation of the government-owned lines, now directed and controlled by two separate boards and two different managements. This board will be thoroughly representative and will include in its number the most competent railway men, men of wide practical experience and training, and possessed of expert knowledge in the various departments of railway activity.

I am aware that there has been criticism of the Government because the new board has not already been appointed. We realize that, for the time being, we might conceivably save some money by the immediate termination of dual control and dual management; on the other hand, we also realize that by unwise or hasty selection of this most important body we might easily, in the long run, lose a great deal more.

It is well to bear in mind that it is intended to turn over to this board properties in which the public and the Government have invested $1,582,500,000—and this does not take into consideration cash subsidies amounting to $41,000,000, nor land grants.

Last year, our railway executives spent $343,458,420, made up as follows:

Grand Trunk (operating)	$ 104,725,040
Canadian National (operating)	142,784,357
Cash voted in Estimates (not including deficits)	95,949,023
	$343,458,420

The total expenditure of the Dominion of Canada on Consolidated Fund account of 1919-1920—fiscal year—was $303,843,930, and in 1920-1921, $362,600,000.

It will be seen that the new Canadian National Railway Board will have the spending of more money than was expended by the Dominion on Consolidated Revenue Fund account in 1920, and almost as much as was spent in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1921. Before turning these properties over, or entrusting any board with an expenditure which equals or may exceed the ordinary expenditures of the Dominion, we are bound to know that the men to whom this vast responsibility is entrusted, and in whom this great confidence is to be reposed, are eminently qualified to successfully discharge such important duties.

I am free to confess that in the short time thus far at our disposal, and with the necessarily limited investigation it has been possible to give the matter, we are not yet in a position to announce who will compose this board. In an undertaking of this magnitude, it is above all essential that we be prudent and careful. When we turn over these valuable railway properties with a view to giving government ownership and operation a fair trial, it is of the utmost importance that we place them in capable and honest hands, and in the hands of men who, as regards component parts of the system, will administer them without fear or favour, without thought of politics, and in the general public interest.

For that reason, we prefer to be careful and prudent, adopting good business methods, and, in the final analysis, the country will benefit by it.

We are impressed with the necessity for bringing about the unification of the system as quickly as may be possible with due regard to the public interest. We keenly realize the magnitude of our responsibility.

We know what is expected of us, and when we appoint our board we wish it to fulfil on behalf of the Government and the people of Canada those same high expectations.

We propose to appoint this board under provisions of existing legislation to which, up to the present time, no effect has been given. This legislation provides for a single board of directors and for the inclusion of any lines of railway which may from time to time be vested in, or owned, controlled or occupied by His Majesty. When this legislation is brought into effect it automaticaly abolishes the present Canadian Northern Board, and the Canadian Grand Trunk Board, which succeeded the English directors in May last.

The new board will be given the direction and control of the Grand Trunk Railway properties, the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the Transcontinental railway and the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railway and branch lines. I have mentioned these lines specifically so that there may be no question or misunderstanding as to where any or all of them stand so far as general direction and control is concerned.

The board will be asked to examine fully for itself the existing situation, and after it has done so to make such recommendations as in its opinion will tend to the highest efficiency in the operation of these railways, without respect to political or any considerations other than the best and most approved railway practice. On their advice and recommendation will depend the division of the immense mileage into suitable operating districts or divisions, with regional headquarters which it is hoped will enable local or district matters to receive the consideration of officials most capable of understanding local requirements. Briefly, what will be aimed at will be centralization of general direction and control and decentralization in matters of local detail.

As to this, I have had opportunity to consult the gentlemen who at present are operating and managing the roads, and while there are natural differences of opinion as to how the various lines might best be grouped for economic management and operation they are unanimously of the opinion that a re-grouping and re-arrangement is necessary if improved results are to be obtained. They agree that the large mileage should be divided into units, each with its own headquarters and under the direction of a general manager who, while subject to the lines of policy laid down for his guidance and direction by the board at general headquarters, should have much wider powers on all matters pertaining to his own particular division or district than has recently been the case so far as the present two divisions of the Canadian National system are concerned. It will be for the new board, however, to advise just what form of administration is most suitable. It is the intention of the Government that the board in the exercise of its several duties and functions shall be free from interference, political or otherwise,

Upon the new board will devolve also the task of selecting and developing an executive composed of the best men in the existing systems, and such others as may be necessary, in order to combine the most suitable talent available for the management of the railways, and in order that economies may be effected which are desirable and necessary in the interests of successful operation and management. It is hoped to build up a distinctly Canadian National personnel and in this the board will receive such co-operation and support from the Government as should secure for it, from the employees, the same loyal and faithful service which generally characterizes the relations of the average railway man with his own particular road. The Government and the board will want the good-will and co-operation of the employees, and we will wish every employee to feel that he will have, under government ownership, the same opportunities of advancement to even greater responsibilities and greater rewards than would have been possible under former restricted conditions. Such of the older officials and employees as have given long service, and who of necessity may have to be retired, will receive the benefit of superannuation.

Just one other point. There has been such criticism of the statements presented by the Management of Canadian National Railways, and also concerning the Grand Trunk, as to impair parliamentary and public confidence in the figures and statements which have been put out from time to time. Naturally, any confirmation or verification of accounts, or investigation or justification of managerial methods and practice is a matter to be dealt with by the incoming board, to whom these properties are being turned over, rather than by the outgoing. The Government is most anxious that as far as the financial affairs of these railways are concerned, not only Parliament, but the general public, may have confidence in any statements which may be issued by the new board. To that end, it

is proposed to supplement the work of co-ordination by an investigation of the financial affairs and business methods generally of the railways passing under the control of the new board. This is a usual business precaution in the nature of a stocktaking on the occasion of a change of administration.

CAANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHNT MARINE

I expect, Mr. Chairman, after the Easter recess, to be in a position to make a statement to the House concerning the operation of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine during 1921. Heretofore, that has been done by the Minister of Marine, but the late government decided that the responsibility of the department and Minister of Marine should cease with the completion of the construction programme. As the ships are being operated in conjunction with National Railways, and directed by the same board, and to a certain extent by executives common to both railways and Merchant Marine, on the Minister of Railways devolves the task of presenting the report of the operations for last year. I understand that the figures are now complete, and I hope, therefore, to present the report when we take up the Estimates of the Canadian Merchant Marine.

And now, Mr. Chairman, before taking my seat, I would like, following the usual practice, to hand in, for publication in Hansard, copies of the various statements which I have endeavoured to analyze in the course of my remarks. I would request the consent of the committee to have them printed as an appendix to the statement I have just concluded.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Railways asks the unanimous consent of the committee that certain statements be printed in Hansard. Is it the pleasure of the committee that such consent shall be granted?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

(The statements referred to are as follows):

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS REFERRED TO BY THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS IN HIS STATEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN CONNECTION WITH OPERATIONS FOR THE YEAR 1921.

N.B.—Figures in italics are deficits, decreases or credits.

1. Mileage Statement.
2. Comparative Statement of Operating Results, 12 months ending December 31st, 1921 and 1920.
3. Memorandum showing Operating Results by months for year 1921.
4. Comparative Statement of Operating Deficits for year 1921 and 1920.
5. Income and Fixed Charges for years ending December 31, 1921 and 1920.
6. Comparison of Payroll showing amount of Operating Revenue paid in Labour, and average number of employees, 1921 and 1920.
7. Comparative Statement of Traffic 1921 and 1920, exclusive of Electric Lines.
8. Comparative Statement of Train Mileage, 1921 and 1920.
9. Statement showing details of equipment on hand December 31st, 1920, deliveries, retirements and positions at December 31st, 1921.
10. Summary of betterments carried out in 1921, and some of the larger works it is proposed to carry out during 1922.
11. Statement respecting Canadian National Telegraphs.
12. Summary of Construction carried out in the year 1921.

[STATEMENT No. 1.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS
INCLUDING
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

OPERATED MILEAGE—DECEMBER 31, 1921.

Canadian Government Railways.—			
Intercolonial Railway (Including International and N.B. and P. E. I. Railways.)		$ 1,670 38	
Prince Edward Island Railway		275 99	
Branch Lines in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec		342 85	
		2,289 22	
Transcontinental Railway (Including the Lake Superior Branch)		2,006 73	
Hudson's Bay Railway		214 00	
		4,509 95	
St. John & Quebec Railway Westfield Beach to Centreville (Leased)	158 11		
St. John to Westfield Beach (Running Rights)	13 96		
		172 07	
			4,682 02
Canadian Northern Railway System			9,899 90
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway			2,756 38
Canadian National Railways			17,338 30

AVERAGE MILEAGE OPERATED.

Canadian National Railways (including Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.)	17,064 43
St. John and Quebec Railway	172 07
	17,236 50

[STATEMENT No. 2.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS INCLUDING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS—TWELVE MONTHS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1921 AND 1920.

Excluding St. John and Quebec Railway.

——	1921.	1920.	Increase.	Decrease.	% Incr.	% Decr.
Operating Revenue.						
Canadian Northern	$69,088,474 16	$66,695,398 80	$ 2,393,075 36	$	3·59	
Canadian Government	40,964,303 92	44,537,803 85		3,573,499 93		8·02
Grand Trunk Pacific	16,638,677 64	14,408,549 66	2,230,127 98		15·48	
Total	126,691,455 72	125,641,752 31	1,049,703 41		0·84	
Distribution.						
Passenger	21,110,052 83	23,583,571 58		2,473,518 75		10·49
Freight	93,785,017 60	90,951,115 73	2,833,901 87		3·12	
Other	11,796,385 29	11,107 065 00	689,320 29		6·21	
Operating Expenses.						
Canadian Northern	75,564,385 30	82,953,978 60		7,389,593 30		8·91
Canadian Government	46,551,602 67	54,987,680 28		8 436,077 61		15·34
Grand Trunk Pacific	20,668,369 51	24,543,063 60		3,874,694 09		15·78
Total	142,784,357 48	162,484,722 48		19,700,365 00		12·12
Distribution.						
Mtce. of Way and Str	33,707,956 47	42,907,217 78		9,199,261 31		21·44
Mtce. of Equipment	31,649,007 49	34,834,703 34		3,185,695 85		9·15
Traffic	2,555,090 60	2,456,715 09	98,375 51		4·00	
Transportation—Rail	71,601,188 73	76,695,606 01		5,094,417 28		6·64
" Water	120,970 66	350,135 79		229,165 13		65·45
Miscellaneous	2,063,096 85	2,564,663 07		501,566 22		19·56
General	3,074,590 13	3,378,724 34		304,134 21		9·00
Transportation for Invest...Cr.	*1,987,543 45*	*703,042 94*	*1,284,500 51*		*182·71*	
Operating Ratios.						
Canadian Northern	109 37	124 38		15 01		12·06
Canadian Government	113 64	123 46		9 82		7·95
Grand Trunk Pacific	124 21	170 34		46 13		27·08
Total	112 70	129 32		16 62		12·85
Operating Deficit.						
Canadian Northern	6,475,911 14	16,258,579 80		9,782,668 66		60·17
Canadian Government	5,587,298 75	10,449,876 43		4,862,577 68		46·53
Grand Trunk Pacific	4,029,691 87	10,134,513 94		6,104,822 07		60·23
Total	16,092,901·76	36,842,970 17		20,750,068 41		56·32
Mileage in Operation.						
Canadian Northern—Steam	9,773·70	9,585·37	188·33		1·96	
Canadian Government	4,509·95	4,295·95	214·00		4·98	
Grand Trunk Pacific	2,756·38	2,756·38				
Total	17,040·03	16,637·70	402·33		2·42	
Can. Nor. Electric Lines	126·2	126·2				
System	17,166·23	16,763·90	402·33		2·40	
Average Mileage Operated.						
System	17,064·43	16,642·66	421·77		2·53	
Revenue Train Miles	$34,701,241	$37,920,271		$3,219,030		8·49
Earnings per R.T M.*	$3 60	$3 27	0·33		10·09	
Expenses " *	4 07	4 24		$0 17		4·01
Net Loss " *	0 47	0 97		0 50		51·35

*Electric and Water Lines Excluded.

[Mr. W. C. Kennedy.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS INCLUDING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY —*Concluded.*

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS—TWELVE MONTHS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1921 AND 1920 —*Concluded.*

Excluding St. John and Quebec Railway—Concluded.

	1921.	1920.	Increase.	Decrease.	% Incr.	% Decr.
Freight Traffic (Ecl. Elec. Lines).						
Revenue Tons Carried	21,182,466	25,089,376		3,906,910		15·57
Rev. Tons Carried 1 Mile	8,991,467,782	9,221,370,748		229,902,966		2·49
Average Rate per Ton	$ 4 41	$ 3 61	$ 0 80		22·16	
Avg. Rate per Ton per Mile	c. 1·039	c. 0·983	c. 0·056		5·70	
Avg. Distance Hauled Miles	424	368	56		15·22	
Passenger Traffic (Ecl. Elec. Lines).						
Rev. Passengers Carried	11,856,620	13,572,245		1,715,625		12·64
Rev. Psgrs. Carried 1 Mile	711,867,853	841,636,864		129,769,011		15·42
Average Rate per Passenger	$ 1 70	$ 1 66	$ 0 04		2·41	
Avg. Rate per Psgr. per Mile	c. 2·826	c. 2·684	c. 0·142		5·29	
Avg. Distance Hauled Miles	60·04	62·01		1·97		3·18

[STATEMENT NO. 3.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

(INCLUDING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY).

MEMORANDUM SHOWING OPERATING RESULTS BY MONTHS FOR YEAR 1921.

Month.	Earnings.	Operating Expenses.	Result.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
January	10,932,081 63	13,808,668 47	*2,876,586 84*
February	10,225,436 82	13,203,762 32	*2,978,325 50*
March	10,539,862 54	13,061,704 27	*2,521,841 73*
April	9,397,525 00	12,005,843 55	*2,608,318 55*
May	8,456,806 61	10,972,049 84	*2,515,243 23*
June	8,429,913 92	10,967,695 62	*2,537,781 70*
July	9,306,384 27	10,568,080 40	*1,261,696 13*
August	10,536,461 74	10,489,230 30	47,231 44
September	11,500,126 24	10,995,951 37	504,174 87
October	12,906,133 97	11,870,003 63	1,036,130 34
November	12,817,198 28	12,083,048 63	734,149 65
December	11,643,524 70	12,758,319 08	*1,114,794 38*
	126,691,455 72	142,784,357 48	*16,092,901 76*

[STATEMENT No. 4.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

(INCLUDING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY).

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF OPERATING DEFICITS FOR YEARS 1921 AND 1920.

	Year ending December 31st, 1921.		Year ending December 31st, 1920.	
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS		5,587,298 75		10,449,876 43
Divided as follows:—				
Intercolonial Railway	4,022,053 92		6,549,629 48	
Prince Edward Island Railway	617,158 93		729,772 16	
Transcontinental Railway	441,182 99		2,780,359 46	
Moncton and Buctouche Railway	43,946 17		43,800 68	
Elgin and Havelock Railway	39,250 67		47,518 25	
St. Martins Railway	42,068 38		60,305 39	
York and Carleton Railway	16,010 95		21,317 39	
Salisbury and Albert Railway	55,040 53		88,033 60	
Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway	25,773 49		20,413 49	
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway	154,504 52		29,329 87	
Cape Breton Railway	24,524 14		14,621 65	
Quebec and Saguenay Railway	33,862 98		13,189 84	
Hudson Bay Railway	71,921 08		51,585 17	
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM		6,475,911 14		16,258,579 80
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY		4,029,691 87		10,134,513 94
Total Deficit		16,092,901 76		36,842,970 17

[STATEMENT No. 5.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

INCOME ACCOUNT

for

YEARS ENDING DECEMBER 31ST, 1921 AND 1920.

	1921.	1920
GROSS OPERATING REVENUE.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	$ 69,088,474 16	$ 66,695,398 80
Canadian Government Railways	40,964,303 92	44,537,803 85
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	16,638,677 64	14,408,549 66
Canadian National Railways	$ 126,691,455 72	$ 125,641,752 31
OPERATING EXPENSES.	$ c.	$ c.
Canadian Northern Railway System	75,564,385 30	82,953,978 60
Canadian Government Railways	46,551,602 67	54,987,680 28
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	20,668,369 51	24,543,063 60
Canadian National Railways	142,784,357 48	162,484,722 48
NET DEFICIT FROM RAILWAY OPERATIONS.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	6,475,911 14	16,258,579 80
Canadian Government Railways	5,587,298 75	10,449,876 43
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4,029,691 87	10,134,513 94
Canadian National Railways	16,092,901 76	36,842,970 17
TAX ACCRUALS.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	1,191,890 84	1,185,652 28
Canadian Government Railways	35,743 87	60 50
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	357,394 54	45,409 30
Canadian National Railways	1,585,029 25	1,231,122 08

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—*Con.*

INCOME ACCOUNT
for
YEARS ENDING DECEMBER 31ST, 1921 AND 1920.

	1921.	1920.
	$ c.	$ c.
TOTAL OPERATING DEFICIT.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	7,667,801 98	17,444,232 08
Canadian Government Railways	5,623,042 62	10,449,936 93
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4,387,086 41	10,179,923 24
Canadian National Railways	17,677,931 01	38,074,092 25
NON OPERATING INCOME.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	3,119,349 72	1,845,994 62
Canadian Government Railways	457,352 46	1,737,978 51
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	863,185 83	1,837,442 03
Canadian National Railways	4,439,888 01	5,421,415 16
DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	1,011,242 14	125,637 37
Canadian Government Railways	845,065 71	720,096 33
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	801,667 77	812,404 79
Canadian National Railways	2,657,975 62	1,658,138 49
TOTAL DEFICITS BEFORE FIXED CHARGES.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	5,559,694 40	15,723,874 83
Canadian Government Railways	6,010,755 87	9,432,054 75
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4,325,568 35	9,154,886 00
Canadian National Railways	15,896,018 62	34,310,815 58
FIXED CHARGES.		
Canadian Northern Railway System—		
Interest due Public	17,595,707 51	13,993,695 36
Interest due Government	13,224,208 27	10,326,260 69
	30,819,915 78	24,319,956 05
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—		
Interest due Public	3,977,447 36	4,270,244 38
Interest due Government	1,535,474 22	1,539,224 00
Interest on Receiver's Certificates	1,702,886 64	808,351 63
Interest due Grank Trunk Railway	2,742,191 60	2,256,467 90
	9,957,999 82	8,874,287 91
Canadian National Railways	40,777,915 60	33,194,243 96
TOTAL DEFICIT.		
Canadian Northern Railway System	36,379,610 18	40,043,830 88
Canadian Government Railways	6,010,755 87	9,432,054 75
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	14,283,568 17	18,029,173 91
Canadian National Railways	56,673,934 22	67,505,059 54
St. John and Quebec Railway (leased)	316,044 60	346,015 49
Total deficit	56,989,978 82	67,851,075 03

[STATEMENT No. 6.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

MEMORANDUM SHOWING AMOUNT OF OPERATING REVENUE PAID IN LABOUR—YEARS 1921 AND 192 .

—	1921	1920.	Increase or Decrease	Inc. or Dec. %.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Gross Earnings:				
Canadian Northern Railway	69,088,474 16	66,695,398 80	2,393,075 36	3·59
Canadian Government Railways	40,964,303 92	44,537,803 85	*3,573,499 93*	*8·02*
Grand Trunk Pacific	16,638,677 64	14,408,549 66	2,230,127 98	15·48
System	126,691,455 72	125,641,752 31	1,049,703 41	0·84
Operating Labour:				
Canadian Northern Railway	42,233,504 97	47,563,113 08	*5,329,608 11*	*11·20*
Canadian Government Railways	28,649,972 81	35,941,959 31	*7,291,986 50*	*20·28*
Grand Trunk Pacific	11,498,120 09	15,262,647 77	*3,764,527 68*	*24·66*
System	82,381,597 87	98,767,720 16	*16,386,122 29*	*16·59*
Ratio of Labour to Gross Earnings:				
Canadian Northern Railway	61 13	71 31	*10 18*	*14·27*
Canadian Government Railways	69 94	80 70	*10 76*	*13·33*
Grand Trunk Pacific	69 10	105 92	*36 82*	*34·76*
System	65 03	78 61	*13 58*	*17·28*
Comparison of Payroll (Including Betterments):				
Canadian National Railways	88,755,060 20	105,109,808 29	*16,354,748 09*	*15·56*

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES.

—	1921.	1920.	Decrease	% Decr.
Canadian Government Railways	20,658	23,849	3,191	13·38
Canadian Northern Railway	32,384	33,654	1,270	3·77
Grand Trunk Pacific	7,281	7,821	540	6·90
Canadian National	60,323	65,324	5,001	7·66

[STATEMENT No. 7.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF TRAFFIC, 1921-20 (EXCLUSIVE OF ELECTRIC LINES).

——	1921.	1920.	Increase or Decrease.	Per Cent Increase.	Per Cent Decrease.
1. *Passengers Carried—*					
Canadian Government	6,235,601	7,344,074	* 1,108,473		15·09
Canadian Northern	4,862,887	5,468,352	* 605,465		11·07
Grand Trunk Pacific	814,845	824,732	* 9,887		1·20
**Canadian National	11,856,620	13,572,245	* 1,715,625		12·64
2. *Number Passengers Carried 1 Mile—*					
Canadian Government	298,645,302	361,555,820	* 62,910,518		17·40
Canadian Northern	335,277,128	387,818,185	* 52,541,057		13·55
Grand Trunk Pacific	77,945,423	92,262,859	* 14,317,436		15·52
Canadian National	711,867,853	841,636,864	*129,769,011		15·42
3. *Tons of Freight Handled—*					
Canadian Government	8,301,330	12,976,623	* 4,675,293		36·02
Canadian Northern	13,634,537	14,504,411	* 869,874		6·00
Grand Trunk Pacific	3,674,507	2,853,116	† 821,391	28·79	
**Canadian National	21,182,466	25,089,376	* 3,906,910		15·57
4. *Tons Freight Moved 1 Mile—*					
Canadian Government	2,706,274,266	3,422,139,155	*715,864,889		20·92
Canadian Northern	4,711,313,574	4,687,603,090	† 23,710,484	0·51	
Grand Trunk Pacific	1,573,879,942	1,111,628,503	†462,251,439	41·58	
Canadian National	8,991,467,782	9,221,370,748	*229,902,966		2·49

——	Per Passenger.		Per Ton Freight.	
	1921.	1920.	1921.	1920.
5. *Average Haul—*				
Canadian Government	47·89	49·23	326·00	263·72
Canadian Northern	68·95	70·92	345·54	323·18
Grand Trunk Pacific	95·66	111·87	428·32	389·62
**Canadian National	60·04	62·01	424·48	367·54

*Decrease.
†Increase.
**Less System Interline.

[STATEMENT No. 8.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

TRAIN MILEAGE.

—	1921	1920.	Inc. or Dec.	% Inc. or Dec.
Passenger—				
Canadian Government Railways	4,624,183	4,791,387	*167,204*	*3·49*
Canadian Northern Railway	6,348,272	6,992,016	*643,744*	*9·21*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	1,606,093	1,539,184	66,909	4·35
Canadian National Railways	12,578,548	13,322,587	*744,039*	*5·58*
Mixed—				
Canadian Government Railways	1,116,665	1,236,931	*120,266*	*9·72*
Canadian Northern Railway	1,784,768	1,824,059	*39,291*	*2·15*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	368,075	435,975	*67,900*	*15·57*
Canadian National Railways	3,269,508	3,496,965	*227,457*	*6·50*
Freight—				
Canadian Government Railways	5,297,882	6,611,115	*1,313,233*	*19·86*
Canadian Northern Railways	10,305,947	11,559,893	*1,253,946*	*10·85*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	3,111,247	2,817,337	293,910	10·43
Canadian National Railways	18,715,076	20,988,345	*2,273,269*	*10·83*
Special—				
Canadian Government Railways	10,680	28,618	*17,938*	*62·68*
Canadian Northern Railway	28,496	82,132	*53,636*	*65·30*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	8,782	53	8,729	.....
Canadian National Railways	47,958	110,803	*62,845*	*56·71*
Work—				
Canadian Government Railways	313,360	622,360	*309,000*	*49·65*
Canadian Northern Railway	1,124,793	1,712,118	*587,325*	*34·30*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	412,619	732,849	*320,230*	*43·70*
Canadian National Railways	1,850,772	3,067,327	*1,216,555*	*39·66*
Total—				
Canadian Government Railways	11,362,770	13,290,411	*1,927,641*	*14·50*
Canadian Northern Railway	19,592,276	22,170,218	*2,577,942*	*11·63*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	5,506,816	5,525,398	*18,582*	*0·34*
Canadian National Railways	36,461,862	40,986,027	*4,524,165*	*11·04*

[STATEMENT No. 9.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

(Including Grand Trunk Pacific Railway)

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EQUIPMENT ON HAND DECEMBER 31ST, 1920; DELIVERIES, RETIREMENTS AND POSITION AT DECEMBER 31ST, 1921.

——	Dec. 31st, 1920.	Retirements during the year.	Delivered during Year	Dec. 31st, 1921.
Locomotives—				
Passenger	1,730	9	12	1,733
Freight	.....	.....	.....	.....
Switching	226	.....	1	227
Electric Locomotives	13	.....	.....	13
Total Locomotives	1,969	9	13	1,973
Passenger Equipment—				
First Class Cars	477	14	14	477
Second Class Cars	249	19	.....	230
Combination Cars	192	.....	3	195
Emigrant Cars	348	6	.....	342
Dining Cars	62	1	12	73
Parlor Cars	67	3	3	67
Sleeping Cars	202	1	21	222
Postal Cars	55	.....	.....	55
Baggage and Express	509	14	70	565
Business and Pay Cars	66	2	2	66
Other Cars in Passenger Service	61	4	26	83
Total	2,288	64	151	2,375
Freight Equipment—				
Box Cars	55,824	706	715	55,833
Flat Cars	9,768	182	.....	9,586
Stock Cars	3,494	19	350	3,825
Coal Cars	8,371	112	.....	8,259
Tank Cars	78	7	.....	71
Refrigerator Cars	1,719	23	104	1,800
Other Cars in Freight Service	1,435	29	189	1,595
Total	80,689	1,078	1,358	80,969
Work Equipment—				
Gravel Cars	271	7	215	479
Derrick Cars	181	14	20	187
Caboose Cars	1,074	55	30	1,049
Other Road Cars	3,497	251	173	3,419
Total	5,023	327	438	5,134
Total Cars	88,000	1,469	1,947	88,478

[STATEMENT No. 10.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS INCLUDING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

ANNUAL REPORT WITH REGARD TO BETTERMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1921.

The total main track mileage operated by the Canadian National Railways on January 1, 1921 was 17,215·27 miles.

On December 31, 1921 the operated mileage was as follows:—

Canadian Northern Railway Eastern Lines—		
Including Halifax and South Western Railway	2,949·91	
Canadian Northern Railway Western Lines—		
Including D. W. and P. Railway	6,823·79	
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway and Toronto Suburban Railway (Electric Lines)	126·20	
		9,899·90
Canadian Government Railways—		
Intercolonial (Including Branch Lines)	2,289·22	
National Transcontinental Railway (Including Lake Superior Branch)	2,006·73	
St. John and Quebec Railway (Leased)	172·07	
Hudson Bay Railway	214·00	
		4,682·02
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway		2,756·38
Total Miles Operated		17,338·30

Lines on which construction was completed and taken over for operation—during the year and included in the above figures

	Miles Added	
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines—		
Burrill Deviation 4·0 miles decreased length of main line by 0·40 miles.		
Washago Connection 0·7 miles made no increase in length of main line.		
Sellwood Jct. to Sellwood 0·18 miles decreased length of main track 0·73 miles.		
T. and Nor. Ont. Connection North Bay	0·25	
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines—		
Preeceville to Lintlaw	27·70	
Sangudo to Whitecourt	38·80	
Cessford to Steveville	11·80	
Lucky Lake to Demaine	9·00	
Humbolt to St. Brieux	32·60	
Moosejaw to Jct. with Riverhurst Sub. Div	1·33	
Union Jct. Edmonton	0·56	
Connection Camrose	0·08	
Connection Alix	0·74	
Connection Barlow	1·30	
Total	124·16	
Less reduction in mileage as above	1·13	Miles
		123·03

Net increase in mileage put in operation, 1921.

In addition to the above the following mileage was put into temporary operation and is included in the operated mileage of the System—

Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines—	Miles	
Turtleford to St. Walburg	22·1	
Demain to Beechy	5·6	
Melford to Ridgedale	23·7	
Lintlaw to Kelvington	13·9	
		65·3
Grand Total Mileage Added		188·33

The following betterments were made to Roadbed and Track during the year 1921:—

New 85-lb. Rail Laid 1921—	Miles
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	166·08
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	71·26
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	37·67
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	211·91
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	24·00
Total	510·92

Second Hand Relay Rail Laid 1921—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	Nil
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	26·87
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	38·89
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	1·71
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	Nil
Total	67·47

Ties Put in Track for Renewals—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	1,193,387
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	147,987
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines (Including Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry.)	1,002,147
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines (Including D.W. and P. Ry.)	2,490,943
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	828,756
Total	5,663,220

	Miles
Ballasting Chargeable to Capital Account, 1921—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	35·3
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	103·3
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	164·0
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	140·3
Total	442·9

	Number
Water Supplies, 1921—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	16
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	13
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	3
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	72
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	23
Halifax and South Western Railway	3
Total	130

	Number
Tie Plates, 1921—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	Nil
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	62,500
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	10,000
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	238,455
Halifax and South Western Railway	Nil
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	121,083
Total	432,038

	Number
Rail Anchors, 1921—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	6,250
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	32,500
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	2,500
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	104,450
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	7,000
Halifax and South Western Railway	Nil
Total	152,700

	Miles
Fencing Wire and Snow—	
Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines	15·4
Canadian Government Railways, Western Lines	1·5
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines	7·5
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines	37·2
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	28·8
Total	90·4

The following new structures were constructed and improvements to existing structures and facilities carried out:

Item.	Canadian Government Railways.		Canadian Northern Railway.		Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.	Total.
	Eastern Lines.	Western Lines.	Eastern Lines.	Western Lines.		
Stations, New	9	.....	1	5	3	18
" Extension	2	.....	3	1	.....	6
Freight Sheds, New	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1
" Extensions	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	2
Bunk Houses, Section Dwellings	13	4	3	31	19	70
Other Buildings, New	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
" Extensions	11	.....	5	9	4	29
Coaling Plants	2	.....	4	2	2	10
Sidings and Extensions to Sidings	65	6	37	30	6	144
New Culverts	17	.....	9	28	9	63
New Bridges	5	.....	20	8	.....	33
Bridges and Trestles filled	14	2	67	39	13	135
	140	12	149	154	56	511

In addition to the above, considerable work was undertaken such as the construction of farm and highway crossings, roadways, ashpits, drop-pits, loading platforms, ditching and wells for station water supply, etc., and the installation of track scales, turntables, interlocking plants, machinery in shops and roundhouses and the heating and lighting of stations, freight sheds, etc.

The following are some of the larger items carried out during the year:—

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS (Eastern Lines)

At Fairview—grading for locomotive terminal started during the previous year was completed.

The replacement of the double track bridge over the Tantramar river, near Sackville, was completed during the year.

At Cape Tormentine, dredging the entrance channel and turning basin, in order to provide a greater depth of water for the ferry steamer s.s. Prince Edward Island, was continued and 65 per cent completed, at the end of the year.

Between Sackville and Painsec Junction absolute permissive automatic block signals were installed, thereby increasing the capacity and improving operation for traffic over this portion of the line.

At Moncton new terminal facilities, consisting of a 40-stall engine-house, machine-shop, power-house, stores building, turntable, coaling plant, water tank, stand pipes, cinder pits, and the necessary lighting, water and sewer facilities was undertaken and was sufficiently completed to be put into operation by the middle of December. Realignment of the main line and alterations and additions to yard tracks in connection with the new facilities were also made.

At Moncton mechanical shops—mechanical stokers were installed and duct for power line constructed.

At Bathurst—terminal facilities to facilitate the operation of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway were constructed consisting of a three-stall engine-house, turntable, ashpit and air hoist, together with the necessary trackage.

Grade and alignment revisions between McGivney Junction and Fredericton, which were started during the previous year, were completed.

On branch lines in New Brunswick the replacement of a number of bridges and the strengthening of trestles was carried out.

Between Lévis and Chaudière the installation of automatic signals was 50 per cent completed.

At Chaudière Junction improvements to terminal facilities consisting of extension to engine-house, new machine shop, coaling plant, ashpit, stand-pipes and yard re-arrangement was 80 per cent completed at the end of the year.

In connection with the co-ordination of the C.G.R. and G.T.R. at St. Rosalie Junction, a six-stall extension to the engine-house and additional yard tracks were provided. The installation of a new water supply at this terminal was 87 per cent completed.

At Hervey Junction the C.N.R. and C.G.R. facilities were co-ordinated, a connection being constructed to enable both lines to use the same station. Additional tracks were provided and a new station built replacing the former station, which was destroyed by fire.

At Parent commencement was made on the construction of staff quarters.

On the Amos subdivision, the replacement of trestle over the Coffee river with permanent structure was 13 per cent completed and the replacement of trestle over the Matagan river 75 per cent completed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Eastern Lines)

Between miles 67.6 and 91.6 on the St. Lawrence subdivision a diversion known as the Burrill deviation was constructed reducing the grades and curvature. On the original lines there were two steel viaducts, but on the deviation only one was required, the other being replaced by culvert and fill. This work was 95 per cent completed.

At Hawkesbury, in order to co-ordinate the G.T.R. and C.N.R. facilities, eliminating one of the stations and an interlocking plant, two main track connections and some additional yard tracks were installed and a three-stall extension to the engine-house built. These works were 70 per cent completed at the end of the year.

At Rockland, a connecting track between the C.N.R. and G.T.R. was constructed, siding tracks provided and one-stall engine-house built. These works were 80 per cent completed at the end of the year, and when fully completed will permit of the consolidation of the stations and the elimination of a diamond crossing and interlocking protection.

At Washago in connection with co-ordination of the C.N.R. and G.T.R., a connection and passing siding were constructed and the C.N.R. station moved to the junction point.

At Hornepayne a new station was erected.

A number of trestles were replaced with concrete culverts and fill or with permanent steel structures and some steel bridges were renewed with heavier spans.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Western Lines)

New steel bridge over South Saskatchewan river at Saskatoon, replacing Howe truss spans, was completed.

Work commenced on new steel bridge seven miles east of Brandon, Man.

Crossing at Kaministiqua river, North Lake subdivision. Work started on new steel bridge.

New subway 90 per cent completed at Dauphin, Man., for pedestrian traffic.

Moose Jaw, Sask., new subway at Athabasca street, completed.

On the Boston Bar subdivision, British Columbia, reinforced concrete culverts were installed at various points, and 312 feet of tunnel lining completed.

New water supply at mile 85.2, Gladstone subdivision, has been established.

Work started on new reservoir for water supply at Ethelbert and work progressed far enough to have enough water to carry along.

At Maymont, Sask., a good water supply has been provided, water being taken from Saskatchewan river.

An excellent water supply at Dona, located to serve two subdivisions which cross at this location, has been completed.

A dam has been constructed at Kindersley, Sask., to collect water from spring run-off.

At South Saskatoon (Nutana), a new terminal yard has been completed and facilities provided comprised of new engine-house, coaling plant, machine shop, stores building, ash-pits, etc.

New freight tracks have been constructed in Winnipeg terminals and extensions were made to passenger tracks.

The yards at Hanna, Drumheller and Wayne were extended and new passing tracks were installed at various points on the Hanna and Drumheller subdivisions, to facilitate the movement of coal.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

At Melville, Sask., a contract was let for construction of dam and reservoir of approximately 250 million (250,000,000) gallons capacity. The reservoir was almost completely filled by rains during months of September and October and an ample supply of good water is now assured. Pipe line and pumping station were constructed in connection with this work.

Water supplies at Hubbard, Archydal and Riverhurst were completed to such an extent as to assure a supply of water at each point during 1922.

A portion of frame trestle at Birdtail creek, mile 190, Miniota subdivision, is being replaced by steel span on concrete piers, the work being 40 per cent completed at the end of the year.

Salmon wharf at Prince Rupert has been practically completed and warehouse is being erected.

New stations are being erected at Prince George and Prince Rupert.

Track diversion at Firdale completed.

Addition to Edson roundhouse completed.

During the present year it is proposed to continue works which were uncompleted at the end of last year and undertake new works of which the larger items are briefly referred to below:—

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS (Eastern Lines)

Continue the work of dredging at Cape Tormentine, yard improvements at Moncton, installation of automatic signals between Lévis and Chaudière, construction of staff quarters at Parent, replacing trestles over the Coffee and Matagan rivers on the Amos subdivision.

Flattening the slope and placing additional rock and large capping stones on the breakwater at Cape Tormentine.

Provide two eighty-ton cranes for Moncton repair shop.

Completion of yard extension and rearrangement of main line at St. John.

Provide telephone train dispatching service between Mont Joli and Lévis.

Extend stores building at St. Malo.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Eastern Lines)

Complete the work on Burrill deviation and replacement of trestles on various subdivisions.

Extend five stalls of the engine-house and provide additional machinery at Parry Sound.

Ballasting on various subdivisions.

Construct a new station at Napanee.

Provide additional stores accommodation and scrap reclaim building and plant at Leaside.

Pave roadways and provide drainage at Cherry street yard.

Provide additional terminal accommodation and trackage at Quebec.

Construct six-stall extension to engine-house and provide additional yard facilities at Limoilou.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS (Western Lines)

Erect boarding-house for staff at Sioux Lookout and lengthen fifteen stalls of engine-house.

Fill various trestles.

Provide telephone train dispatching service between Sioux Lookout and Winnipeg.

Install scrap reclamation plant at Transcona.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Western Lines)

On the D.W. and P. railway it is proposed to construct car repair shops at Virginia and Duluth as required by the Minnesota state laws.

Between Port Arthur and Fort William a second track is proposed to provide for the dense traffic between these points.

A number of wooden trestles are to be replaced with steel bridges on concrete foundations and a number with concrete culverts and earth fills.

Wooden bridges over the Kaministiqua and Assiniboine rivers are to be replaced with steel trusses on concrete substructures.

Ballasting on various subdivisions.

At Fort Rouge a new trunk sewer and a filtering plant for the water supply are to be constructed to serve the terminal. New water supplies are proposed at Maryfield, Rama, Avonlea, Gravelbourg, Delisle, Wiseton, Eston, Lloydminster, Vegreville, Mecheche, and completion of the water supplies at Paskwegin and Kindersley.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

Construct additional trackage at Watrous and Rivers terminals and improve the water supply at the latter point.

Provide water supplies at Arrow river, Tate and Bradwell and complete the water supply at Hubbard.

Complete the filling of Battle river trestle.

Improve Mirror terminal by the construction of six additional stalls to roundhouse and additional trackage.

Construct a freight repair shop at North Edmonton, this to form a unit of a complete repair shop at that point.

Construct a diversion of the railway at the Big Eddy crossing at Sundance creek.

Complete the construction of a terminal at Coalspur.

Complete the construction of a station, Salmon dock and warehouse at Prince Rupert.

Complete the filling of the Ky-ax river crossing and erect a steel span to provide permanent waterway at this point.

Ballasting on various subdivisions.

Replace various trestle bridges with steel spans on concrete substructures or with concrete culverts and earth fills.

CO-ORDINATION, CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY, CANADIAN GOVERNMENT AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS

Connect Transcontinental railway with Canadian Northern at Mokomon, in order to permit abandonment of approximately 28 miles of the Lake Superior branch.

Provide new classification yards west of Fort William.

Consolidation of C.N.R. and G.T.P. yards at Portage la Prairie.

Complete the consolidation of terminal facilities at Regina.

Consolidate the G.T.P. and C.N.R. in one line through Camrose and provide the necessary connections.

Complete connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P. at East Edmonton.

Consolidate the C.N.R. with the G.T.P. in the vicinity of Entwhistle and construct the necessary connections.

Construct connections between G.T.P. and C.N.R. at Stony Plains and abandon the C.N.R. between Edmonton and Stony Plains.

Consolidate Lucerne and Jasper terminals at one point.

[STATEMENT No. 11.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

STATEMENT OF POLE AND WIRE MILEAGES

	January 1, 1922		January 1, 1921	
	Poles	Wires	Poles	Wires
C.N.R. System (Including Transcontinental and Intercolonial)	12,150	57,157	10,424	44,553
Great North Western System	8,201	37,925	8,181	29,401
Grand Trunk Pacific System	2,818	14,590	2,820	14,430
	23,169	109,672	21,425	88,384

PRINCIPAL ADDITIONAL WIRES ERECTED IN 1921

Number	Kind of Wire	Between	Mileage
1	Copper	Winnipeg-Vancouver	1,645
2	"	Newcastle-Campbellton	214
1	"	Montreal-Quebec	178
1	"	Toronto-Niagara Falls	84
—	"	Miscellaneous	318
1	Iron	Saskatoon-Calgary	399
1	"	Edmonton-Vancouver	779
2	"	Vancouver Island	147
1	"	Warden-Brazeau	173
—	"	Miscellaneous	350
			4,287

Memorandum

Poles and wires property of G.N.W. System not on Canadian National Railway Right-of-way have been included in 1922 Statement, also Railway Wires in Western Union Territory East of Moncton. These were not included in 1921 Statement and will explain increased mileages.

[STATEMENT No. 12.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT OF WORK DONE ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW LINES DURING THE YEAR 1921

Eastern Lines

There was no work done on Eastern lines in the way of constructing new branches, all this work during the year being confined to Western lines.

Western Lines

Grading.—During the year there was the equivalent of 67 miles of grading completed. By "equivalent" is meant that in certain places each mile may not have been completely finished so the percentage of this in yards to the whole yardage was taken to get the number of miles done.

Of this 67 miles of grading 65.6 miles were done on prairie lines and 1.4 in British Columbia on the Okanagan branch.

An appended statement gives in detail the branches on which this grading was accomplished, and is divided by provinces; this shows there was completed in Manitoba, nil; Saskatchewan, 51.2 miles; Alberta, 14.4 miles, and in British Columbia, 1.4 miles.

Bridges and Trestles.—On new lines in 1921 in the erection of 51 bridges and trestles 4,015,200 feet B.M. of timber, 118,260 lineal feet of piling, and 200,760 pounds of iron were used. Detail of where this work was done is given on an attached statement.

Cowichan river bridges at miles 71.6 and 74.6 and E. and N. crossing at mile 74.4 Vancouver Island line were completed during the year.

The substructure of the bridge over the Red Deer river at mile 59.3 on Hanna-Medicine Hat line was also completed during the year.

The erection of some wooden bridges on the Okanagan branch was also proceeded with.

Tracklaying.—There was laid in 1921, 99.6 miles of track on new lines, 96.5 miles being laid on prairie lines, and 3.1 miles in British Columbia on the Vancouver Island line. Detailed statement attached shows the branches on which this track was laid, and divided into provinces shows there was laid in Manitoba 17.7 miles, in Saskatchewan 66.9 miles, in Alberta 11.9 miles, and in British Columbia 3.1 miles.

In connection with tracklaying 74 switches and frogs were placed for sidings and wyes on new lines. This used up 10 miles of track in addition to the main line track referred to above.

Ballasting and Surfacing.—In 1921 there were 188.6 miles of new track ballasted; the whole of this was on prairie lines. Detailed statement is attached showing the branches on which this ballasting was done, and divided into provinces shows there was ballasted on Saskatchewan lines 90 miles, and on Alberta lines 98.6 miles. There was no ballasting done on new lines in other provinces.

Fencing and Telegraph Lines.—264.08 miles of fence, and 163.2 miles of telegraph line were erected during the year. Detailed statement showing the lines on which this work was done, and given mileages is attached.

Buildings and Structures

Water Tanks.—6 water tanks were completed in the season for new lines and 5 pump-houses, and 2,515 lineal feet of pipe line built to serve them.

Stations.—During the year one third class and one fourth class stations, 11 freight and passenger shelters, 32 loading platforms, and 12 stock yards, were erected on new lines.

Section Houses.—Nine section houses were completed on new lines during 1921. The branches on which these buildings were placed is shown in the attached table.

Miles Put in Operation.—During 1921 on Canadian Northern, Western lines, there were 173.4 miles of new lines turned over to the operating department for permanent operation, and in addition to this 65.3 miles of new lines were turned over to the operating department for operation on behalf of construction department, or a total of 238.7 miles. Attached is detailed statement showing these lines and mileages.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

WESTERN LINES.

STATEMENT SHOWING FENCING AND TELEGRAPH LINE ERECTED DURING 1921.

Branch.	Fencing. Fence Miles	Telegraph Line. Miles.
Onoway	68·30	16·0
Melfort-Humboldt	20·90	
Oliver	42·70	10·5
Melfort, N.E	2·00	23·0
Jackfish	44·00	21·5
Hanna-Medicine Hat	18·33	7·8
Luck Lake	32·35	9·2
Red Deer Spur	.....	6·1
Thunderhill Branch	.....	13·5
Okanagan Branch	35·5	
Vancouver Island Line	.....	55·6
Total	264·08	163·2

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

WESTERN LINES

STATEMENT SHOWING GRADING, TRACKLAYING AND BALLAST DONE DURING THE YEAR 1921.

Branch.	Grading.	Tracklaying	Ballasting.
Manitoba—			
Amaranth	.....	17·7	
Total for Manitoba	.....	17·7	
Saskatchewan—			
Peebles-Lampman	.....	0·5	
Thunderhill	1·7	13·9	28·0
Melfort, N.E	.....	23·7	
Melfort-Humboldt	.....	.....	33·0
Prince Albert, N.E	13·5	.....	
Luck Lake	3·2	15·02	29·0
Eston, S.E	4·9	0·17	
Turtleford, S.E	21·4	.....	
Jackfish Lake	6·5	13·06	
Acadia Valley	.....	0·64	
Total for Saskatchewan	51·2	66·9	90·0
Alberta—			
Acadia Valley	12·6	.....	
Hanna-Medicine Hat	1·6	.....	58·6
Onoway Branch	0·2	11·9	40·0
Total for Alberta	14·4	11·9	98·6
British Columbia—			
Okanagan Branch	1·4	.....	
Vancouver Island	.....	3·1	
Total for British Columbia	1·4	3·1	
Total all Western Lines	67·0	99·6	188·6
SUMMARY.			
Manitoba	.....	17·7	
Saskatchewan	51·2	66·9	90·0
Alberta	14·4	11·9	98·6
Total Prairies	65·6	96·5	188·6
British Columbia	1·4	3·1	
Totals	67·0	99·6	188·6

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Western Lines.

Statement of Miles of New Lines put into either Permanent or Temporary Operation, 1921.

No.	Branch.	From Mile.	To Mile.	Miles.	Total.
	Turned Over for Permanent Operation.				
	Saskatchewan.				
11	Luck Lake	19·75	28·8 (Demaine)	9·0	
7	Melfort-Humboldt	21·5 (St. Brieux) "A"	54·1 (Humboldt)	32·6	
5	Thunderhill	72·6 (Preeceville) "B"	100·3 (Lintlaw)	27·7	69·3
	Alberta.				
"C"	Drumheller Sub	315·6 (West of Drumheller)	322·7 (Just beyond Wayne)	7·1	
18	Hanna-Medicine Hat	0·0 (Med. Hat. Jct.)	58·2 (Steveville) "D"	58·2	
22	Onoway	33·4 (Robinsons)	72·2 (Whitecourt)	38·8	104·1
	Mileage put in Permanent Operation				173·4
	Turned Over for Temporary Operation on Behalf of Construction Dept.				
	Saskatchewan.				
15	Jackfish Lake	55·7 (Turtleford)	77·8 (St. Walburg)	22·1	
11	Luck Lake	28·8 (Demaine)	34·4 (Beechy)	5·6	
6	Melfort, N.E	0·0 (Melfort)	23·7 (Just beyond Ridgedale)	23·7	
5	Thunderhill	100·3 (Lintlaw)	114·2 (Kelvington)	13·9	
	Mileage put in Temporary Operation				65·3

SUMMARY.

Mileage put in Permanent Operation	173·4
Mileage put in Temporary Operation	65·3
Total Mileage put in Operation	238·7

"A" Previously near Lake Lenore to Humboldt (15 miles) operated on Behalf of Construction Department.
"B" Previously operated on behalf of Construction Department.
"C" Double track.
"D" Included in this figure is 46·4 miles, from Mile 0·0 to Mile 46·4 which was taken over for Permanent Operation prior to 1921, but not reported by this office.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

STATEMENT OF WORK DONE BY CONSTRUCTION DEPT., 1921.

Branch.	Turnouts Placed	Tanks.	Pump Houses.	Pipe Line.	3rd Class Stn.	4th Class Stn.	F. & P. Shelter.	Section Houses.	Loading P.F's.	Stock Yards.	No. of Trestles.	Trestles.	Piles Driven.	Iron.
				Lin. Ft.								M.F.B.M.	Lin. Ft.	Lbs.
Prairie Lines.														
Acadia Valley	3													
Alsask S.E.									1					
Amaranth Extension	9										7	45,800	1,720	2,290
Eston S.E.	1													
Hanna-Medicine Hat	4	1	1	75			1	1	3	2	2	449,700	18,745	22,485
Humboldt-Melfort Branch							1	3	3	2				
Jackfish Lake Branch	9	1	1	400					3	2	2	311,500	7,825	15,575
Luck Lake Branch	9					1	1	2	5	2	2	62,800	2,560	3,140
Melfort N.E.	11	1							3		5	82,500	4,515	4,125
Munson-Wayne Dbl. Track	8										2	90,700	4,820	4,535
Onoway Branch	9	1	1	240			2		4		26	2,937,000	76,245	146,850
Oliver N.E. Branch		1	1	1,700	1		3	3	3	4				
Peebles-Lampman Branch											1	6,200	325	310
Line Rev. 333·5 Drumheller Sub	2													
Thunderhill Ext.	9								4		4	29,000	1,505	1,450
Swift Current Ext.		1	1	100					3					
Total Prairie Lines	74	6	5	2,515	1	1	8	9	32	12	51	4,015,200	118,260	200,760
British Columbia. Vancouver Island							3							
Grand Total	74	6	5	2,515	1	1	11	9	32	12	51	4,015,200	118,260	200,760

STATEMENTS REFERRED TO BY THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS IN CONNECTION WITH THE OPERATIONS OF THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY PROPERTIES DURING 1921.

Statement No. 1

Comparative statement of the results of the operations of the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont, for the years ending December 31, 1920 and 1921.

Statement No. 2

Comparative statement of the principal and interest and the funded debt of the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont, for the years ending December 31, 1920 and 1921, showing the increase in principal and interest charges in 1921 over 1920.

Statement No. 3

Comparative statement of the results of the operations of certain stock controlled subsidiary companies, the net results of whose operations do not wholly enter the net income of the Grand Trunk Railway system.

Statement No. 4

Some comparative operating and statistical information in respect of the Grand Trunk Canadian lines for the years ending December 31, 1920 and 1921.

Statement No. 5

Statement showing for the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont. the locomotive and car stock on hand December 31, 1921.

Statement No. 6

Statement for the Grand Trunk Railway system, including the Central Vermont, showing the additions to investment during the year ending December 31, 1921.

STATEMENT No. 1.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT)
RESULTS OF OPERATIONS 1921-1920.

	1921.	1920.
Railway Operating Revenues.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Lines	76,858,032 27	81,442,647 32
Western Lines	22,193,256 82	22,106,707 15
New England Lines	2,910,515 43	2,936,869 55
Central Vermont	7,135,753 06	6,737,710 50
	109,097,557 58	113,223,934 52
Railway Operating Expenses.		
Canadian Lines	71,179,292 80	76,213,815 16
Western Lines	22,641,181 93	21,389,912 07
New England Lines	3,592,005 72	3,712,544 75
Central Vermont	7,312,559 48	7,568,556 60
	104,725,039 93	108,884,828 58
Net Revenue from Railway Operations.		
Canadian Lines	5,678,739 47	5,228,832 16
Western Lines	447,925 11 Def.	716,795 08
New England Lines	681,490 29 Def.	775,675 20 Def.
Central Vermont	176,806 42 Def.	830,846 10 Def.
	4,372,517 65	4,339,105 94
Taxes, Uncollectable Railway Revenues, Hire of Equipment and Joint Facility Rents—Net.		
Canadian Lines	1,149,574 46 Cr.	156,614 01 Cr.
Western Lines	3,640,721 22 Dr.	3,841,249 46 Dr.
New England Lines	673,594 82 Dr.	724,027 95 Dr.
Central Vermont	469,122 37 Dr.	377,346 97 Dr.
	3,633,863 95 Dr.	4,786,010 37 Dr.

STATEMENT No. 1—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT)

RESULTS OF OPERATIONS 1921–1920.

—	1921.	1920.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Net Operating Income or Loss.		
Canadian Lines	6,828,313 93	5,385,446 17
Western Lines	4,088,646 33 Def.	3,124,454 38 Def.
New England Lines	1,355,085 11 Def.	1,499,703 15 Def.
Central Vermont	645,928 79 Def.	1,208,193 07 Def.
	738,653 70	446,904 43 Def.
Difference	.....	1,185,558 13
Other Income—Net.		
Canadian Lines	2,278,129 80 Cr.	2,996,057 06 Cr.
Western Lines	1,368,567 48 Cr.	3,124,881 93 Cr.
New England Lines	526,008 73 Dr.	508,834 12 Cr.
Central Vermont	286,057 91 Dr.	1,315,524 62 Cr.
	2,834,630 64 Cr.	7,945,297 73 Cr.
Difference	.....	5,110,667 09
Net Income Before Fixed Charges.		
Canadian Lines	9,106,443 73	8,381,503 23
Western Lines	2,720,078 85 Def.	427 65
New England Lines	1,881,093 84 Def.	990,869 03 Def.
Central Vermont	931,986 70 Def.	107,331 55
	3,573,284 34	7,498,393 30
Fixed Charges—Interest on Funded Debt.		
Payable to Dominion Government Canadian Lines	3,107,420 66	771,450 67
	3,107,420 66	771,450 67
Payable to others—		
Canadian Lines	13,385,194 04	10,765,944 62
Western Lines	2,077,098 70	1,935,583 49
Central Vermont	675,870 28	552,658 29
	16,138,163 02	13,254,186 40
Net Income or Loss.		
Canadian Lines	7,386,170 97 Def.	3,155,892 06 Def.
Western Lines	4,797,177 55 Def.	1,935,155 94 Def.
New England Lines	1,881,093 84 Def.	990,869 03 Def.
Central Vermont	1,607,856 98 Def.	445,326 74 Def.
	15,672,229 34 Def.	6,527,243 77 Def.
Difference	.....	9,145,055 57

NOTES:—1. 1921 figures do not include credits on account of interest on advances to G.T.P. Ry., shown in G.T.P. statement as $2,742,191.60, and do not take into account in statement of interest due Government $1,000,000 payable to Government for loans to G.T.P., $10,000,000 (due 1919) and $15,000,000 (due 1923) guaranteed by G.T.

2. 1920 statement of Operating results shows operations of Lines in U.S., for ten month period only. Corporate income, however, is for 12 months and includes Standard return paid and to be paid by U. S. Railroad Administration.

[Mr.W. C. Kennedy.]

STATEMENT No. 2.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT 1920 AND 1921.

	1920.			1921.		
	Principal O/S Dec. 31.	Rate.	Interest.	Principal O/S Dec. 31.	Rate.	Interest.
	£ cts.	%	$ cts.	$ cts.	%	$ cts.
Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.						
G.T.R. Perpetual Debenture Stock	20,782,491 67	5	1,039,124 58	20,782,491 67	5	1,039,124 58
G.W. " " "	13,252,322 67	5	662,616 12	13,252,322 67	5	662,616 12
G.T.R. Consolidated Debenture Stock	119,839,014 33	4	4,793,560 56	119,839,014 33	4	4,793,560 56
Northern Railway Perpetual Stock	1,499,979 67	4	59,999 18	1,499,979 67	4	59,999 18
Canada Atlantic 1st Mortgage Bonds	16,000,092 00	4	640,003 68	16,000,092 00	4	640,003 68
Northern Railway 3rd Preference Bonds	70,566 66	6	4,234 00	70,566 66	6	4,234 00
Second Equipment Mortgage Bonds	719,780 00	6	43,186 80	.....	6	*21,593 40
Wellington, Grey and Bruce Bonds	279,346 67	Vs.	28,266 37	268,640 00	Vs.	*28,223 37
Guaranteed Stock	60,833,333 33	4	1,482,812 50	60,833,333 33	4	†2,433,333 33
Equipment Trust Notes "A"	591,000 00	4½	39,892 50	197,000 00	4½	*19,207 50
" " " "B"	672,000 00	4½	41,580 00	336,000 00	4½	*23,940 00
" " " "C"	672,000 00	4½	37,800 00	448,000 00	4½	*26,040 00
Whipple Car Shop Bonds	75,000 00	6	5,250 00	45,000 00	6	*4,350 00
Notes Payable Whipple Car Shops	200,000 00	5	12,500 00	100,000 00	5	*5,000 00
5 year 5½% Secured Notes July 1920	.....	.....	334,583 33	.....	.....	*
3 year 6% Secured Notes Jan. 1921.	4,866,666 67	6	292,000 00	.....	.....	*
Equipment Trust Notes "D"	1,750,000 00	5	96,875 00	1,500,000 00	5	*79,166 66
3 year 6% Secured Notes	14,600,000 00	6	876,000 00	.....	.....	*657,000 00
20 year S.F.G. Debenture Bonds	25,000,000 00	7	218,750 00	24,743,000 00	7	†1,741,824 00
Equipment Trust Notes U.S.R.A.	898,500 00	6	53,910 00	838,600 00	6	*50,316 00
Equipment Trust Certificate "F"	.....	.....	.....	11,586,000 00	6½	†703,994 99
15 year S.F.G. Debenture Bonds	.....	.....	.....	25,000,000 00	6	†391,666 67
Dominion Government Loan—						
1918	593,733 34	6	35,624 00	.....	.....	35,624 00
1919	554,800 00	.....	.....	.....	6	†33,288 00
1920–21	20,192,275 28	6	735,826 67	25,000,000 00	6	†1,481,038 81
1921–22	.....	.....	.....	48,702,154 42	6	†1,557,469 85
Sundry items	35,000 00	Vs.	3,000 00	.....	.....	*
Total Grand Trunk Railway Co. of Canada	303,977,902 29	.....	11,537,395 29	371,042,194 75	.....	†16,492,614 70

* Decrease.
† Increase.

STATEMENT No. 2—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST ON FUNDED DEBT 1920 AND 1921.

	1920.			1921.		
	Principal. O/S Dec. 31.	Rate.	Interest.	Principal. O/S Dec. 31.	Rate.	Interest.
	$ cts.	%	$ cts.	$ cts.	%	$ cts.
Grand Trunk Western Railway Company.						
1st Mortgage Bonds	14,990,720 00	4	599,988 80	14,990,720 00	4	599,988 80
Cons. Mortgage Bonds	11,541,000 00	4	461,640 00	11,541,000 00	4	461,640 00
G. T. Jct. Mortgage Bonds	3,872,000 00	5	193,600 00	3,872,000 00	5	193,600 00
Equip. Gold Notes	3,027,000 00	6	174,052 50	2,891,000 00	6	†178,203 00
Indebtedness for Cars	1,098,700 00	6¾ & 8	82,174 76	1,098,700 00	6¾ & 8	82,174 76
Indebtedness for Adv	792,701 77	5	39,635 08	1,874,583 60	5	†93,729 18
Whipple Car Shop Bonds	.....	.....	1,050 00	.....	.....	*
Total Grand Trunk Western Railway Co	35,322,121 77	.....	1,552,141 14	36,268,003 60	.....	†1,609,335 74
Detroit, Grand Haven and Mil. Ry. Co.						
Equip. Mortgage Bonds	1,999,000 00	6 & 7	122,612 88	2,000,000 00	7	†140,000 00
Cons. Mortgage Bonds	3,200,000 00	6 & 7	195,754 71	3,200,000 00	7	†224,000 00
Mowatts Mortgage Bonds	146,000 00	5	7,300 00	146,000 00	5	7,300 00
So. Lyon Land Bonds	80,000 00	6½	5,200 00	80,000 00	6½	5,200 00
Indebt. for Cars and Strs	285,000 00	.....	19,260 30	285,000 00	.....	*16,010 30
Indebtedness for Advances	666,289 28	5	33,314 46	1,505,053 39	5	†75,252 66
Total Detroit, Grand Haven and Mil. Ry. Co	6,376,289 28	.....	383,442 35	7,216,053 39	.....	†467,762 96
Total Grand Trunk Western Lines	41,698,411 05	.....	1,935,583 49	43,484,056 99	.....	†2,077,098 70
Central Vermont Railway Company.						
Refunding Mortgage Gold Bonds	13,261,000 00	5	516,219 30	13,161,500 00	5	†654,915 62
Montreal and Province Line Bonds	200,000 00	4	8,000 00	200,000 00	4	8,000 00
Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Bonds	155,865 00	4	6,234 60	155,865 00	4	6,234 60
Equip. Trust Gold Notes "D."	147,000 00	5	8,983 35	49,000 00	5	*4,083 33
U.S. Govt. Note	.....	.....	.....	65,000 00	6	†1,551 51
U. S. Govt. Note	.....	.....	.....	128,000 00	6	†1,085 22
Collateral Trust Bonds	35,000 00	5	1,924 91	* Transferred to unfunded debt, Jan. 1921.		
U.S.R.A. Note March 1 to Nov. 18, 1920	300,000 00	6	14,379 45	* Renewed and transferred to unfunded debt, Nov. 1920.		
West River Bonds ($75,000)	.....	4	3,000 00	† Transferred to "Income from funded Securities."		†
Adjustment.....Cr.	.....	.....	83 32	.....	.....	
Total Central Vermont Ry. Co	14,098,865 00	.....	552,658 29	13,759,365 00	.....	†675,870 28

* Decrease.
† Increase.

STATEMENT No. 2—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

INCREASE IN INTEREST CHARGES INCLUDED IN INCOME STATEMENT.

Item.	1921.	1920.	Increase, Decrease,
4% Guaranteed Stock	$ 2,433,333 33	$ 1,482,812 50	$ 950,520 83
20 year 7% S.F.G.D. Bonds	1,741,824 00	218,750 00	1,523,074 00
Equipment Trust "F"	703,994 99	.....	703,994 99
15 year 6% S.F.G.D. Bonds	391,666 67	.....	391,666 67
Government Loans	3,107,420 66	771,450 67	2,335,969 99
Western Lines—Fixed Charges	2,077,098 70	1,935,583 49	141,515 21
Central Vermont—Fixed Charges	675,870 28	552,658 29	123,211 99
Total	$ 11,131,208 63	$ 4,961,254 95	$ 6,169,953 68
Other Issues of G. T. Ry. Co. (Decreases)	8,114,375 05	9,064,382 12	*950,007 07*
Grand Total	$ 19,245,583 68	$ 14,025,637 07	$ 5,219,946 61

STATEMENT No. 3.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

SEPARATELY OPERATED COS. NET SURPLUS OF WHICH IS NOT TAKEN UP IN INCOME ACCOUNT OF G. T. RY. CO. RESULTS OF OPERATION 1920 AND 1921.

	Net Income.		Dividends paid to G. T. R. Co.		Accumulated Undistributed Surplus.	
	1921.	1920.	1921.	1920.	Dec. 31, 1921.	Dec. 31, 1920.
Chicago, N. Y. & Boston Refrigerator Co	219,526 48	32,162 98*	.....	.....	340,522 42	120,995 94
International Bridge Co	88,310 09	174,642 17	120,000 00	120,000 00	379,740 40	445,217 44
Montreal Warehousing Co	165,772 42	109,648 42	.....	.....	2,598 05	21,825 63
Terminal Warehouse Reg'd	57,838 03	75,907 00	.....	.....	232,617 91	174,779 88
Oshawa Railway Co	51,367 29	94,074 65	2,800 00	2,800 00	143,767 61	115,737 20
Rail. & River Coal Co	211,573 84	443,188 26	.....	.....	854,158 83	698,834 62
Thousand Islands Ry	1,830 26	6,105 34	4,200 00	4,200 00	6,995 05	11,507 29
Montreal & Southern Counties Ry	90,124 23*	120,893 39*	.....	.....	548,708 86*	458,584 63*
St. Clair Tunnel Co	106,102 37*	134,952 02	.....	.....	390,299 83*	278,721 88*
G. T. Mil. Car Ferry Co	146,873 13*	1,917,79*	.....	.....	102,405 37*	82,832 00
Total	$453,118 68	$613,639 66	$127,000 00	$127,000 00	$918,986 21	$934,423 49

*Deficit.

STATEMENT No. 4.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

CANADIAN LINES.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS AND DETAILED STATISTICAL INFORMATION, 1921 AND 1920.

	1921.	1920.	Increase or Decrease	%
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Passenger	15,510,164 08	16,948,180 21	R 1,438,016 13	8·49
Freight	54,239,903 65	58,102,053 78	R 3,862,150 13	6·65
Other	7,107,964 54	6,392,413 33	715,551 21	11·19
Operating Revenue	76,858,032 27	81,442,647 32	R 4,584,615 05	5·63
Maintenance Way and Structures	12,862,797 47	12,005,384 17	857,413 30	7·14
Maintenance of Equipment	17,809,497 41	21,103,421 77	R 3,293,924 36	15·61
Traffic	1,583,830 08	1,304,106 94	279,723 14	21·45
Transportation—Rail	35,574,797 57	38,518,233 35	R 2,943,435 78	7·64
Transportation—Water				
Miscellaneous	462,320 04	501,360 95	R 39,040 91	7·79
General	2,904,024 32	2,787,700 26	116,324 06	4·17
Transportation Capital Account Material (cr.)	17,974 09	R 6,392 28	11,581 81	181·18
Operating Expenses	71,179,292 80	76,213,815 16	R 5,034,522 36	6·61
Operating Ratio	92·61%	93·58%	R 0 97%	1·04
Net Revenue from Ry. Operations	5,678,739 47	5,228,832 16	449,907 31	8·60
Railway Tax Accruals	1,325,577 28	1,280,062 62	45,514 66	3·56
Uncollectable Railway Revenue	8,908 68	23,004 63	R 14,095 95	61·27
Hire of Equipment (cr.)	1,755,059 13	690,172 71	1,064,886 42	154·29
Joint Facility Rents (cr.)	729,001 29	769,508 55	R 40,507 26	5·26
Net Operating Income	6,828,313 93	5,385,446 17	1,442,867 76	26·7
Revenue Tons Carried	21,687,749	26,322,423	R 4,634,674	17·61
Revenue Tons Carried 1 Mile	4,052,564,411	5,028,651,524	R 976,087,113	19·41
Average Rate Per Ton	$2 50	$2 21	29c	13·12
Average Rate Per Ton Per Mile	0·0134	0·0116	0·0018	1·55
Average Distance Hauled	186·90	191·00		
Revenue Passengers Carried	11,609,762	12,206,977	R 597,215	4·89
" " 1 Mile	509,330,321	529,809,165	R 20,478,844	3·87
Average Rate Per Passenger	$1 33	$1 39	R 0 06	c 4·32
" " Per Mile	0·0305	0·0320	R 0·0015	0·47
Average Distance Hauled	43·9	43·4		
Revenue Train Miles	17,587,275	18,628,310	R 1,041,035	5·59
Earnings Per Revenue Train Mile	$4 37	$4 37		
Expenses Per Revenue Train Mile	4 05	4 09	R 0 04	0 98
Net Earnings Per Revenue Train Mile	0 32	0 28	0 04	14·29
Employees and Compensation.	1921.	1920.	1917.	
Average Number of Employees	29,127	32,260	24,457	
Average Wage	$1,574 66	$1,661 54	$914 80	
Total Operating Expenses	$71,179,292 80	$76,213,815 16		
Total Payrolls	42,149,952 50	49,567,436 72		
Payrolls to Op. Expenses	59·22%	65·04%		
Total Fuel for Locomotives	9,860,454 22	11,785,773 67		
Fuel to Operating Expenses	13·86%	15·46%		

NOTE.—R denotes DECREASF.

STATEMENT No. 4.—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

CANADIAN LINES.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS AND DETAILED STATISTICAL INFORMATION, 1921 AND 1920.

Freight Traffic Movement (Company's Material Excluded). Year, 1921.

Commodity.	Tons.	Percent.
Products of Agriculture.		
Wheat	1,057,362	4·88
Corn	931,522	4·30
Oats	480,112	2·21
Barley	123,135	0·57
Rye	73,000	0·34
Flax	18,141	0·08
Other Grain	40,210	0·19
Flour	585,782	2·70
Other Mill Products	297,553	1·37
Hay and Straw	165,510	0·76
Cotton	38,186	0·18
Apples (fresh)	56,636	0·26
Other Fruit (Fresh)	161,582	0·74
Potatoes	50,564	0·23
Other Fresh Vegetables	65,385	0·30
Other Agricultural Products	207,011	0·95
Total	4,351,691	20·06
Products of Animals.		
Horses	19,309	0 09
Cattle and Calves	214,553	0·99
Sheep	25,935	0·12
Hogs	94,455	0·44
Dressed Meats (Fresh)	219,090	1·01
Dressed Meats (Cured or Salted)	31,295	0·14
Other Packing House Products	116,138	0·54
Poultry	14,889	0·07
Eggs	50,217	0·23
Butter and Cheese	91,813	0·42
Wool	12,869	0·06
Hides and Leather	67,337	0·31
Other Animal Products	43,529	0·20
Total	1,001,429	4·26
Products of Mines.		
Anthracite Coal	3,285,225	15·15
Bituminous Coal	2,359,069	10·88
Lignite Coal	7,484	0·04
Coke	96,350	0·44
Iron Ore	121,722	0·56
Other Ores and Concentrates	96,651	0·45
Base Bullion and Matte	3,968	0·02
Clay, Gravel, Sand, Stone (Crushed)	1,332,213	6·14
Slate—Dimension or Block Stone	271,168	1·25
Crude Petroleum	30,460	0·14
Asphaltum	23,692	0·11
Salt	95,666	0·44
Other Mine Products	61,391	0·28
Total	7,785,059	35·90

STATEMENT No. 4—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

CANADIAN LINES.

Freight Traffic Movement (Company's Material Excluded) Year 1921.

—	Tons.	Percent.
Products of Forests.		
Logs, Posts, Poles, Cordwood	262,743	1·21
Ties	40,816	0·19
Pulpwood	1,109,606	5·12
Lumber, Timber, Box Shooks, Staves Heading	1,063,404	4·90
Other Forest Products	96,513	0·45
Total	2,573,082	11·87
Manufacturers and Miscellaneous.		
Refined Petroleum and its Products	389,469	1·80
Sugar	215,489	0·99
Iron Pig and Bloom	118,326	0·55
Rails and Fastenings	54,986	0·25
Bar and Sheet Iron, Structural Iron and Iron Pipe	264,068	1·22
Castings, Machinery and Boilers	128,909	0·59
Cement	379,069	1·75
Brick and Artificial Stone	198,360	0·91
Lime and Plaster	98,438	0·45
Sewer Pipe and Drain Tile	43,730	0·20
Agricultural Implements and Vehicles other than autos	60,175	0·28
Automobiles and Auto Trucks	127,825	0·59
Household Goods	18,288	0·08
Furniture	29,861	0·14
Liquor and Beverages	42,861	0·20
Fertilizers (all kinds)	83,451	0·38
Paper, Printed Matter, Books	525,780	2·42
Wood Pulp	344,523	1·59
Fish (Fresh, Frozen, Cured, etc.)	24 944	0·11
Canned Meats	3,535	0·02
Canned Goods (all Canned Food Pds, other than Meat)	42,803	0·20
Other Manufacturers and Miscellaneous	1,418,144	6·54
Merchandise	1,363,454	6·29
Total	5,976,488	27·55
Grand Total	21,687,749	100·00

STATEMENT No. 4—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

CANADIAN LINES.

Freight Traffic Movement (Company's Material Excluded) Year 1920.

Commodity.	Tons.	Percent.
Products of Agriculture.		
Wheat	1,040,272	3·95
Corn	342,563	1·30
Oats	448,937	1·71
Barley	80,177	0·30
Rye	168,077	0·64
Flax	18,011	0·07
Other Grain	43,274	0·16
Flour	421,072	1·60
Other Mill Products	293,435	1·11
Hay and Straw	292,699	1·12
Cotton	61,922	0·24
Apples (Fresh)	63,744	0·24
Other Fruit (Fresh)	161,102	0·61
Potatoes	81,122	0·31
Other Vegetables (Fresh)	84,030	0·32
Other Agr. Products	194,937	0·74
Total	3,795,374	14·42
Animal Products.		
Horses	27,713	0·11
Cattle and Calves	241,364	0·92
Sheep	17,792	0·07
Hogs	109,979	0·42
Dressed Meats (Fresh)	294,723	1·11
Dressed Meats (Cured or Salted)	30,639	0·12
Other Packing House Pds	147,286	0·56
Poultry	11,942	0·04
Eggs	37,354	0·14
Butter and Cheese	84,976	0·32
Wool	16,229	0·06
Hides and Leather	67,326	0·26
Other Animal Products	42,721	0·16
Total	1,130,044	4·29
Mine Products.		
Anthracite Coal	4,140,076	15·73
Bituminous Coal	3,051,832	11·59
Lignite Coal	22,914	0·09
Coke	290,663	1·10
Iron Ore	241,357	0·92
Other Ores and Concentrates	169,985	0·65
Base Bullion and Matte	9,007	0·03
Clay, Gravel, Sand, Stone (Crushed)	1,002,353	3·81
Slate Dimension or Block Stone	787,434	2·99
Crude Petroleum	332,026	1·26
Asphaltum	9,600	0·04
Salt	94,977	0·36
Other Mine Products	142,581	0·54
Total	10,294,805	39·11

STATEMENT No. 4—*Con.*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

CANADIAN LINES.

Freight Traffic Movement (Company's Material Excluded) Year 1920.

Commodity.	Tons.	Percent.
Forest Products.		
Logs, Posts, Poles, Cordwood	195,454	0·74
Ties	48,752	0·19
Pulp Wood	951,404	3·61
Lumber, Timber, Box Shooks, Staves and Headings	1,254,565	4·77
Other Forest Products	308,456	1·17
Lumber, Timber, Pulpwood	773,715	2·94
Total	3,532,346	13·42
Manufacturers and Miscellaneous.		
Refined Petroleum and its Products	243,734	0·93
Sugar	281,033	1·07
Iron—Pig and Bloom	334,685	1·27
Rails and Fastenings	122,195	0·46
Bar and Sheet Iron—Structural Iron and Iron Pipe	489,105	1·86
Castings, Machinery and Boilers	284,968	1·08
Cement	305,606	1·16
Brick and Artificial Stone	416,520	1·58
Lime and Plaster	69,301	0·26
Sewer Pipe and Drain Tile	25,472	0·10
Agricultural Implements and Vehicles other than autos	102,908	0·39
Automobiles and Auto Trucks	81,256	0·31
Household Goods	27,171	0·10
Furniture	21,354	0·08
Liquor and Beverages	87,732	0·33
Fertilizers (all kinds)	113,924	0·43
Paper, Printed Matter, Books	538,925	2·05
Wood Pulp	694,924	2·64
Fish (Fresh, Frozen, Cured, etc)	24,824	0·10
Canned Meats	2,676	0·01
Canned Goods (all Canned Food Pds. other than Meat)	54,739	0·21
Other Manufacturers and Miscellaneous	1,691,997	6·43
Total	6,015,049	22·85
Merchandise	1,554,805	5·91
Grand Total	26,322,423	100·00

STATEMENT No. 5.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM, INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT

STATEMENT OF LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR STOCK ON HAND, DECEMBER 31ST, 1921.

—	G. T. Ry. System.	C. V. Ry.	Total.
Locomotives—			
Steam	1,398	99	1,497
Electric	6	.....	6
	1,404	99	1,503
Passenger Service Cars—			
First and Second	533	49	582
Combination Cars	90	12	102
Dining Cars	23	1	24
Parlor Cars	28	4	32
Postal Cars	36	5	41
Baggage and Express	366	20	386
Other Passenger Cars	30	13	43
	1,106	104	1,210
Freight Service Cars—			
Box Cars	30,501	1,875	32,376
Flat Cars	3,505	423	3,928
Stock Cars	1,510	7	1,517
Coal Cars	6,829	200	7,029
Tank Cars	100	.....	100
Refrigerator Cars	1,638	13	1,651
Caboose Cars	671	40	711
	44,754	2,558	47,312
Company's Service—			
Officers' and Pay Cars	33	1	34
Gravel Cars	605	1	606
Derrick Cars	40	2	42
Other road Cars	1,721	142	1,863
	2,399	146	2,545
Total Cars	48,259	2,808	51,067

STATEMENT No. 6.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM.

ADDITIONS TO INVESTMENT YEAR ENDING DEC. 31, 1921.

Item.	Canadian Lines.	Western Lines.	New England Lines.	Central Vermont.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Land	67,763 48	239,729 73	.....	.....	307,493 21
New Equipment	20,534,246 09	34,465 26	.....	*10,234 24*	20,558,477 11
Improvements to Equipment	1,979,903 34	70,450 88	.....	41,621 00	2,091,975 22
Increased Weight of Rail	770,557 89	292,951 57	59,572 97	21,627 86	1,144,710 29
Sidings, Yards and Spur Tracks	253,174 64	547,713 66	2,588 39	.....	803,476 69
Roadway, Buildings, Structures and Miscellaneous	1,162,542 49	365,202 85	*106,439 30*	91,370 48	1,512,676 52
Securities and Investment in Affiliated Cos	22,713 08	.....	.....	330,535 03	353,248 11
Total	24,790,901 01	1,550,513 95	*44,277 94*	474,920 13	26,772,057 15

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not intend to make any comments at the moment; I simply wish to ask, I think, three questions of the minister. The first is this: As respects his figure of operating ratio for last year, which he gave as 129 and a fraction, I draw his attention to the fact that it was given in last year's statement as 124 and a fraction. As long as he is certain that his figure is not an error, I am quite prepared to take his statement that it is a correction of last year's figure.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I shall be glad to verify the statement. I gave it in good faith, and assumed it was correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I ask the question particularly for this reason: The loss last year was given in the same statement as $69,000,000, whereas the minister to-day corrects it and reduces the loss for 1920 to $67,000,000. Consequently, I would think, were he altering the operating ratio, he would alter it by diminishing it; instead of that, it is a very substantial increase.

The next question is this: In referring to the construction programme for this year, the minister stated that nothing would be done save in cases where construction had already proceeded to the point where the track was laid. I would like the minister to explain just what that means: how much of the track; the ballasting, or merely the construction of the grade; or does it include, indeed, the laying of the rails?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): It includes the rails.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I would understand that there were no new rails to be laid—not a mile of rails to be laid?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): That is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The next question is this: In stating the invested capital in the railways that will subsequently be included in the entire unified system, he fixed the figure at one-and-a-half billions as subscribed by the public. I would understand by that, he means the public of this and other countries, not simply of this Dominion?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last question is this: The minister referred to an investigation that was to be conducted for some purpose not any too closely defined, but he gave no intimation as to what would be the character of the commission or committee or individual who is to investigate. Is it under the Inquiries Act, is it to be a committee of this House a royal commission, or what?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): My hon. friend refers to the investigation of the board?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really hardly know how to describe it because the minister did not describe it himself. He said there was to be an investigation concurrently with the co-ordination. What it is to investigate I do not know very well—finances, I think, or something like that. Is the investigation to be by a committee of this House, or a commission, or is to be under the Inquiries Act?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): That will be a matter for the new board. If it is thought advisable to have an investigation likewise by a committee of the House constituted for that purpose, very well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the minister had in mind, though, was an investigation under the new board after its appointment?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Yes. I might point out to my right hon. friend that there has been considerable criticism in the press of recent statements issued by the National Railways; they have been analyzed in detail in the press, and the criticism has been made that the statements put out by the railways were incorrect. One of the first things the new board will do will be to verify the figures that have already been given out. The thought I had in mind was that the statements that are given out should be of such a character that the people of this country will rely upon them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Meaning it will be done by or under the board?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Yes.

Hon. J. A. STEWART (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, when hon. gentlemen who sit opposite occupied seats on this side of the House, it was customary to delay discussion of the annual report of the Minister of Railways until after it had been printed and distributed and the members had had an opportunity to study the figures contained in the report. I have no intention this afternoon—and I fancy that those who sit in this part of the House will for the most part delay discussion of this report—of following the Minister of Rail-

ways through the comprehensive report that he has presented to the House. He has given to us sufficient statistics to justify study by the members, and we will at some time before his Main Estimates are considered make opportunity to discuss such features of his statement today as in the opinion of members in this part of the House should be reviewed.

I would, however, like to say just a few words in passing with reference to certain features of the railway situation, and particularly with reference to the carrying out of the promise of co-ordination as contained in the Speech from the Throne. It is now some five weeks since co-ordination first broke upon the House, and during that time an anxious House and an interested public have looked for a realization of co-ordination by action of the Government. The statement made by the Minister of Railways to-day would appear to work out co-ordination by promising the bringing into force of the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 at an indefinite time, and the appointment of a committee of the House to consider the question of railway rates. As I understood the minister's statement, those were the two declarations of policy which he made to us this afternoon.

It is very difficult for us on this side of the House to appreciate the necessity for the delay. The minister has stated to us that the matters involved in the appointment of a unified board are so important and so difficult that it is impossible for the Government at this time to appoint its board and to carry on the policy of unification that was contemplated when the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 was passed. Those who were interested in the campaign last fall and followed the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite will be surprised, I am sure, that they do not feel they have yet a sufficient knowledge of the railway situation to carry out even the appointment of a unified board. The policy of the late government was a clean-cut policy so far as the administration of our railways is concerned. In 1917, when the Canadian Northern system was taken over, the Government of Canada assumed a tremendous responsibility, assumed it at a time when in the opinion of the Canadian people and of Parliament there was no policy open to the government except to do as the government did, and when any other policy would have broken down at the most critical time in the history of Canada the whole transportation system of this Dominion. The difficulty with the Canadian Northern arose at a time when the transportation facilities of Canada were groaning under war traffic, and had the road been permitted to go into liquidation there is no question that it would have not only destroyed the usefulness of the Canadian Northern system itself, but it would also have paralysed the whole transportation system of Canada.

I am not going to discuss whether the arrangement of 1917 was a wise one or not. The fact is that it is the one that was adopted by the Parliament of Canada. The government was face to face with the problem of providing for the management of the railways which were taken over by the Canadian Government at that time. Two plans for the management of its railway property were open to the government of the day. One was to manage the railways under a department of government, to continue the whole railway system of Canada under the political management under which the Intercolonial had been managed and controlled for forty years prior to that time; the other was to provide for independent control in the management. The policy adopted by the late government was to try out, perhaps for the first time in the history of railway economics, government ownership with independent control in management. The policy adopted at that time provided for the complete removal of the management of the nationally owned railways from political control. That condition prevailed down to 1919 when the arrangements for taking over the Grand Trunk were completed, and in order to continue the policy that had been adopted in 1917 the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919 was passed. That act provided for a new board which would take over the combined systems. It provided for the taking over of both the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk systems, so that we would have a unified management, under which we could get co-ordination. And perhaps those who have studied the Canadian railway situation will agree that there must be a ruthless co-ordination of these systems if we are to see daylight through our railway problem.

Now, under the original arrangement with the Grand Trunk the Grand Trunk officials were continued in office. They were continued in office for the reason that it was felt that in order to enable them to pro-

perly prepare and conduct their case before the arbitration tribunal they should have access to the books and records of the company and should be in complete touch not only with the records but with the operation of the system. But after there had been default in the completion of the arbitration proceedings at the time specified—a default which in the opinion of the government of the day was a deliberate default on the part of the officials of the Grand Trunk, a deliberate attempt to postpone the arbitration proceedings—and after the government had refused to extend the period for the completion of the arbitration, it was agreed between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk itself that the government should be given immediate control of the Board of Management of the system, and this was carried out, and a new board was appointed. The question might further be asked why the government did not at the time provide for the unified management, why at the time it did not provide for a central control? That occurred in the early months of 1921.

Mr. KENNEDY: In May.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): And a board was appointed at that time, an independent board, the board as it exists to-day. On that board the Government appointed executive officers of the Grand Trunk, and they appointed as chairman Sir Joseph Flavelle. The Deputy Minister of Justice was a member of the board, and Mr. Dupuis. The reason why an independent board was appointed was in order that it might be given an opportunity to investigate such details as might be necessary to carry out the amalgamation in management of two great railway systems. It was thought at that time that it would result in a more efficient means for the appointment of a central board and for its control in management if an independent board for the Grand Trunk railway were given an opportunity to study the details of the Grand Trunk system and its requirements, and that then the two boards would be utilized for one purpose of working out a central control. As early as October of last year we had, in the opinion of the government, reached the time when it would have been possible to carry out the provisions of the Canadian National Railway Act of 1919. We had reached the time when the two boards could have been dispensed with and a central board appointed. The question may fairly be asked why the government did not carry out that policy? The answer consists in the fact that we were in the midst of a federal election, and it was felt that it would have been unwise for the government to have possibly complicated the situation by the appointment of a board pending the result of the poll. Hon. gentlemen opposite will no doubt commend us on our foresight in that connection. The fact is that the new board was not appointed, but as early as the month of October the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, in making a statement in the maritime provinces as to his view of how the eastern lines of the government owned railways should be managed, made practically the statement that was made by the Minister of Railways to-day. He stated in the maritime provinces in the early days of the month of October that in his opinion there should be a grand division—a grand division that would manage not only the Intercolonial and National Transcontinental but such of the Grand Trunk lines as might be brought within its jurisdiction. So that as early as the month of October last it was the opinion of the late government that the time had arrived when the provisions of the Act of 1919 might be brought into force.

We commend the Minister of Railways for his policy in reference to the Intercolonial. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) put up a very strong argument the other day in support of the return of the Intercolonial to political control. He gave us a very interesting historical account of the conditions under which the maritime provinces entered confederation, and urged that section 145 of the British North America Act made it compulsory for this Government to continue the management of the Intercolonial railway under the system that had obtained from 1878 down to the time it was placed under the management of the Canadian National Railway Board. He at the same time made a further statement with reference to rates—stated it as his opinion that the question of rates upon the Intercolonial was one which should not be determined by commercial considerations at all but should be regulated and controlled by the requirements of trade. I am not so sure that the position taken by the hon. gentleman as to rates can be disputed. I am not so sure that it is not possibly fundamental in the pact of Confederation that there should be interprovincial trade, and inter-

provincial trade—it matters not whether it originates in the East or in the West, or whether it originates centrally for the East or for the West—must be on conditions that will permit that trade to be carried on. So I submit that possibly the position taken by the member for Cumberland in reference to rates is one that will commend itself to the House. But what I am glad to note by the statement delivered by the Minister of Railways this afternoon is, that the Intercolonial is to be permitted to function as a part of the great national railway system, and I am sure the fact that the Intercolonial should be treated in this way will commend itself to the House. Unquestionably it will best serve the people whom it was built to serve, and whom it was intended to serve, as a part of the national system rather than by reverting to a position of "splendid isolation."

I am not going to attempt to deal with the financial portion of the statement of the minister except to say this: That the improvement in round figures of $20,000,000 in operating revenue between 1920 and 1921 is a record which brings comfort to those who were chiefly responsible for the system that was adopted in respect of the national railway properties. As I understand it, and as I understood the figures of the minister, on the whole of the government properties, including the Grand Trunk, the operating improvement was $20,000,000 in round figures. The real test of a railway's strength, and the real test of administrative skill, does not occur in periods of prosperity and buoyancy of traffic, it occurs in periods of adversity and depression. And the fact that during a year such as 1921 we were able to show, in connection with the government railways, a result as satisfactory as that reported to the House to-day is very creditable indeed. It is unquestionably a good showing, and that statement will scarcely be disputed. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen who questioned the policy of the late government with reference to the property which came over to the Canadian people if there is amongst them those who still feel that the result for 1921 would have been better had we had private ownership and private control.

I wish to refer in a general way to the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the railway policy in Canada, not so much now as during the later months of last year. It was a popular political pastime for the opponents of the late government to lay at the feet of that government the blame for all our railway troubles. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) when he says it matters little which political party was to blame, or whether both were entitled to censure for the conditions that led up to the situation in which we found ourselves in 1917 and again in 1919, and I entirely agree with him when he says that the people of Canada must bear their fair share of the blame. I am sure, as far as the Liberal-Conservative party was concerned, that in 1904, and again in 1908, we did everything we could to convince the Canadian people that the construction of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific was a mistake. There is no question about our position in that regard. The people decided otherwise in terms that could by no possible means be misunderstood, and for that reason there is no question that they are entitled to some share of the blame, if blame attaches, for the position in which we found ourselves later.

In the confession of political faith of the Liberal faith, and the confession of political faith of hon. gentlemen opposite, contained in the Ottawa platform of 1919, and in the public press, particularly in the press of the latter months of last year, and on the public platform of the same period and since this House opened, hon. gentlemen have charged the late government and the Liberal-Conservative party with the deliberate intention of destroying the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental by encouraging construction of the Canadian Northern system, and charging that the Canadian Northern system was deliberately built into territory which should have been the territory of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Hon. gentlemen who take that position might, with profit, refer to the views held by the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. His views are very clearly set forth in the discussion in 1914 on the question of the advance which was then under consideration to the Canadian Northern railways. It will be found in Hansard 13th May, 1914. In his discussion of the resolution introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden providing for a loan to the Canadian Northern in that year, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid said in part:

> I may confess at once that I have long believed that this country requires three transcontinental railways and although this theory has been sometimes controverted, in this House and out of it, I have never seen any reason to

change my opinion * * * For my part I can say that I have always favoured the efforts of our two fellow citizens,—

Mackenzie and Mann.

—whose names have been mentioned several times by my right hon. friend, and who have applied themselves for many years to the task of binding the continent with another band of steel. The late Government were not slow to interest themselves in the enterprise and to favour it as much as they could. * * *

In 1899, or thereabouts, after we came into office, we asked Parliament to give them assistance to extend the railway system then in existence in Manitoba eastward to the end of Lake Superior. If I remember rightly, we gave them a cash subsidy of $6,400 a mile for that length of railway. Later, in 1903, we induced Parliament to give them a guarantee of $13,000 a mile for a line of railway running through Manitoba to the city of Edmonton. Afterwards, in 1908, we asked Parliament to give them another guarantee of bonds to provide for several branch lines which would be feeders of the line in the Prairie Provinces. In 1911, as has been explained by my right hon. friend, it was considered that the system would not be complete unless it were extended eastward to the St. Lawrence and eventually to the Maritime Provinces, that is to say, unless it were made a transcontinental railway, and in that year we asked Parliament to give to the enterprise from Port Arthur to Montreal a guarantee of bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile. * * *

We are told that these companies are to be united in a transcontinental system, and with that object I agree. * * * My right hon. friend said, and I altogether agree with him, that we cannot allow this enterprise to fail. We have too much money in it not only the money of the country, but of the Provinces and of the bond holders themselves. It is therefore, necessary that we should assist this enterprise. * * * My right hon. friend says that we are to go into partnership with Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann and the Canadian Northern railway. These are the very words of the Prime Minister. That being so, is it unreasonable to ask that in that partnership we should be the leading and not the junior partner? * * *

I said a moment ago, and I repeat, that this enterprise must go on. It has been conceived for the benefit of the Canadian people. We require this Railway. My right hon. friend said he would not let it go into liquidation. It must not go into liquidation, but we should have the contol of it. * * * Since we must go into partnership with the Canadian Northern railway let us see that we are the master, and not the servant. * * * We have helped them in the past, I for my part, have been an admirer of their energy and enterprise.

That was the policy advocated by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1914. In 1917, when the financial difficulties of the Canadian Northern forced them to come to the Canadian parliament, the policy of the late government was in direct line with that advocated by the right hon. leader of the Liberal party in 1914. I submit to the House that when hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to disassociate themselves from the construction of the Canadian Northern and all that led up to its completion, they cannot, in the records of parliament, find anything to support that position. The hon. Prime Minister, the other day, urged that it was under the late government that more than 4,000 miles of the Canadian Northern came into operation. That I am willing to concede. The point I want to make is this, that practically all the main line construction of the Canadian Northern was effected under charters issued by the Liberal government prior to 1911, and the subsidies, with the exception of the subsidy covering the railway from Prince Albert to the British Columbia boundary, were largely, if not exclusively authorized by the former Liberal government.

I stated before and I repeat now that I do not propose to discuss the report further, but I shall have an opportunity of doing so when the general estimates of the Railway Department are considered.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): This old and familiar subject of railways is rather tempting to one who has been in this House as long as myself. Let me at once congratulate the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) upon the very able and excellent presentation which he has made of the case to the committee. I am sure that there is no misunderstanding the real situation as presented by the minister and that, as he continues in the administration of the railway affairs of this country, the people generally and this House will be satisfied that no mistake has been made in putting the hon. gentleman at the head of this very important department.

The history of railways in Canada is rather an old one, and nothing comes closer to the interest of the people generally than the operation of our railways. Perhaps, this is not the time to go at any length into this question, and if any person of less incisive speech than the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart) had replied to the Minister of Railways, I am not sure that I would have said anything at all on this subject. Although always opposed to the hon. gentleman politically, I have great admiration for his talent and ability; he has a great knack of making things appear just exactly what they are not. After my hon. friends across the way came into power, there became noticeable amongst them an absolute neglect or forgetfulness of time; they apparently became possessed of one divine attribute in that one day

was to them as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day.

The hon. member for Lanark reminded the committee that, in 1919, they passed an act for the purpose of amalgamating the railways. Well, 1919 is a good while ago. I was in the House at that time and I think the hon. member for Lanark was also. If I remember correctly, the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who now leads the Opposition, had charge of that bill. If he had not charge of it, he was very industrious, as he always is, in the promotion of it. The bill was introduced in such a hurry that, after it had received its second reading, eleven clauses were added to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What bill does the hon. member refer to?

Mr. McKENZIE: The bill for the amalgamation of the railways, chapter 13 of the acts of the first session of 1919. I think my right hon. friend had charge of it. The year 1919 has passed; so have 1920 and 1921, and now we are barely started with 1922. And although lately hon. gentlemen opposite have had no control over these matters, during those years, although there was such feverish haste over introducing the bill that it had to be put before the House and put into committee before it was all properly drafted, nothing was done towards bringing about this amalgamation. To-day, however, I find the hon. member for Lanark metaphorically shaking his fist in the face of the minister and saying: "Here you have been in power since the 27th of December last, and nothing has been done in connection with the matter." Is it not a little marvellous what a difference it makes whose ox is being gored?

I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are highly critical that we are taking so much time in carrying out other matters of this kind, when during ten long years with opportunities which we do not possess even now, they did nothing at all. Will the hon. member for Lanark take these matters into serious consideration and put himself for a moment in the other fellow's place? He himself has been a Minister of Railways, if not for a longer time, at all events, for about as long a time as the present minister, and I find no monuments standing to his memory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. member would agree that the statement just read by the minister is some monument itself to what was done by the late government.

Mr. McKENZIE: All I can say is that for ten years we were hearing statements from ministers of my right hon. friend's party, and in them we found nothing at all of the hopeful note that is contained in the statement made to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a monument to what had been done before the present minister came into office.

Mr. McKENZIE: As regards the will of the people, and monuments, I say to my right hon. friend that, in 1904, the railway policy of the Liberal party was submitted to the people of Canada, and it received almost unanimous approval from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The great leader of the Liberal party of
5 p.m. those days did not expend one dollar in carrying forward the railway policy of that party until he first made it the main issue in the election of 1904, and having received the mandate of the people of Canada to go on with this work, he went on with it. Therefore, it must be admitted that the policy of the Liberal party was fully and squarely presented to the jury of the electorate of Canada, and that the work was proceeded with only after the electorate had given full consent to the government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier to go on with the work. What happened? The government that has just gone out of office and its predecessor in office, the Borden administration, came into charge of this policy before it was completed and brought to its full fruition; they had charge of the business of completing the construction of the railway and managing it for ten years, and the same people who said to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government "Build the railway," said to that administration after ten years of management: "You must be kicked out; you are not fit to be relied on."

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What did Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government inform the people this railway would cost them?

Mr. McKENZIE: Neither Sir Wilfrid and his government, nor any other government could say how much would be the cost of an enterprise comprising as many miles as this. There has been a great deal of misrepresentation about some statement alleged to have been made by the

Minister of Finance of that day. It has been answered and cleared up a hundred times; but hon. gentlemen opposite, wishing to make political capital out of that statement and to put the Liberal party in wrong in connection with it, persist, notwithstanding those various and multitudinous statements, in still standing by the old statement. Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, as far as I know, never made any definite statement as to what the road was going to cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend explain now why the statement that the road was going to cost $13,000,000 was made? He says that one hundred and one reasons have been given. What was the reason for that statement?

Mr. McKENZIE: We were told in an estimate issued by the late government, of which my hon. friend was an ornament, that this magnificent building was going to cost $5,000,000. What is it going to cost now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I could not tell you.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps $15,000,000 before we are through with it. Will my hon. friend explain that difficulty and that difference?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very easily, if you desire the explanation now.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend is quite profuse with his language, and somewhat regardless of his figures sometimes, and I am sure he will give an explanation, whether satisfactory or not. When a certain man of old was asked who gave him his sight, he answered: "I know not; but one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." All I need say to my hon. friend is, that whereas his Government told the people that this building was going to cost $5,000,000, it will cost them $12,000,000 or $15,000,000. That is all the explanation I require from my hon. friend.

An hon. MEMBER: No such thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I might point out that what my hon. friend has favoured us with is hardly an answer, and cannot be regarded as one of the hundred and one explanations why $13,000,000 was given as the true cost of the Transcontinental.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Which it never was.

Mr. McKENZIE: I say it never was; and it is no wonder that the people turned my hon. friend out of his high position of Minister of Finance if he could not see the difference himself. Now, we are told that we made a mistake in the building of this road. Let me remind hon. members opposite of the history of their own party and what the first Minister of Finance in the Borden administration, the Right Hon. Sir Thomas White, stated in regard to this matter. If any hon. member cares to turn up the first budget speech of the Right Hon. Sir Thomas White, delivered in February, 1912, he will find that the then Minister of Finance stated that so far as the railways then in operations or in course of construction were concerned, they were a splendid national asset, and would continue to be essential to our full development. That, sir, is the condition in which we handed over the railways to the management of the Borden government, and if they made ducks and drakes of them we cannot help it.

Mr. ARTHURS: How many railroads were then in the possession of the Dominion government?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not a question so much—

Mr. ARTHURS: How many railroads were then in the possession of the Dominion government?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will my hon. friend answer my question?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was never any criticism—

Mr. ARTHURS: Answer the question. My hon. friend has not answered the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not obliged to answer the question at all,—

Mr. ARTHURS: I asked my hon. friend how many railroads were then in the possession of the Dominion government. He has not yet answered that question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE:—and if I answer it, I shall answer it in my own way. I am too old a bird to be caught in that way.

Mr. ARTHURS: I ask the privilege of putting this question to my hon. friend: How many of the present units of the National Railway system were then in the possession of the Dominion government?

Mr. McKENZIE: The Canadian National Railways were not at all in the possession of the Dominion government in 1912.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is not an answer. I asked: How many—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not an encyclopedia of railway information. And, further, even if I did know, I would not undertake the enormous task incident to the penetration of the information to my hon. friend's understanding.

Mr. ARTHURS: My hon. friend knows very well that there was only one railway then in the possession of the Dominion government. If his intellect does not carry that far—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: How unkind of my hon. friend from Parry Sound to try and trap an inexperienced member like myself! He knows all about it. I thought he did. That is why I delayed giving him the information. Now he is unkind enough to try and get me "in wrong" with the committee by asking me to tell him what he knows perfectly well himself. It is hardly fair, and I would not have expected it of my hon. friend.

Mr. ARTHURS: I desire to tell my hon. friend that he is a better authority than I am on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was expecting, Mr. Chairman, that I would be given right of way this afternoon after having kept so very quiet since the beginning of the session; but I observe there is no consideration to be gained from some hon. members by being quiet. My point is that the Canadian people gave their assent to the railway policy of the Laurier government; that it was necessary for the full development of the country to carry that policy into effect; that when the party to which I belong left office in 1911, we passed over the National railway property in its then condition to the incoming administration; and that their financial critic when making his budget speech in February, 1912, stated that that property was a splendid asset to the country. What he stated then has been often quoted in the House since, and it has never been contradicted because it cannot be.

Now then, the general railway policy of the Laurier administration was endorsed by the people, and we carried the Transcontinental almost to completion. And when we handed it over to the incoming administration, and one of their leading financial men said, "It is all right, it is money well expended, it is a splendid national asset," our responsibility ended. If the new administration spoiled the road in the building; if they broke the contracts and interfered with the arrangements we had with other companies in regard to it; if they made it impossible to carry out the original arrangement of which the people of Canada approved; if they made a wreck of the whole thing—and it was a wreck when handed over to us the other day—who is responsible? After the Government has been in power for a few weeks, hon. gentlemen, like the priest with the Levite, pass by on the other side; they say they had nothing at all to do with this wreckage. Is that fair? Will the hon. member for Parry Sound go home and pray over that, and then say that his attitude is right? Surely it is not an attitude which should be taken by fair minded men to-day. If the road has not been a success during ten years of administration by hon. gentlemen opposite, that is no fault of ours. If they spoiled the grade in the building of the remainder of the Transcontinental road and brought about a condition under which the contracts with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk could not be carried out, that is no fault of ours. But the condition faces us, and we must make the most of it. We have promised to give government ownership a square deal and a fair trial, and that we are bound to do; we are bound to give the people an opportunity to see how this thing works out.

I do not wish anybody to have any misapprehensions about my own position in the matter. I happen to be a member of this Government, and I stand by the position the Government has taken in regard to giving this road a square deal and making the most of it. The records of this House will show that ever since there was talk of the Government taking these roads over, as a matter of conscientious belief I was op-

posed to that being done. I was not in favour of government ownership, because I have always believed that you cannot get the same results from government ownership and government management that you get under private ownership and private enterprise. But I am anxious and willing that everything shall be done in order to make this road a success, and I hope it will be a success. In that respect the statement made by the minister to-day is encouraging; it shows some signs of an advance in the right direction.

There is one other thing I wish to say about this railway situation. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen sitting in opposition can talk as they do about Portland and the branch lines of the Grand Trunk in the United States, having regard to the attituude they themselves have taken. Since Parliament opened, several criticisms have been made about the attitude of the present Government with regard to the situation at Portland. We did what we could to prevent the acquisition of the Grand Trunk, particularly that portion of it which is in the United States. We took the ground that hundreds and millions of dollars had been spent in this country to establish railways running from east to west; that millions had been spent in the deepening of the St. Lawrence and the enlarging of canals to make navigation possible, so that we would be an independent nation and capable of carrying on our own affairs. But after all that money had been expended, the Meighen administration went down to Portland and established there, in a foreign country, what is practically a national port of this country. Can anybody stand by a policy of that kind? They bought not only 2,000 miles of road in a foreign country, but they virtually bought a port which must be maintained. Will anybody for one moment say to the Canadian people: "We were advised by the late government to spend millions in buying this road and establishing this terminus in a foreign country, and now we are to starve it by cutting off every avenue of traffic leading to it"? If hon. gentlemen opposite are consistent, they must be in favour of diverting traffic toward that port, thereby starving such places as Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, Sydney, and St. John.

Mr. ARTHURS: Cape Breton.

Mr. McKENZIE: Cape Breton is so well off and so wealthy that they could not starve it; if they could, they would have done it long ago. I may tell my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Stewart) that I have before me a record of the various resolutions that were proposed while the discussion on the Grand Trunk railway acquisition was proceeding in the House. Resolution after resolution was moved by hon. gentlemen then in opposition, now on the right of the Speaker, asking that delay should take place; that there should be investigation; that the bill should not be read until further information had been obtained. I find on looking at the division lists the illustrious name of my hon. friend from Lanark, indicating, by his vote, his desire to rush pell-mell to Portland and establish there, in a foreign country, the national terminus of all our railway systems. My good friend from St. John City (Mr. Baxter), who accepted office in the late administration, knowing the history of matters in connection with Portland, knowing that a stage had been reached which made a retracing of steps impossible, now finds fault, because forsooth, we are not cutting off Portland and cutting off all our connections with the United States. It is far from businesslike, far from courageous on the part of my hon. friends to whine about Portland and our connection with the United States when that is a condition which they themselves brought about. Our national status requires that we should have our own ports on the Pacific and on the Atlantic, independent of any foreign country. I condemn, as I have always done, the idea of linking up our railways with the railway systems of the United States and with United States ports, as was done by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition and his predecessor as Prime Minister of this country. Those who are old members of the House recall the battles that were fought over this question. They know, and we know in the maritime provinces, particularly in Nova Scotia, that one of our grievances against the outgoing government was their taking over coal mines in the United States, the output of which must necessarily compete with ours, thus destroying a part of the market for our coal. It was a near-sighted policy on the part of my right hon. friend and those who sat in council with him, to buy coal mines in the United States capable of producing something like two or three million tons of coal annually and to admit that coal into the markets of this country free of duty. While that coal output was controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway Company,

duty had to be paid upon it when it came into Canada, and that was a matter of business; we could say nothing about it. But we bought the Grand Trunk, with its various railway lines, its coal mines, and everything belonging to it, and if the coal now pays duty on coming into Canada, it is simply a case, so far as the Government is concerned, of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other.

Mr. ARTHURS: Was the hon. gentleman opposed to the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway, and is he still?

Mr. McKENZIE: Always was, am to-day, and shall continue to be. My hon. friend knows, and my record in this House will show, that I was always opposed to any property being acquired to be run by the Government, particularly the government of that day. I feel rather humiliated that I have never been able to impress upon my hon. friend where I stood on this matter. However, there is hope yet.

Mr. ARTHURS: My hon. friend quotes scripture oftener than he does politics.

Mr. McKENZIE: Of some people it can be said as was said of Ephraim, "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone." I have always been opposed to this policy of buying railways in the United States because, as every member of this House knows, we have no control, so far as legislation goes, over these properties in a foreign country. We cannot pass one line of legislation regarding them. They come under the legislation of the different states through which they run, and we have no representation in those state legislatures at all. Federal legislation by the United States may also be passed affecting these vast properties, as to which we would have nothing to say. That in itself would be a reason why the people of this country should be careful before they launch into the purchase of vast properties in a foreign country over which we have no control so far as legislation is concerned, and as to the management of which we have nothing to say. I submit to you, Sir, that the question of owning and operating and competing as a Government with our coal mines in Nova Scotia is a particularly sore spot with the people of that province, who cannot understand how any person or any government will take the responsibility of putting themselves in competition with private enterprises. I hope that as time goes on, now that the management is under the control of the Liberal government, the railways will show an improvement. Even in the short period towards the end of the year, the change of government has brought its results. The management knew, because they could not help reading the signs of the times, that there was to be a change of administration. Everybody believed that except perhaps the ex-Minister of Finance and his leader, and the management shaped their course to meet coming events; they were more careful, knowing that they would be submitted to the close criticism of a Liberal government and that business-like methods would be expected of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps it was the anticipation of the coming government that caused the big deficit in the month of December last.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware that there was any such deficit, but I can readily understand that the old government having gone out, if there was any possible way by which they could take anything with them they would do it. However, the inquiry that the minister has promised will see to these things, and I would advise my hon. friends opposite to be careful about anything of that kind which they might have carried with them. I hope that as the years go on and proper management prevails in connection with these roads better results will be obtained for the good people of this country.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I will not undertake to make any exhaustive analysis of the statement presented by the minister to-day. It is too long and encloses within its compass so many figures, I think I might say, so much information—though I might add, were it appropriate, so little in the way of policy—that more time than a few minutes for reflection would be requisite for that purpose.

It is very rare, however, in the history of this Parliament that a minister of the Crown has presented a statement to the House which was received with a great deal more applause upon the part of the Opposition than upon the part of the Government. That has been reserved for the experience of this afternoon. I listened to the report with interest; I listened to it with some gratification, and I think the same can be said for most of the hon. members of this House. Upon the results of the operation of the national railways,

particularly for the year 1921, depended very much as to what would be the attitude of the people of this country toward the continuance of the system of operation then in vogue, indeed, what would be their attitude to the whole immense problem of the management of our railways.

I could not help but come to the conclusion that the Government likely thought it would be wisest that as little serious discussion should take place this afternoon on this statement as could not be avoided, and that as a consequence the Solicitor-General (Mr. McKenzie) was put up with instructions to take just as much time as he could and say as little as possible. The Solicitor-General had the accumulations of humour of all this last winter to retail to Parliament; he has had his opportunity, and that task he has mightily well performed.

The statement presented to-day of the operations in 1921 before the change of Government—and I am not for a minute suggesting that under a change of Government, if they follow the lines intimated by the minister, there will be difference in the future—is such, I am sure, that it will carry encouragement to many throughout this country, and will strengthen the hands of those who have not given up hope, who have consistently believed that we can, if we follow right lines such as have been pursued, make these roads a success.

The hon. minister's statement discloses that in the national railway management, that is to say, within the ambit of the system given to the board, the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, in all that vast system, including a mileage of 7,340 miles, there has been an improvement in operating returns in what has been the worst commercial year for many years in this country—an improvement of something over twenty million dollars. From a deficit in 1920 of 36 million odd on all those systems, there has been a reduction to about 16 millions in the year 1921. There has been at the same time, it is true, an increase in the fixed charges. Such is inevitable because the deficits that necessarily accumulated during the time of amalgamation, during the time of the rehabilitation of the road, during the time of the completion of construction and—after construction—during the time when deferred maintenance and deferred betterments had to be made up—when all these had to be overtaken, the deficits that accumulated were necessarily substantial and consequently the fixed charges increased accordingly. The fixed charge increase this year—which if I gather the figures correctly amounts to $7,000,000, the difference between the $40,000,000 as it stands now and the 33 millions odd as it stood in 1914—will be made up in the main of the interest on last year's deficit and even in greater degree of the interest on the money put into the system in the way of betterments and in the way of increased construction, almost wholly in western Canada. But that increase is much less than the improvement that is shown in operation returns, with the consequence that a deficit of 69 millions odd announced last year is now reduced to 56 millions odd.

The minister gives us the information, which I receive with pleasure, that the deficit announced to Parliament last year of 69 millions as the 1920 deficit turns out to have been too large, and that the real deficit was $67,505,000. The difference is not great but that there is a difference on this side is something significant. It would indicate that the former Minister of Railways in giving the information last year erred on the side adverse to himself, and instead of painting the deficit as smaller than it actually was, he painted it larger. That fact surely has some significance. It stands alongside the other undoubted fact, that from the day the former Minister of Railways made it until this hour he has been condemned through the whole of the Dominion of Canada as having misrepresented the deficit, as having stated it to be far less than it actually was.

Very well, there is this improvement in the returns. It was accompanied by a small reduction of wages, but it shows itself, as disclosed in the statement of the minister as very largely due to the economies resultant upon amalgamation; to the increased traffic; to the perceptibly increased proportion of the traffic of this Dominion, indicating that the National Railway system is gaining on all competitors due to better service. The better service to the better equipment and better system brought about by the expenditures under the late administration. Anyway the corner has been turned. I want to impress again that, so far as I have discussed the subject up to now, my reference has been wholly to the roads under what we know as the National Railway Board, the board of which Mr. Hanna has been the president. That system has been in operation since, I think, the fall of 1917; I think it was put in operation just after the Union government was formed. The

whole mileage was not then under the board but one by one different systems have been put under it. First the Canadian Northern; and, I think at the same time, the Transcontinental railway. We did not relieve the Grand Trunk Pacific from operating that line but the Grand Trunk Pacific refused to operate it. The Grand Trunk Pacific had no more competence or power to operate it than any humble penniless individual in this House. It could not begin to operate it because of the position it was in, and absolutely declined to do so. We were powerless to make it do so because it had not the resources with which to operate the road. We had in the system then, first the Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Northern; later was added the Intercolonial. The Canadian National Railway Board was made the manager of the Intercolonial, and later in the spring of 1919 on the seventh day of May, the Grand Trunk Pacific Board having notified the Government that on that date it would cease to operate the Grand Trunk Pacific because it could not even operate that road any longer we took the Grand Trunk Pacific, operated it as receiver, and very shortly afterwards turned it over to the Canadian National lines for operation. That brought all that system under the Canadian National Railway Board. There remains now outside one only of the government-owned lines—the Grand Trunk line, the parent Grand Trunk.

Very well. In so far as this speech discloses the condition of the national railways I venture to submit to the House that it is gratifying to a degree. And more: In comparison with the record of government operation in other countries—yea, in comparison with the record of private operations during the same period in other countries—it establishes the system of management which the late government put in, as the best yet devised for the operation of government lines. For although a deficit appears, although there is a deficit on operation, although there is still a very substantial deficit in operation and fixed charges, a deficit of some 56 millions —though that is the fact, you can put the result, that is the final result, alongside of corresponding results by similar privately-owned systems in other countries, and you will find that result to reflect credit upon the operations here; a favourable result as compared with the results in the United States for the same period.

I observe that the minister has not favoured the House with any figures corresponding with those he gave us as to our own roads taken from the returns of the United States railways in the same time. In the statement given last year those figures appeared and they were illuminating indeed. Other figures appeared as to relative results over in England. They also were of very great service to Parliament. I am sorry the minister did not include these comparisons in the statement he presented this afternoon.

There is one other point I want to emphasize. In the statement made last year by the Minister of Railways estimates were given as to what would be the result for 1921. It was estimated that in 1921 there would be better results in operation, but the utmost the minister of that day expected from the year 1921 was that, in operation and in fixed charges put together we could not expect to get out under less than sixty millions odd of a deficit. The figures given this afternoon show that that has been very much reduced, at least to the extent of some $4,000,000.

Consequently, all in all, the statement this afternoon will bring to the people of Canada the realization of this truth at least—that facing, as we have had to face, the taking over a system which we had to get under and take over or let it fall into liquidation, if not into desuetude and idleness, the best course available was adopted. And, having decided on the best course, the best system of management was devised, and that system of management has been vindicated by the results.

I was not able to follow—because a parallel method was not adopted—the figures given by the Minister of Railways as regards the Grand Trunk railway. I rather came to the conclusion, from the general purport of his remarks, that the results of the 1921 operations of the Grand Trunk are by no means as satisfactory as are the results with the sister system, the Canadian National. Of course, it must be remembered that the 1921 results in the Grand Trunk are results accruing, in so far as the government board is concerned, as only from the month of May,—I will be corrected if I am wrong. I am satisfied that it was towards the end of May when what could be called a government board was put in charge of the Grand Trunk. Hon. gentlemen will remember that until that time the government was

not empowered to place directors in charge of the railway, the Grand Trunk directorate managed the system. The Grand Trunk Railway Company insisted, as one of the terms, which, finally, we conceded to them in making the arrangement for arbitration, that until the arbitration was over they be not ousted from control. Finally we yielded to that contention. I am not sorry that we did. If we had not yielded, there would be at least some semblance of justice in the cry that is now all too common in the Old Land that we used harsh methods in connection with the shareholders of that road. If we had ousted them, they would be able to say "Yes, you threw us out of our system, you insisted that we should get out or you would have nothing to do with us, and then, when we were out, unable to get the evidence to go before the arbitration board, you took advantage of the disability there imposed upon us, and you got the best of the arbitration." We yielded to them on that point, and as a consequence they had a right to keep their board in control of the Grand Trunk system until the time expired when the arbitration was to end. When that time expired, however, the government of the day determined, as disclosed in the speech of the former Minister of Railways, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. J. A. Stewart), that, though the arbitration was not over, it should have been over, and, as the Grand Trunk had not used due expedition to get it over, if they wanted an extension of the time they must, first of all, yield that point, and permit the government to go into control of the road. The government of the day was anxious to hasten that time when we would be able to get, to the full, the advantages of complete amalgamation of the government system. We knew we could not get them in full immediately we put our board in. We knew that some time would be required on the part of the former officers of the Grand Trunk, and on the part of some of the officers of the Canadian National railways, to prepare the way for amalgamation, to prepare the lines immediately to be pursued when the amalgamation would take effect. Consequently, we were anxious that as little delay as possible should intervene between the control of the Grand Trunk Board proper and the advent of the Grand Trunk Board appointed by the Government. The Government appointed its board about the end of May or the 1st of June last year. The Government retained, and necessarily retained, on the board, temporarily at least, certain high officials of the Grand Trunk. The reason for that was manifest, and the justice of it no one would dispute. The government board, therefore, only operated with part of the Grand Trunk Board, the Government appointees, from the middle of May last year until the end of the year; consequently the less favourable showing of the Grand Trunk last year, is not attributable to the fact that there was a government board in control as opposed to the old board. I do not think there are many Canadians who would not gladly agree that those gentlemen added to the board by the government were strong, able and competent men, and who would not also be glad to hear the news that men of that character, or the same men, would be accepted by this Government and continued. Very well, that was the position they were in. There has been no opportunity at all as yet to secure the fruits of that unification, which was the policy of the late government, which was embodied in and the reason of the Act of 1919. The Act of 1919 is in itself the machinery by which the whole fruits of amalgamation can be secured. It will be seen that no time whatever was lost on the part of the late administration in reaching for that goal—that goal which we must reach if our national railway management is to be a success. But, unfortunately, there has been delay on the part of this Government. I know of no reason why it should not have been called into effect immediately they came into power. What was there to ascertain? What more was there to be done? I know there was not need for further conferences between the directorates. I am aware myself, and I am sure the minister will not dispute it, that the necessary arrangements had been made, so far as the organizations of the two systems were concerned, that would have enabled the Government to have called the act into effect at once. The minister in his speech does not in any word or sentence indicate that there was any reason on that score for not calling the act into effect. He says "We had to get good men to go on the new board, and three months and a half has not been time enough to enable us to think who the good men are." Is not that the only reason the minister has given? I would venture to suggest, in the light of the results of last year as disclosed in the

statement this afternoon, that the Government would do very well to reflect, in the seriousness of their own cabinet council, whether or not it is probable that there were good men on the board last year. Why, then has the Government delayed? If I have understood properly the full meaning of the statement the minister has made it is this. He says "We are going to carry out the policy of the late government; after tribulations, after doubtings, after twistings and turnings, after fears, inward quarrels, and all sorts of rebellion in the party, we have decided that we are going to pursue the very policy the late government laid down, the policy the late government pursued right up to the time it went out of power. We have decided on all that, and all we have not decided on is just when we will put it into effect." That is one statement of policy as announced by the minister this afternoon. It is not very radical or momentous, but I think on the whole it is fairly wise.

Then on the subject matter of rates, about which we have heard much for many months, I waited with apprehension—not with apprehension but with genuine curiosity—to find what the minister would have to say. I was aware, as every hon. gentleman is aware, that the control of rates on our railways was delegated, by the legislation of 1902 or 1903, to the Railway Commission of this country. I was aware that the Railway Commission was sitting and considering the problem at the present time. I was aware that the Commission had an organization that had command of the facts and the history of the whole question. I was aware that it was composed of men whom, if they were not competent men, or were in any way truant in their duty, there was a proper method of removing. I was aware the Railway Commission had been placed in this position at the hands of hon. gentlemen, many of whom are now members of the present Government; but, of course, I had to remember as well that, notwithstanding, the scale of rates in effect under that commission was laid at the door of the late government by their orators, yea, by themselves, all through this Dominion, and I was wondering what would be the policy of this administration, what line they would devise that would harmonize their own conduct in placing this question under a judicial tribunal, with their professions in declaring that they would decide it themselves. Well, we get the result this afternoon. The whole of their policy is this: We promised in the Speech from the Throne a "consultation" of the railway heads. We have found that is no good. Here is our policy now: "We will appoint a committee of Parliament to think it over." That is the mouse that has come out of the mountain. There is going to be a committee of this House to decide what to do about railway rates. Will the Railway Commission be called as witnesses before the committee? Will we try all over again what the Railway Commission has been trying for almost a year back, or for twenty years back? If so, when is this session going to end?

I think this committee will clearly understand that the statement of the minister this afternoon disclosing the Government policy on rates is merely an admission of mental and moral bankruptcy on the whole question. There is no way in which they can carry out what they have declared they can carry out. There is no way to harmonize their professions now with their promises. There is no way in the world in which they can make good to the people of this country the promises they have made, without violating the policy of which they themselves are not only the disciples but, twenty years ago, the originators.

That is all I have to say on this question this afternoon. In so far as the facts of management are disclosed with regard to a system where the method of operation, the personnel of operation, the system and principles of operation, have been put to the test, the statement is gratifying to me—I do not know whether it is gratifying to the Government or not. I know how far it harmonizes, or rather fails to harmonize with their statements of the position all through last fall; and as I sat here and heard those definitions of future policy—a committee of Parliament to look into the question of rates, a committee or some agent of a new board which is to be put into the National Railways to investigate whether what the National Railway Board gives out as facts are really facts or not—I wondered how far those two anæmic and equivocal definitions of policy would be accepted by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell), as fulfilling his pledges made to the electors of his constituency during the last campaign. He was going to have a commission, a royal commission; he was going to bring over experts from Asia, no, from Europe and from some other continent which he did not name. These experts

were going to be brought over to Canada to supplement the brains of hon. gentlemen opposite and to study the alleged railway tangle into which the late government had plunged this country. Where is his pledge now? Can he find any reference to it in the speech of the Minister of Railways? Who is this committee or this individual whom the new board, at some unspecified time in the indefinite and misty future, is going to appoint to see whether the board itself is telling the truth or not? Is that the fulfilment of his pledge to his electors? As we received notice that the late government's plans as to amalgamation were to be followed line by line and letter by letter, I wondered what thoughts were passing through the mind of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and I wondered what comments he was making to his seat mate beside him, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who, I see, is conferring now with his fellow pledgor, the hon. member for St. Antoine. They, speaking in Nova Scotia, and, as well, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), used this pledge, that the Intercolonial railway was going to be jerked out of the National system when they came to Ottawa; that it was going to be extricated and restored to the Department of Railways and Canals, and run as it was in the years of long ago. I wonder now how they are going to square themselves with the electors of their constituencies. Do not let it be said that I favour the carrying out of what they were pledged to do. I favour now precisely what I said in the last campaign —precisely what the present Government is now undertaking to do at a very indefinite time, precisely what we undertook to do most definitely before the people of this country. I stated plainly in Moncton that, just as soon as we took in the Grand Trunk, as would be done at the earliest possible moment, at that time there would be sufficient eastern mileage to warrant the establishment of, and that there would be established, an Eastern Grand Division, in which there would be that measure of railway home rule that was essential, but in which there would not be lost at all the advantages of unification. There would be, in a word such decentralisation as the Canadian Pacific has in effect, as all railways of sufficient magnitude have in effect. That was what I stated was the proper policy. That is now what is intimated in the speech of the Minister of Railways. But it is entirely out of accord with promises given electors, which promises account for the presence in this House of the hon. member for Cumberland, the hon. member for St. Antoine, the hon. member for Pictou, the hon. member for Colchester, and, I know not how many more. I am not going to seek to exhaust, for it is six o'clock already, the comparison of the statement of policy on this phase this afternoon, attenuated, vague, timid, as it is, with the various bold commitments of hon. members opposite,—not at all. They were quite loose and reckless in their engagements; anything they thought would suit their constituents—that was the commitment made. One policy came from British Columbia, another policy from the prairies, another from Nova Scotia and another from New Brunswick, all designed to catch the prevailing opinion or cupidity of the district. All these policies are now scrapped, the policy which the former government sturdily pursued is now proclaimed as right and hon. members are asked by the Minister of Railways to go back and make their peace with their deluded electors.

Mr. FIELDING: It was understood that the House was to adjourn at six o'clock. I therefore, move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 6.04 p.m.

Wednesday, April 19, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 48, respecting Aberdeen Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

Bill No. 49, respecting Armour Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate The Sisters of Saint Mary of Namur.—Mr. Demers.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS— IMPORTATION OF COAL

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What quantity of coal was imported into Canada during the calendar year 1921 from

the United States for the Canadian National Railway, exclusive of the Grand Trunk?

2. What was the cost per ton of the said coal at the border?

3. What amount was paid for said coal?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. 977,696 net tons.

2. $5.10 per net ton.

3. $4,992,694.97.

NOTES FOR INCOME TAXES

Mr. HALBERT:

1. Has a note been accepted in payment of income tax from any firm or individual other than the Riordon Pulp and Paper Company?

2. If so, from what firm or individual?

3. On what dates, and for what amounts?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Several notes were received, which were regarded by the officials as an acknowledgment of indebtedness, but not as payment. No such notes are now received.

The Minister of Finance has doubt of the propriety of making public transactions between the Government and citizens respecting income taxes. In England it is understood such information is regarded as confidential. The right of Parliament to full information regarding public business being recognized, a predecessor of the present minister held that if information of this kind was desired a motion for it should be placed on the order paper, and upon discussion the House should judge whether the public interests required it to be brought down.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PASSENGER TRAFFIC

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. How many different passenger rates are in effect on each of the systems of railways under government ownership in Canada?

2. Under what titles or headings are the classifications made, and what is the rate per mile for each classification?

3. What percentage of the total number of passengers carried during the last financial year is embraced in each class?

4. What percentage of the total yearly revenue of the last financial year was derived from each of such passenger rates?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. See attached statements, "A" as to Canadian National Railways, and "B" as to Grand Trunk Railway, Canadian Lines.

2. See above-mentioned statement "B" as to Grand Trunk and "C" as to Canadian National Railways.

3. Existing methods of accounting do not provide for the separation of the number of passengers in accordance with the various classifications of rates. To secure such information would require an analysis of all the original detailed records, such as conductors' train reports, etc., for the entire year. Information, therefore, is not available.

4. See answer to No. 3.

STATEMENT "A"—CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES.

——	Regular Passenger Fares		Special Passenger Fares	
	Number of rates	Description	Number of rates	Description
Canadian Northern Ry.....	3	First class one way..... Second class one way..... One month return.....	33	For details see Statement "C" in connection with Question 2.
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry.....	3	First class one way..... Second class one way..... One month return.....	30	" "
Canadian Government Railways.	3	First class one way..... Second class one way..... One month return.....	36	" "

STATEMENT "B"—GRAND TRUNK CANADIAN LINES

CLASSIFICATION OF PASSENGER TRAFFIC ON GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM LINES IN CANADA SHOWING CURRENT RATE PER MILE FOR EACH CLASS (APRIL 7, 1922)

Classification	Rate per mile	Classification	Rate per mile
	cts.		cts.
First Class, Maximum one way	3·45	Members of Press	2·3
Second Class "	3·00	Nuns, Sisters of Charity	1·725
Third Class "	2·30	Deaconesses	
Commercial Trav. "	2·587	Prison Gate Officers	
One Month R.T	3·105	Rescue Officers Salvation Army Women	
Commercial Trav. RT (Wk. End)	1·725	Entertainment Parties visiting Military Hospitals.	1·725
Mileage Ticket	2·100	Live Stock Attendants returning Western Canada.	1·725
Commutation, 50-R	0·85 (*a*)	Men in charge perishable fruit returning to points east of Levis and Megantic.	1·725
" 40-R	0·425(*a*)	Missionary, Eleemosynary, etc	1·725
" 10-R	2·50 (*a*)	Fall Fairs and Exhibitions	2·3
Excess Baggage	0·48	Soldiers Civil Re-establishment	1·725
Cert. Plan Arrangements—		Soldiers Land Settlement	1·0
Less than 150 people	3·105	Parlor Car Tolls	0·6 (*b*)
150 or more people	2·587	Dominion Provincial Employment Service.	2·70
Military and Naval—		Empire Parliamentary Association, one-way.	1·725
1st Class	3·0	Empire Parliamentary Association, Round Trip.	1·725
2nd Class	2·33		
350 or more—all ranks (over 100 miles)	2·0		
Royal Can. Mounted Police (R.N.W.M.P.).	2·5		
Charitable Homes (inmates)	2·3		
Charitable Homes (attendants and Officers).	1·725		

(*a*) Minimum per ride 7½ cents except where local fare of 5 cents exists.
(*b*) Minimum fare of 50 cents applying for distance of 90 miles or less.

STATEMENT "C"—CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES—REGULAR FARES—GENERAL BASIS

—	1st Class Per Mile	2nd Class Per Mile	One Month Return Per Mile
	c.	c.	c.
Canadian Northern Railway—			
All lines	3·45	Nil	3·105
Exceptions—			
Line Tannis to Brazeau and Main Line Wolf Creek-Vancouver	4·0	Nil	3·6
Lines in Quebec, also Hawkesbury-Ottawa	.....	3	
Line Hudson Bay to Le Pas	3·5	Nil	3·15
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry.—			
All lines	3·45	Nil	3·105
Exceptions—			
Line Wolf Creek to Prince Rupert	4·0	Nil	3·6
Canadian Government Railways—			
Intercolonial Ry., 1 to 200 miles	3·45	2·3	2·795
Prince Edward Island Ry.—			
201 to 300 miles	3·105	2·070	2·515
301 to 400 miles	2·875	1·917	2·329
401 to 600 miles	2·760	1·84	2·236
601 to 800 miles	2·645	1·763	2·143
801 and over miles	2·530	1·687	2·050
Exceptions—			
Line Montreal to Levis, inclusive	.....	3·0	
Transcontinental Ry.—1 to 225 miles	3·45	2·3	2·795
Line Moncton to Charny—			
226 to 300 miles	3·335	2·223	2·702
301 to 400 miles	3·105	2·070	2·515
401 to 500 miles	2·99	1·993	2·422
Transcontinental Ry.—			
Line Quebec to Hearst	3·45	3·0	3·105
Line Hearst to Winnipeg and Fort William	3·45	Nil	3·105
Cape Breton Ry	3·45	Nil	3·105
Quebec and Saguenay Ry	3·45	Nil	3·105
Lotbiniere and Megantic Ry	3·45	3·0	3·105
Salisbury and Albert Ry	3·45	Nil	2·795
Elgin and Havelock Ry	3·45	Nil	2·795
Moncton and Buctouche Ry	3·45	2·3	2·795
St. Martins Ry	3·45	Nil	2·795
St. John and Quebec Ry	3·45	Nil	2·795
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Ry	4	Nil	3·6
International Ry. of N.B	4	2·75	3·6
York and Carleton Ry	4	Nil	4

STATEMENT "C" CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES—SPECIAL FARES

EXHIBIT "B" SPECIAL FARES

Description	Class	Applies over lines indicated by "X"			Territory	Bases of Fares	
		Can Nor. Ry.	G.T.P. Ry.	Can. Gov. Ry.		One Way	Round Trip
1. All Year Tourist Fares.....	1st	x	x	x	(*a*) From Eastern Canada to Western Canada and Pacific Coast.....	.....	Double regular first class one way fare less 10%.
					(*b*) From Prairie Provinces to Pacific Coast.....	.....	Double regular first class one way fare less 10%.
2. Barnardo Homes, Inmates of.....	1st	x	x	x	Port Arthur, Armstrong, Ont. and West.....	2·3c. per mile...	
3*a*. Canada Land Settlement Agency (Applies for bona fide settlers from the United States).	2nd	x	x	x	(*a*) From Montreal, Toronto, Niagara Falls, Windsor, Sarnia, and other points in Eastern Canada to destinations in Western Canada.	Blanket rate of $25.00 to Edmonton, Calgary and intermediate points, plus 2c. per mile to points beyond	
					(*b*) Winnipeg, Port Arthur, Brandon, Calgary, Edmonton and Regina to destinations in Western Canada.	2 cents per mile.	
					(*c*) Vancouver to destinations in Western Canada.....	$16.00 to Edmonton and $17.90 to Calgary, plus 2c. per mile to points beyond.	
3. (*b*) Canada Land Settlement Agency (Applies for bona fide settlers from Europe).	2nd	x	x		(*a*) From Calgary, Edmonton or Saskatoon or destinations in Western Canada (to bona fide settlers from Europe).	2 cents per mile.	
4. Caretakers—Live Stock (Returning to their homes after accompanying shipments.	2nd	x	x	x	(*a*) From Eastern Canada to Western Canada.	One-half regular first class one way fare.	
" "	2nd	x	x	x	(*b*) Between Stations Port Arthur, Armstrong, Ont., and West.	"	
" Perishable Freight.	2nd	x	.....	x	Between Stations Armstrong, Ont., Montreal and East on Can. Govt. Rys. also from Can. Nor. Ry. Stations in Ontario to Can. Govt. Rys. stations east of Levis.	1·725c. per mile.	
" Frozen Meat for export.	2nd	x	x	x	From Montreal and Quebec to destinations Winnipeg and West.	One-half regular first class one-way fare.	
" Fresh fruits, Vegetables Liquors, Minerals and aerated waters.	2nd	x	x	x	Between Stations Port Arthur. Armstrong, Ont., and West,	"	
5. Charitable Homes—Inmates of	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	2·3c. per mile...	2·3c. per mile each way.
6. Charitable Homes—Officers and Attendants of	1st	x	x	x	"	One-half regular first class one way fare.	Regular first class one wah fare.
7. Colonization.....	2nd	x	.....	x	(*a*) From stations in Ontario and Quebec to destinations in Northern Quebec.	2·3 cents per mile.	3·45 cents pe mile.
"	2nd	x	.....	x	(*b*) From stations in Ontario and Quebec to destinations in Northern Ontario.	" ..	"
	2nd	.....	.....	x	(*c*) From stations in Quebec to destinations in Matapedia Valley.	Two thirds of regular second class one-way fare.	One and one third regular second-classk one-way fare.
	2nd	.....	x	.....	(*d*) From G.T.P. stations in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to destinations in British Columbia (Tete Juane to Terrace incl.).	2 cents per mile to Edson, Alta., plus 3 cents per mile beyond.	2 cents per mile to Edson plus 3 cents per mile beyond each way.

[Mr. W. C. Kennedy.]

STATEMENT "C" CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES—SPECIAL FARES—*Con.*

Description	Class	Applies over lines indicated by "X"			Territory	Bases of Fares	
		Can. Nor. Ry.	G.T.P. Ry.	Can. Gov. Ry.		One Way.	Round Trip.
					(*e*) In commutation zones on Can. Northern and G.T.P. Railways.	2½ cents per mile minimum rate per trip, 7½ cents.	
8. Commutation fares—10 trip	1st	x	x	x	Between station not more than 50 miles apart on Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways (east of St. Hyacinthe).		
40 trip scholars	1st	x	x	x	(*b*) " " "	4½ mills per mile, minimum rate per trip, 7½ cents.	
50 trip	1st	x	x	x	(*c*) " " "	8½ mills per mile minimum rate per trip, 7½ cents.	
10 trip workmen	2nd	.....	.....	x	(*d*) New Glasgow-Trenton—Westville District.	Approximately 1⅞ cents per mile.	
9. Commercial Travellers One-Way and Week-End Return.	1st	x	x	x	(*a*) All stations in Canada, except locally Cochrane, Armstrong, Ont. and Capreol, Port Arthur, Ont. inclusive.	2·587 cents per mile.	Regular first class one-way fare for week-end and return tickets.
					Exception: (1) Wolf Creek, Alta., Vancouver, Prince Rupert, inclusive. Tannis, Brazeau, Alta., inclusive.	3 cents per mile.	"
					(2) Hudson Bay Junction, Sask., The Pas, Man., incl.	2·625 cents per mile.	"
10. Conventions—150 or more in attendance	1st	x	x	x	(*a*) Quebec, Levis and West Canada.	.....	Regular first-one-way fare and one half.
Conventions—75 or more in attendance	1st	.....	.....	x	(*b*) East of Quebec and Levis.	.....	Regular first class one-way fare and two-fifths.
11. Employees of Railways and Steamship Companies.	1st or 2nd	x	x	x	All stations in Canada	One half regular fare charged General Public.	One half regular fare charged General Public.
12. Empire Parliamentary Association.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada	One half regular first class one-way fare.	Regular first class one-way fare.
13. Entertainment Parties visiting Military Hospitals.	1st	x	.....	x	All stations, Port Arthur, Armstrong, Ont. and East.	.....	Regular first class one-way fare.
14. Excursions and Pilgrimages Organized.	1st	.....	.....	x	East of Quebec and Levis, Que. only.	.....	Railway accepts regular first class one-way fare from Organizers, who sell to the Public at regular first class one-way fare. plus 15% with maximum of 75 cents retaining the difference to defray expenses.
15. Exhibitions and Fall Fairs.	1st	x	x	x	To points of Exhibitions in Canada, from adjacent territory.	.....	Regular first class one-way fare and one third.
16. Family Summer Resort and Seabathing 10 Round Trip Tickets.	.....	.....	.....	x	From Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, or St. John to Summer Resort at Seabathing points east of Quebec and Levis.	.....	Regular first class one-way fare and one-third per each round trip.

STATEMENT "C" CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES—SPECIAL FARES—*Con.*

Description	Class	Applies over lines indicated by "X"			Territory	Bases of Fares	
		Can. Nor. Ry.	G.T.P. Ry.	Can. Gov. Ry.		One Way	Round Trip
17. Farm Laborers.....	2nd	x	x	x	From Eastern to Western Canada to assist in Harvest operations.....	*Going*—From Quebec, Levis and West $15 to Winnipeg. From St. John N.B. $20 to Winnipeg. To points west of Winnipeg authorized rate to Winnipeg plus one half cent per mile.	*Returning*--From Points West of Winnipeg ½ c. per mile to Winnipeg plus authorized rate East of Winnipeg. From Winnipeg, $20 to stations Quebec, Levis and West—and $25 to St. John, N.B.
18. Field Crop Competitions, judges of	1st	x	x	x	To points of Exhibitions in Canada.	.....	Regular first class one way fare and one third.
19. Homeseekers.....	2nd.	x	x	x	From Eastern to Western Canada.	.....	Regular second class one way fare and one half.
20. Immigrant fares for Passengers from Europe.	1st and 2nd	x	x	x	From Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal to destinations in Canada.	Regular 1st and 2nd class one-way fares not however to exceed fares authorized from New York and Portland, Me.	
" " ..	3rd	x	x	x	From Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal to stations Winnipeg and West in Canada.	$35 from Port of Landing to Winnipeg plus ½ cent per mile	
21. Indians.....	2nd	.....	.....	x	(*a*) Intercolonial Ry. Prince Edward Island Ry. and International Ry. of N.B (stations Levis and East).	1·15 cents per mile.	
"	2nd	x	.....	.....	(*b*) Can. Nor. Ry. (Ruel to Port Arthur only).	One half lowest regular one way fare.	Lowest regular one way fare.
"	2nd	x	x	.....	(*c*) Port Arthur, Armstrong, Ont. and West, in Canada, also from Transcontinental Ry. stations Goodwin, Ont. Winnipeg, Man. incl. to Cochrane and vice vers.	2·3 cents per mile.	2·3 cents pe mile each way
22. Indian Hop Pickers..	2nd	x	.....	.....	(*d*) Can. Nor. Ry. (Stations Vancouver to Albreda, B.C. incl. only).	.....	Regular one way first class fare
23. Laborers under direction of Dominion Provincial Employment Service.	2nd	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	2·7 cents per mile, minimum $4.	
24. Male Ex. Members and Ex-Nursing Sisters of Canadian Expeditionary Forces receiving treatment or training at Hospitals or Institutions of Department of Soldier's Civil Re-Establishment.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	.....	Regular first class one way fare.
25. Male Members of Canadian Expeditionary Forces under medical treatment travelling on Furlough.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	.....	Regular first class one way fare.
26. Market Return Fares	2nd.	x	.....	x	Between stations on Intercolonial Rly. (Ste. Hyacinthe and East).	.....	Approximately 2·05 cents per mile each way
27. Mileage Books—1,000 Miles.....	1st.	x	.....	x	(*a*) Stations in Canada, Port Arthur, Armstrong, Ont. and East.	3·1 cents per mile.	
" " ..	1st.	.....	.....	x	(*b*) Canadian Government Railway Stations (Ste. Hyacinthe and East).	3·1 cents per mile.	

STATEMENT "C" CANADIAN NATIONAL LINES—SPECIAL FARES—*Con.*

Description	Class	Applies over lines indicated by "X"			Territory	Bases of Fares	
		Can. Nor. Ry.	G.T.P. Ry.	Can. Gov. Ry.		One Way	Round Trip
27. Mileage Books—*Con.* Lumber-Workmen	2nd.	.....	.....	x	(*c*) Stations on International Railway of N.B.	2·875 cents per mile.	
" " ..	2nd.	.....	.....	x	(*d*) Stations on Transcontinental Railway. (Quebec City to Nottaway, Que. incl.)	3 cents per mile.	
28. Militia and Naval Forces.	1st and 2nd	x x	x x	x x	All stations in Canada.....	*First Class*—3 cents per mile. *Second Class*—2½ cents per mile.	*First Class*—3 cents per mile each way. *Second Class*—2½ cents per mile each way.
					Exception: For Bodies of Troops by special train numbering 350 or more and travelling distances over 100 miles.	2½ cents per mile	2½ cents per mile each way.
29. Missionary, Charitable—Eleemosynary Workers.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	One-half regular first class one way fare.	Regular first class one way fare.
30. Press, Members of the.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	2·3 cents per mile.	2·3 cents per mile each way
					Exceptions: Wolf Creek, Alta.-Vancouver-Prince Rupert, incl. Tannis-Brazeau, Alta. incl. Hudson Bay Jct., Sask. The Pas, Man. incl.	2½ cents per mile	2½ cents per mile each way.
31. Royal Canadian Mounted Police.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	2½ cents per mile	2½ cents per mile each way.
32. Salvation Army—Rescue Officers (Women).	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	One-half regular first class one way fare.	Regular first class one way fare.
33. Salvation Army—Prison Gate Officers.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	One-half regular first class one way fare.	Regular first class one way fare.
34. Second class return fares.	2nd	.....	.....	x	Between stations on Prince Edward Island only.	.....	Approximately 2·05 cents per mile each way
35. Sisters of Charity, Nuns and Deaconesses.	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada.....	One-half regular first class one way fare.	Regular first class one way fare.
36. Soldiers' Land Settlement (for Ex-Members of C.E.F.)	1st	x	x	x	All stations in Canada—for distances of not less than fifty (50) miles.	1 cent per mile..	1 cent per mile each way.
37. Summer Tourist Fares.	1st	x	x	x	To summer tourist resorts and stations in Canada.	.....	Double regular first class one way fare less 10%.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—TIES

Mr. PUTNAM:

1. What quantity of railway ties have been purchased by the Canadian National Railway in Nova Scotia since November 30th, 1921?

2. What are the names of the parties from whom said ties were purchased and the quantity in each case?

3. What was the price paid?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. 150,130.

2.

Contractor	Quantity	Price		
		No. 1	No. 2	No. 3
Awalt, D. W.	1,000	60	50	25
Bent, C. M.	10,000	70	60	30
Best, Eldred	500	60	50	30
Blanchard, C. P.	10,000	70	60	35
Bruhm, J. M. and Oikles Ltd.	10,000	70	60	30
Gass, Robt.	3,000	60	50	30
Johnson, M. S.	300	60	50	30
Kennedy, Bros.	600	60	50	30
Kennedy, D. H.	1,000	60	50	30
King, Bros.	2,000	60	50	30
King, Willard	2,000	60	50	30
Livingston, J. H.	2,000	60	50	30
Lunenburg Milling Co.	25,000	70	60	30
Martin, Malcolm	200	60	50	30
Martin, R. N.	500	60	50	30
Lewis Miller & Co., Ltd.	8,400	60	50	30
Morton, Bennet	2,500	60	50	30
Munro, J. S.	2,000	60	50	30
MacBaine, J. W.	880	60	50	30
MacAskill, Frank	300	60	50	30
McCabe, C. A.	2,500	60	50	30
McDonald, John D.	3,000	60	50	30
Maitland Lumber Co.	15,000	70	60	30
McDonald, Parker	10,000	70	60	30
McDonald, Robert	400	60	50	30
McIntyre, H. A.	600	60	50	30
McIver, John E.	350	58	48	28
McKay, Garnet	2,000	65	55	30
McKenzie, A.	500	60	50	30
McKenzie, K. M.	500	60	50	30
McLean, Allan	400	60	50	30
McLean, John D.	800	60	50	30
McLeod, Hugh	1,000	60	50	30
McPherson, Robert	100	60	50	30
McRitchie, M. A.	300	60	50	30
Nicholson, Dan.	500	60	50	30
Payne, E. G.	5,000	65	55	27½
Reid, A. J. & Son	15,000	70	60	35
Turner, John	10,000	70	60	30

3. See answer to question No. 2.

FREIGHT RATES

Mr. STEWART (Lanark):

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation at this session to continue the provisions of subsection (5) of section 325 of the Railway Act, 1919, or to in any way further suspend the freight rate provisions of chapter 5 of the Statutes of Canada 60-61, passed on the 29th of June, 1897, which would become operative on and after July 6 next, or to repeal or vary or in any way amend said chapter 5?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The subject of freight rates is being referred for consideration to a committee of the House, and is receiving the consideration of the Government. Should it be found necessary or desirable to introduce legislation at this session, intimation to this effect will be given in due course.

[Mr. W. C. Kennedy.]

ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. CHAPLIN:

How many Orders in Council have been passed by the present Government since it came into office on the 29th day of December, 1921, up to and including the 31st of March, 1922?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

Orders in Council—

Establishing regulations under legislation	35	
Administrative	608	
Routine	91	
		734
Treasury Board minutes—		
Administrative	497	
Routine	129	
		626
Total		1,360

Mr. ANDERSON:

How many Orders in Council were passed by the late government during the months of January, February and March, 1921?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Orders in Council passed during January, February and March, 1921:

Orders in Council—		
Administrative	878	
Establishing regulations under legislation	30	
Routine	62	
		970
Treasury Board minutes—		
Administrative	247	
Routine	53	
		300
Total		1,270

DOMINION NOTES

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many dollars in Dominion notes were passed over by the hon. Finance Minister White to Mackenzie and Mann on the guaranteed bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway?

2. How many dollars in Dominion notes did Mr. White, as Minister of Finance, pay to the Grand Trunk Railway on bonded security?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Under authority of Orders in Council detailed hereunder, $10,000,000 by way of the issue of Dominion notes were paid to the Canadian Northern Railway company, on the security of $12,500,000 bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway company deposited with the Minister of Finance.

Date and number of Order in Council	Amount of advance
Sept. 5, 1914, P.C. 2325	$2,500,000
Sept. 26, 1914, P.C. 2450	2,500,000
Oct. 24, 1914, P.C. 2670	2,000,000
Nov. 20, 1914, P.C. 2921	2,000,000
Dec. 16, 1914, P.C. 3170	1,000,000

2. Moneys were advanced about the same time to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company, but not to the parent Grand Trunk Railway company.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—CHIEF OF ORGANIZATION BRANCH

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. What is the name and age of the chief of the Organization Branch of the Civil Service Commission?

2. When was he first appointed to the commission, in what capacity and at what salary?

3. Was he appointed after competitive examination?

4. What experience had he fitting him for this position?

5. On what date, month and year, was he appointed as chief of the said Organization Branch, and at what salary?

6. Was his appointment retroactive?

7. If so, to what date, month and year, and on whose recommendation?

8. Did he receive any back pay?

9. If so, what amount?

10. What increase has he received each year since 1918?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. C. V. Putman, 33 years.

2. Temporary, to assist in classification work November 15, 1918, at $1,500.

3. Yes, when permanently appointed.

4. Six and a half years' banking experience, eight years of engineering experience; nearly two years of experience in classification work.

5. January 11, 1922, at $3,840.

6. Yes.

7. April 1, 1921. The Civil Service Commission.

8. Yes.

9. $450.

10. 1918—Answered by No. 2.

1919—Appointed Acting Chief, Organization Branch, March 1919. Temporary $2,700.

1920—Appointed Assistant Chief, Organization Branch, and Acting Chief, March 1920. Permanent $3,060.

1921—Promoted to Chief, Organization Branch, permanent, at $3,840.

VENEREAL DISEASES

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. What amounts are contributed yearly by the Department of Health to provincial authorities for purposes of combating venereal diseases?

2. What amount of such sum is unexpended by each province for the year 1921?

3. Has the federal Department of Health any control of the amount contributed?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. For 1921 the following amounts were contributed: New Brunswick, $7,517.83; Nova Scotia, $10,573.86; Alberta, $11,979.62; Manitoba, $12,611.20; British Columbia, $14,628.19; Saskatchewan, $15,361.63; Quebec, $47,388.80; Ontario, $57,473.68. The province of Prince Edward Island declined to enter into the scheme; therefore, no contribution was made to that province.

2. None.

3. Yes.

ST. THOMAS-NIAGARA FALLS HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAPLIN:

1. Has any federal grant been paid on the cost of the provincial highway from St. Thomas to Niagara Falls, Ontario?

2. What is the distance from the Village of Canboro to the Village of Allanburg, via Dunnville and Welland, how many railway crossings are there, and has any federal grant been paid towards the cost of this section of the said highway?

3. What is the estimated cost of this section of the said highway?

4. What is the distance from Canboro village straight east, following the old Canboro or Talbot road to the village of Allanburg. How many railway crossings are there on this section, and was any estimate prepared for this route?

5. Why was such a big bow put in the road between Canboro and Allanburg villages, at such an increased mileage and expense?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. No.

2. 36.9 miles; eight railway crossings; no federal grant paid.

3. This section has not been separately estimated. Portion from Canboro to Dunnville estimated to cost at rate of $29,918 per mile.

4. 25.8 miles. Four railway crossings. This department has no information of any estimates made.

5. Road was located through Dunnville and Welland for following reasons: 1st. Following practice of the provincial government of reaching county seats and larger centres of each county. 2nd. With object of connecting in future with an extension of the provincial system on the old Garrison road through townships of Bertie, Humberstone and Wainfleet to Fort Erie.

WELLAND CANAL—TONNAGE

Mr. CHURCH:

How many vessels, and of what tonnage, passed through the Welland Canal during each year since 1913?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

Year	Vessels		Cargo in Tons
	No.	Registered Tonnage	
1913	3,229	3,164,530	3,570,714
1914	3,692	3,635,695	3,860,969
1915	2,922	2,855,195	3,061,012
1916	2,939	2,513,619	2,544,964
1917	3,251	2,776,261	2,490,542
1918	3,192	2,595,389	2,174,298
1919	3,213	2,616,014	2,170,779
1920	3,124	2,528,256	2,276,072
1921	3,770	3,329,371	3,076,422

STEAM RAILWAY FREIGHT—TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

What was the total gross freight tonnage entering and leaving Toronto on steam railways since 1914?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: Information in full not available, but a record begun in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, September, 1920, shows the following for the year ended October 31, 1921:—

Freight loaded on cars in Toronto .. .. 1,155,599 tons
Freight unloaded from cars in Toronto .. .. 4,600,301 tons

VICKERS DRY DOCK

Mr. MARLER:

1. What subsidy, if any. was paid per annum by the late government to Vickers Dry Dock, Montreal?

2. On what valuation was this subsidy based?

3. What does said valuation include in the way of plant, tools, machinery, fixed assets and so forth?

4. Was subsidy originally intended to be paid only on construction of actual dock?

5. Is the subsidy to be continued?

6. If so, on what basis and on what valuation?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. $105,000.00.

2 and 3. Valuation includes: Buildings, $561,075; fixed plant, $199,915; machine tools in machine and ship departments, $479,955; electrical equipment, $178,495; patent self-docking floating dock of 25,000 tons lifting capacity, $1,775,000; rent to be paid, capitalized at 4 per cent, $353,015; interest, during construction of plant, 5 per cent for half year on $3,000,000, $75,000; total, $3,622,455.

4. No.

5. Yes.

6. The value established was $3,000,000, and under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act 9-10 Edw. VII., chap. 17 (1910), a subsidy at the rate of 3½ per cent is payable annually for a period of 35 years from January 1st, 1914.

PARLIAMENT HILL MONUMENTS

Mr. St. PERE:

1. Is it the intention of the Federal Government to erect on Parliament Hill monuments of our celebrated statesmen?

2. If so, when will the monument of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier be erected?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The policy pursued in the past will be continued.

2. In the near future.

MR. E. BERTRAND

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Is Mr. E. Bertrand a permanent official of the Labour Department at Montreal?

2. If so, does he receive a lower salary than others holding similar positions at Vancouver, Calgary and Toronto, and what is the reason for the distinction?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. Mr. T. Bertrand is a permanent official of the Labour Department at Montreal.

2. Mr. Bertrand was classified by the Civil Service Commission as "Junior Wage Investigator and Mediator," with a salary range of $1,500 to $1,860. The Fair Wages Officers at Vancouver, Calgary, and Toronto were each given, by the Civil Service Commission, the classification "Wage Investigator and Mediator," with a salary range of $1,980 to $2,400.

Mr. W. E. CAMPBELL

Mr. BOWEN:

1. Has W. E. Campbell been recently appointed to advise the Minister of Railways or Deputy Minister of Railways, or the Board of Railway Commissioners in regard to traffic matters, or has he been appointed in any capacity, and for what duties?

2. If so, is such appointment permanent or temporary, and if the latter, for what period?

3. Is Mr. W. E. Campbell the gentleman who has held the position of Secretary of the Canadian Freight Association, Western Lines?

4. If so, has he resigned such position?

5. Is Mr. Campbell's appointment for the special purpose of advising the government regarding the Crow's Nest Pass agreement?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. W. E. Campbell has been appointed as a rate expert to assist the Board of Railway Commissioners in an advisory capacity.

2. Is employed by the month for such period as may be found necessary.

3. Was secretary of the association in question until September 18th last, when he was appointed chairman.

4. At present Mr. Campbell is on leave of absence from his late duties.

5. No.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—KAMLOOPS-KELOWNA BRANCH

Mr. McBRIDE:

1. What has been the total amount of expenditure in connection with the Kamloops-Kelowna Branch of the Canadian National Railways?

2. When does the Canadian National Railway Board intend to complete the said branch?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Expenditure to December 31st, 1921, $5,268,156.45.

2. Completion of this branch as well as other branches deferred until financial conditions permit construction.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND—INCOME TAX

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Did the Department of Finance, during the month of March, send out a circular letter to the accountants of the several public departments at Ottawa enclosing a statement showing the amount of interest added for the calendar year 1921 to the Retirement Fund accounts of the several employees of the public service, from whose salaries Retirement Fund reduction is made monthly?

2. Did such circular letter request the accountants of the several departments "to notify the employees concerned that the amount of this interest is to be included in their declaration of income tax for 1921, providing they come within the scope of the Dominion of Canada Income War Tax Act?

3. Upon whose authority was such letter communicated to the several departments?

4. Before the notification was sent out, was it submitted to the Honourable the Minister of Finance for his approval?

5. Was the opinion of the Department of Justice obtained as to the legality of such notification? If so, what was the opinion of that department?

6. Is it obligatory or optional on the part of any permanent employee of the Government not on the old "Superannuation List" to come under the Retirement Fund?

7. If obligatory, can an employee paying to the Retirement Fund deduct from his declaration of income the amount of his annual contribution to such fund?

8. Is the interest allowed on Retirement Fund contributions paid annually to the officials affected, or is it retained by the Government?

9. Is a Civil Servant who has to pay income tax annually upon the full amount of his income, less the statutory deduction, taxed both for Retirement Fund principal and interest withheld from him by the government?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Upon the request of the Commissioner of Taxation for the convenience of the members of the Civil Service concerned.

4. No.

5. No.

6. Obligatory.

7. No.

8. Interest on Retirement Fund accounts is retained by the Government and added to the amount at the credit of the respective officials.

9. A civil servant's salary is subject to income tax law and no allowance is made for deductions on account of Retirement Fund. The annual increment of interest on retirement fund balances is considered as part of income and subject to income tax law.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PENSION FUND

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways and Canals or the Board of Commissioners of the Canadian National Railways to reorganize the pension fund of the said railways so as to increase the pensions to employees?
2. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Investigation is now being conducted, and it is hoped shortly to present for consideration a complete pension scheme for the Canadian National Railways.
2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to increase the pension paid to the old employees of the Intercolonial Railway?
2. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. The current estimates of the Department of Railways includes a vote of $50,000, the same as last year, to provide for increasing the minimum compensation from $20 to $30 per month for employees who have been superannuated under the present Provident Fund Act of the Intercolonial Railway.
2. Answered by No. 1.

GRAND ANSE, C.B., MAIL SERVICE

Mr. JONES:

1. When were tenders received by the Post Office Department for carrying the mails from Grand Anse, via Arichat and West Arichat, Cape Breton?
2. From whom were tenders received and for what amount in each case?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, on what date, and what was the amount of the tender?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. November 4, 1921.
2. (a) C. J. Terrio, $1,742; J. Doiron, $1,765; S. A. Boucher, $2,000; E. C. Reinhardt, $2,000; G. Landry, $2,200. (b) These tenders being considered somewhat excessive for the amount of work involved the tenderers were given an opportunity to modify their offers and the following were received: C. J. Terrio, $1,700; J. Doiron, $1,700; S. A. Boucher, $1,750; E. C. Reinhardt, $1,878; G. Landry, $1,900.
3. C. J. Terrio, the present contractor, having rendered satisfactory service and having completed arrangements to carry on the work, the contract was awarded to him on April 10, 1922, at the rate of $1,700 per annum.

[Mr. Fielding.]

POSTAL RECEIPTS

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What were the total Post Office receipts during each year, from 1911 to 1921, inclusive, in the town of Parry Sound, Ontario?
2. What towns or cities in Canada, having equal or less average Post Office receipts, have public buildings used for Post Office purposes?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Parry Sound, Ontario,—1911, $6,951.36; 1912, $6,790.81; 1913, $7,397.54; 1914, $7,906.29; 1915, $7,743.09; 1916, $15,919.55; 1917, $17,807.23; 1918, $18,418.46; 1919, $17,844.86; 1920, $14,906.44; 1921, $14,443.80.

2. Acton, Ontario, $6,728.04; Alexandria, Ontario, $8,729.45; Almonte, Ontario, $9,392.21; Amherstburg, Ontario, $8,267.11; Arnprior, Ontario, $14,301.65; Athens, Ontario, $3,983.06; Aurora, Ontario, $11,192.40; Aylmer West, Ontario, $12,897.70; Bowmanville, Ontario, $12,672.36; Burford, Ontario, $2,715.55; Bracebridge, Ontario, $12,668.39; Cardinal, Ontario, $5,058.06; Carleton Place, Ontario, $13,424.05; Cayuga, Ontario, $4,754.35; Chesley, Ontario, $8,586.80; Clinton, Ontario, $9,138.11; Deseronto, Ontario, $5,749.12; Dresden, Ontario, $6,230.82; Eganville, Ontario, $5,568.90; Elmira, Ontario, $6,213.97; Elora, Ontario, $6,287.63; Essex, Ontario, $8,997.06; Fergus, Ontario, $14,644.76; Glencoe, Ontario, $5,766.47; Grimsby, Ontario, $11,126.71; Hanover, Ontario, $13,112.12; Harriston, Ontario, $10,147,95; Hawkesbury, Ontario, $9,321.04; Kemptville, Ontario, $6,488.07; Kincardine, Ontario, $9,869.27; Lakefield, Ontario, $4,705.47; Leamington, Ontario, $14,279.30; Listowel, Ontario, $11,738.86; Markham, Ontario, $3,751.86; Milton West, Ontario, $8,932.00; Milverton, Ontario, $5,050.58; Mitchell, Ontario, $8,374.85; Mount Forest, Ontario, $10,139.10; Newmarket, Ontario, $14,897.91; Norwich, Ontario, $6,692.70; Orangeville, Ontario, $10,725.61; Palmerston, Ontario, $6,304.04; Park Hill, Ontario, $7,021.85; Petrolia, Ontario, $13,213.95; Port Colborne, Ontario, $13,933.98; Port Perry, Ontario, $5,764.97; Prescott, Ontario, $11,284.25; Seaforth, Ontario, $10,447.91; Shelburne, Ontario, $7,186.21; Strathroy, Ontario, $11,580.97; Tilbury, Ontario, $5,414.10; Tillsonburg, Ontario, $14,588.54; Uxbridge, Ontario, $8,555.87; Walkerton, Ontario, $11,046.75; Whitby, Ontario, $11,631.47; Wingham, Ontario, $10,875.13; Acton Vale, P.Q. $3,176.67; Arthabaska, P.Q. $3,393.82; Aylmer East, P.Q. $3,476.40; Berthier (en haut), P.Q. $5,715.66; Buckingham, P.Q. $7,249.63; Coaticook,

P.Q. $10,899.58; Cookshire, P.Q. $6,395.45; Drummondville East, P.Q. $7,569.51; East Angus, P.Q. $6,156.29; Farnham, P.Q. $8,413.70; Granby, P.Q. $14,707.63; Iberville, P.Q. $3,044.45; Jonquieres, P.Q. $5,033.70; Knowlton, P.Q. $5,316.55; Lachute, P.Q. $7,829.12; Lake Megantic, P.Q. $6,853.85; La Malbaie, P.Q. $4,544.47; La Prairie, P.Q. $3,154.18; Louiseville, P.Q. $3,676.73; L'Assomption, P.Q. $2,687.87; Levis, P.Q. $7,557.21; Magog, P.Q. $8,782.20; Marieville, P.Q. $2,865.69; Matane, P.Q. $5,418.60; Montmagny, P.Q. $7,397.36; Nicolet, P.Q. $5,109.35; Pierreville, P.Q. $3,109.47; Plessisville, P.Q. $4,807.22; Richmond, P.Q. $10,082.27; Rigaud, P.Q. $3,118.18; Rimouski, P.Q. $9,482.42; Roberval, P.Q. $7,869.25; Rock Island, P.Q. $8,517.62; Riviéré du Loup (en bas), P.Q. $7,018.48; Ste. Agathe des Monts, P.Q. $8,380.99; St. Eustache, P.Q. $2,883.59; St. Gabriel de Brandon, P. Q. $2,663.47; St. Jerome, P.Q. $8,505.02; Ste. Therese de Blainville, P.Q. $4,872.75; Shawville, P.Q. $4,273.92; Sorel, P.Q. $11,188.16; Terrebonne, P.Q. $5,080.10; Valleyfield, P.Q. $10,587.32; Victoriaville, P.Q. $12,744.07; Annapolis Royal, N.S. $6,750.37; Arichat, N.S. $1,763.72; Baddeck, N.S. $2,787.91; Canso, N.S. $4,589.84; Digby, N.S. $8,670.45; Guysboro, N.S. $2,662.09; Inverness, N.S. $4,436.21; Liverpool, N.S. $9,524.69; Lunenburg, N.S. $11,327.67; Parrsboro, N.S. $6,487.50; Pictou, N.S. $13,253.04; Shelburne, N.S. $4,865.60; Springhill, N.S. $9,073.12; Sydney Mines, N.S. $9,638.99; Trenton, N.S. $5,343.76; Westville, N.S. $6,611.07; Wolfville, N.S. $11,806.23; Bathurst, N.B. $11,829.73; Chatham, N.B. $12,938.56; Dalhousie, N.B. $4,988.22; Fairville, N.B. $4,831.16; Grand Falls, N.B. $5,605.47; Hampton Station, N.B. $2,685.32; Hartland, N.B. $4,778.99; Hillsborough, N.B. $2,880.97; Maryville, N.B. $2,194.21; Milltown, N.B. $2,314.69; Newcastle, N.B. $12,891.64; Richibucto, N.B. $2,754.80; Sussex, N.B. $14,361.47; Georgetown, P.E.I. $1,450.40; Montague, P.E.I. $4,839.36; Souris East, P.E.I. $4,709.13; Tignish, P.E.I. $2,593.95; Carman, Man. $8,560.72; Emerson, Man. $3,936.73; Minnedosa, Man. $9,457.22; Morden, Man. $7,495.58; Neepawa, Man. $11,538.85; Selkirk, Man. $7,717.51; Souris, Man. $8,689.86; Stonewall, Man. $4,912.16; The Pas, Man. $6,897.13; Virden, Man. $9,674.04; Battleford, Sask. $9,585.57; Gravelbourg, Sask. $8,591.96; Humboldt, Sask. $11,719.28; Lloydminster, Sask. $9,913.14; Maple Creek, Sask. $10,746.59; Melfort, Sask. $12,965.21; Bassano, Alberta, $7,050.96; Westaskiwin, Alberta, $14,777.99; Ashcroft, B.C. $5,131.48; Chilliwack, B.C. $13,151.34; Comox, B.C. $1,024.00; Cumberland, B.C. $6,504.98; Duncan's Station, B.C. $11,700.71; Grand Forks, B.C. $7,857.73; Greenwood, B.C. $2,765.48; Ladysmith, B.C. $5,963.30; Port Alberni, B.C. $4,618.32; Rossland, B.C. $8,480.85; Union Bay, B.C. $1,636.73.

CANADIAN MERCANTILE MARINE—PASSENGER TRAFFIC

Mr. MARTELL:

1. Was any person employed or any Commission appointed by the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railway during the year 1921, to proceed to England to investigate or report upon the question of passenger traffic on the Atlantic Ocean in connection with the Canadian Mercantile Marine?
2. If so, who was appointed?
3. What amount was paid for services rendered?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. No.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. See answer to No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. LOGAN:

1. What was the quantity of coal imported from the United States into Canada in the years 1918-19, 1919-20, 1920-21 by the Government of Canada for use upon
   (a) Railways;
   (b) Federal buildings and public works?
2. What was the amount of coal imported by the Government of Canada from United States during the above mentioned years for the use upon railways
   (a) East of Lake Superior;
   (b) West of Lake Superior?
3. What was the cost of coal per ton imported by the Government of Canada from the United States during the above mentioned years
   (a) At point of production;
   (b) At point of Canadian delivery?

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What is the total amount of the bonus paid to civil servants up to April 1, 1921?
2. What is the total amount paid to civil servants on account of annual statutory increase for the fiscal years 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921?

Mr. SHAW:

1. What offices, buildings or parts of buildings are rented for Government purposes in the city of Calgary?
2. From what owners and through what rental agents are such offices, buildings or parts of buildings rented?
3. What rental is paid in each case?
4. For what period are such offices, buildings or parts of buildings rented?
5. Which of such leases, if any, have been renewed by the present Government?

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What amount of compensation has been paid out of the vote for health of animals, for cattle slaughtered affected with tuberculosis, during each of the years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What proportion of this amount was paid for animals slaughtered in herds supplying milk to the people in cities, towns and villages; not necessarily pure bred animals, during the years referred to?

3. What proportion of the total grant paid was for animals under what is known as the accredited herd system of pure bred animals, during each of the years referred to?

4. What was the amount paid out in connection with each of the pure breeds for which compensation was paid during each of the above years?

5. What was the average compensation per animal paid in connection with each breed referred to in question four, during each of the above years?

6. What was the total compensation paid in connection with each breed in each province during each of the three years referred to?

7. How many veterinary inspectors have been employed by the health of animals branch of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the health of animals during each of the three years referred to?

8. What has been the total amount paid in salaries to inspectors under the health of animals branch during the years above mentioned?

THE GRAIN TRADE

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RECONSTRUCTION OF WHEAT BOARD

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With reference to the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, in which the House concurred on the eleventh instant, I may say that the Government has obtained the written opinion of the law officers of the Crown upon the question thereby suggested as to the constitutionality of the reconstruction of the Canadian Wheat Board, and that opinion is now submitted for the information of the House. I would ask the permission of the House to have the opinion printed in Hansard so that it will be available in that form to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted for the publication of this document in Hansard?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

(The document referred to is as follows):

OTTAWA, April 17, 1922.

Memorandum for the Minister of Justice:

The House of Commons on 11th instant having concurred in a report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization recommending "that the question of the constitutionality of the reconstruction of the Wheat Board, with the powers conferred thereon by the Orders-in-Council establishing or extending the same, be referred to the law officers of the Crown for their reasoned opinion", I submit for your consideration the following statement of my opinion.

The Canadian Wheat Board to which the resolution refers was constituted under authority of an Order-in-Council, No. 1589, of July 31, 1919, which was sanctioned, as therein expressed, "under and in virtue of the War Measures Act", and there are several amending Orders, the principal one being No. 1741 of August 18, 1919. The powers, duties and rights of the Board as set forth in these Orders-in-Council were by the terms of an *Act respecting the Canadian Wheat Board*, Chapter 9 of 1919, second session, continued in force for eighteen months from the passing of that Act, November 10, 1919, and the Governor-in-Council was thereby empowered to fill vacancies and to make regulations for the extension, conduct or management of the business of the Board. The Orders-in-Council and the rules, regulations and orders made thereunder by the Board were moreover by the provisions of an *Act concerning the Canadian Wheat Board*, Chapter 5 of 1921, ratified and confirmed as and from their respective dates, and it was also thereby enacted that the Board should continue to exercise its powers so far as might be necessary and convenient for winding up and concluding the business of the Board.

By the Orders-in-Council the Board was empowered to make such enquiries and investigations as were necessary to ascertain what supplies of wheat were or might be available from time to time; the locality and ownership of these supplies; the transportation and elevator facilities available therefor, and generally the conditions connected with the marketing of wheat.

The Board was also empowered to buy and sell wheat or wheat products at any point in Canada; to pay therefor the prices to be scheduled by the Board and approved by the Governor-in-Council; to sell wheat to the millers in Canada at prices and upon conditions fixed by the Board; to store, transport and market wheat; to sell quantities in excess of domestic requirements to purchasers overseas or in other countries at such prices as might be obtainable; to provide for the retention and distribution in Canada of seed wheat required for the season of 1920; to fix maximum prices or margins of profit at which flour and other products made from wheat delivered to millers might be sold, and to fix standards of quality of flour; to purchase flour from millers at prices to be fixed by the Board, and to sell the flour in Canada or in other countries; to take possession of and to sell and deliver wheat stored in any elevator or warehouse, or in railway cars or Canadian boats, and to deal with the same as if acquired by the Board in ordinary course; to control by license or otherwise the buying and selling of wheat and wheat products in Canada, and the export and sales of flour outside of Canada; to allocate Canadian lake tonnage and to distribute cars for rail shipments; to provide that no person, firm or corporation other than the Board should buy wheat, operate any elevator or warehouse where wheat is received, or handle wheat on commission or otherwise, unless licensed by the Board; to require that any wheat sold or purchased in Canada should be delivered to the Board, or to its order, in accordance with such regulations as the Board might make; to re-

quire every licensee of the Board accepting delivery of wheat to pay the purchaser by way of an advance or cash payment such sum or sums as might be directed by the Board; to order any person holding wheat stored in any elevator or warehouse or in railway cars or Canadian boats to sell and dispose of the wheat to any purchaser named by the Board on such terms as the Board might direct, and it was provided that any such order of the Board should pass to the purchaser the property in the wheat therein described.

The Board was also empowered to prohibit the export out of Canada, or the importation into Canada, of any wheat or wheat products otherwise than in accordance with the orders or regulations of the Board, and to prescribe penalties for contravention of the orders or regulations of the Board.

There were some other powers conferred by these orders, of a subordinate or incidental character, which need not be more fully set out because the foregoing statement indicates sufficiently for present purposes the objects of the board and the scope and character of its powers.

It will be perceived that these powers naturally group themselves under two heads; there are enabling or facultative provisions, and there are compulsory provisions. As to those of the former class, I apprehend that Parliament has undoubted authority to constitute a board for the purpose of buying and selling, and to enable it to contract and to exercise such powers as are necessary or incidental to a voluntary undertaking.

The board is, however, invested with compulsory powers, and for the purpose of considering the authority of Parliament to constitute a commission clothed with these powers, it is well to mention some of them separately. They include (a) the fixing of maximum prices or margins of profit at which flour may be sold by the millers; (b) the compulsory taking of wheat in store or in transit subject to compensation fixed by the board, including power by order of the board to transfer the property in any wheat so stored or in transit to such purchaser, and upon such terms, as the board may nominate and prescribe; (c) prohibition of buying and selling wheat in Canada upon commission or otherwise, and the operating of elevators or warehouses for wheat, except by license of the board; (d) authority to require delivery to the board of all wheat sold or purchased in Canada; (e) regulation by the board of the dealings of its licensees.

These coercive powers would be exercisable by the reconstructed board in the provinces, and they directly affect property and the exercise of civil rights in the provinces; they enable the board generally, not only to have a monopoly of the trade in wheat, but also to regulate the price of flour manufactured in a province, even from wheat grown in that province; they may be exercised to forbid trading in the provinces except by Dominion license. They are therefore powers of the character described by the British North America Act 1867 as relating to matters coming within "property and civil rights in the province," or "matters of a merely local or private nature in the province." Consequently, upon well established principles or interpretation, the reconstruction of the board with these powers is competent to the Parliament of Canada only if the necessary enacting authority be found in the enumerated Dominion powers of legislation, in which case the prima facie provincial powers are overborne.

Comprehensive authority is conferred upon the Parliament of Canada to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the provinces, and moreover there are enumerated subjects as to which the authority of Parliament is exclusive; one of these is the class of subjects described as "militia, military and naval service and defence," including the necessary or incidental powers exercisable in time of war for the defence of the country. No question is suggested as to the authority of Parliament, or of the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act and the confirming Acts, to give effect to the Orders in Council under which the former Wheat Board was established and exercised the powers expressed to be conferred upon it. The temporary nature of these powers is evidenced, not only by the Orders in Council themselves, but also by chapter 5 of 1921, whereby the Orders in Council were continued in force merely for the necessary and convenient purpose of winding up and concluding the unsettled business of the board, and thus it is plain that the provisions affecting the former board were sanctioned only as war measures.

The present inquiry is concerned with the question as to whether Parliament may in the existing circumstances reconstruct the board with its former powers, and it does not appear whether it be proposed to reconstruct upon a permanent or a temporary footing; that consideration, however, becomes immaterial if, as I think, the board cannot now be reconstituted as a war measure.

It might have been suggested that the exclusive power of Parliament with regard to "the regulation of trade and commerce" would extend to regulation of the wheat trade in the manner provided by the Orders in Council, but this power, comprehensive enough in its mere statement, has been limited by judicial interpretation; and, compatibly with the decisions, it does not comprise the powers which would be necessary for the reconstruction of the Wheat Board.

The insurance trade was regulated by means of a system of licenses under the provisions of a series of statutes enacted by the Parliament of Canada from the time of the Union until 1910, but when the Consolidated Act of that year came to be reviewed by the courts it was held, both by the Supreme Court of Canada and by the judicial committee of the Privy Council, that the legislation was ultra vires, and their lordships of the judicial committee in pronouncing the judgment held that, as a result of the decisions, "it must now be taken that the authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not extend to the regulation by a licensing system of a particular trade in which Canadians would otherwise be free to engage in the provinces." Attorney General for Canada vs. Attorney General for Alberta, 1916 Appeal Cases, at page 596.

Similarly in the recent case with regard to the Board of Commerce Act, and the Combines and Fair Prices Act, although the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada were equally divided in opinion, it was held by the judicial committee that the legislation, which was designed to prohibit the hoarding of the necessaries of life and to require the sale of them

at fair prices, could not be upheld under the power to regulate trade and commerce.

It may be observed that the wheat trade is in some of its aspects not merely local within the province of production. The greater part of the crop in the wheat growing provinces is exported, not only from the province of growth, but from the Dominion, and the trade thus assumes an interprovincial or foreign character; it is also a trade of great dimensions and importance affecting the interests of the whole Dominion; but in like manner the insurance trade in itself was not the less interprovincial or extra local; and moreover the fair distribution of the necessaries of life at reasonable prices, which seems to have been the dominant motive of the Board of Commerce and Fair Prices legislation, was a project of general importance and of common interest, potentially affecting the whole body politic.

In the Prohibition Case, 1896 Appeal Cases, at page 361, their lordships of the Judicial Committee expressed their conviction that "some matters, in their origin local and provincial, might attain such dimensions as to affect the body politic of the Dominion, and to justify the Canadian Parliament in passing laws for their regulation or abolition in the interests of the Dominion"; and apparently their lordships upheld the Canada Temperance Act, which was then under consideration, upon the ground that the dimensions of the liquor trade were such as to withdraw the particular subject matter of that Act from provincial powers. We are told however that the principle enunciated by the Prohibition Case is to be applied with great caution, and with reluctance, and that its recognition as relevant can be justified only after scrutiny sufficient to render it clear that the circumstances are abnormal. A constitutional power which is beset by these conditions, and which moreover depends upon the dimensions of its subject matter, is not a very safe one to rely upon; the principle has in fact been made effective only with relation to the Canada Temperance Act, notwithstanding that it was afterwards advocated in several cases where the subject of the enactment in question was held to remain provincial, although not lacking in growth, magnitude or general importance. Therefore I do not think that the dimensions doctrine can be successfully invoked to reconstitute the compulsory powers which were possessed by the Wheat Board.

It is clear that so long as a subject matter of legislation finds place within the enumerations of provincial powers it does not belong to the Dominion under its general authority to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. It is certain that the essential compulsory powers of the Wheat Board are prima facie included in the provincial enumeration of property and civil rights or local matters in the provinces. In my opinion these powers do not lie within the field which may be occupied by the execution of the Dominion power to regulate trade and commerce, as that power has been expounded in successive decisions by the ultimate tribunal of appeal; and I think it may be affirmed without uncertainty that the necessary reconstructive powers are not comprehended in any other of the Dominion enumerations. While I do not suggest a doubt that conditions of export from the Dominion and foreign trade relations may be regulated by Parliament, I am impressed with the view that these powers cannot be made a cover for legislation which denies the freedom of contract, capacity to buy and sell and the maintenance and exercise of proprietary rights which exist under the provincial laws. The powers of criminal legislation which belong exclusively to the Dominion are in their application to this case of an ancillary character and cannot as such be invoked to afford a sanction for measures in themselves ultra vires. Consequently it is my opinion that the reconstruction of the Wheat Board in the present circumstances with the powers conferred thereon by the Orders-in-Council is a project constitutionally incompetent to the Parliament of Canada.

E. L. NEWCOMBE.

I concur,
Sir LOMER GOUIN,
D. D. McKENZIE.

NOTICE OF MOTION TRANSFERRED

On the motion:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, reports to Council, Orders in Council and other documents in the possession of or under the control of the Government, relating to the alleged application of the British Empire Steel Corporation for incorporation under the Companies Act or any other Statute of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, I asked that this notice of motion for the production of papers be transferred to the debatable motions, and I understood that an order of the House was issued accordingly. I should like that to be done if possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion will be transferred accordingly.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. PUTNAM:

For a return showing a list of the amounts paid, and the persons or firms to whom they were paid, in respect of maintaining the price on the stock markets of Victory Bonds, from the year 1916 to the end of the year 1921. Also a copy of all letters, telegrams, accounts, receipts, memoranda, agreements and other documents relating to this matter.

Mr. SIMPSON:

For a copy of Timber License issued to the Union Bank of Canada or any other parties to cut timber on Indian Lands in the Township of Laird, District of Algoma, together with a copy of all correspondance, letters, memoranda, telegrams and other documents, passing between the Indian Agent at Sault Ste. Marie, the Licensees or any other parties, and the Department of Indian Affairs, in connection therewith. Also a statement of all dues paid the Department in respect to said License.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that legislation be introduced during

the present session to prohibit the adoption of Daylight Saving Time in any part of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution which stands in my name is, I think, of the greatest interest to the people of Canada at the present time. During the war daylight saving was introduced in Canada as a war-time measure, in order that the people of this country should be able to devote an extra hour of the evening to cultivating land, especially in the cities, where, by working on garden plots during this extra hour of daylight, people were able to cultivate a good deal of ground in the aggregate, and so help production. At that time this Parliament enacted a measure enforcing daylight saving throughout the country, and the people without exception accepted the change of time. Since the war ended, this Parliament has not seen fit to re-enact daylight saving legislation, but many of the cities have adopted the change. We find that as a rule the larger cities, through an order of their municipal councils, adopt daylight saving for themselves, but the smaller towns and villages all go by standard time. The result is that there is no uniformity in the clock, of this country, and this causes a great deal of confusion, and even some cases of unhappiness. I submit that if we must have daylight saving time—and I for one do not approve of it—the change should be adopted throughout the whole country, as it would be better to have a uniform time than the present bungle.

The railways, as members of the House all know, are still running on standard time, but in order to meet the convenience of their terminals, which are, of course, always in the cities, they advance their schedules one hour commencing with the first of May, so that on and after the first of May if you are going to leave Ottawa or any other city by a train scheduled to leave the station at three o'clock railroad time, that train leaves at four o'clock city time. If you leave Ottawa at four o'clock and travel to a station an hour's distance away, you will find that according to the local time there it is still four o'clock, whereas by Ottawa time it is five o'clock. This discrepancy creates a great deal of confusion in the minds of the people. As indicating the feeling of people throughout the Dominion on this matter, since giving notice of this resolution I have received a great many letters from all parts of the country commending me for bringing the motion forward and expressing the hope that legislation will be introduced during the present session to prohibit any municipality from advancing its clocks at will. I do not wish to weary the House by reading all these letters but it may be worth while to quote from a few of them. I will commence by reading an excerpt from a letter from the county of Chateauguay:

It is a matter for congratulation to have at least one member of Parliament who is brave enough to rise in his seat and make a stand in favour of the general public. The so-called "Daylight Saving" fad is class legislation of the worst kind, as its chief beneficiaries are the class who already have leisure enough. It is certainly not a measure calculated to be the greatest good to the greatest number, and is without doubt a detriment to agriculture. We wish you success for the manly stand which you have taken and trust that you will keep on with the good work.

Here is a communication from Ontario:

All success to you with your Bill to prohibit forever and ever the so-called daylight saving which is nothing else than a death knell to all people and especially children. Is there one who can come forth and show where anything was gained by such outrageous Acts? Who first put the clock back? Was it not Germany? Why should any civilized people follow their method? Since reading in Thursday's paper I have spoken to a great many, and have heard the greatest praise for the noble stand you are about to take. I will venture to say if a vote was taken nine out of ten would vote against any such measure; and the voice of the people is what all governments should seek on all important questions. I hope no dissenting voice will be heard when you bring in your notice.

Here is another, from New Westminster:

We, Local 134 of Amalgamated Associates of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, endorse your stand on Daylight Saving. Passed at our regular meeting.

I have a letter from the city of Toronto which reads:

Notice in Mail and Empire of 23rd you are going to bring in a bill to prohibit daylight saving in the Dominion, and I, and thousands of others, earnestly pray that you will succeed in carrying it, as daylight saving is the worst fraud that ever was imposed on white people. We have a member here called T. Church. His hobby is daylight saving. He has tried to run this city—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KAY (Reading):

—and will try and run the House in Ottawa, so please tell him where he belongs.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name.

Mr. KAY (Reading):

Get every farmer member to work and vote against that cursed daylight saving, for if it carries we might as well leave the country. So

please fight it to the last ditch, and you will confer a favour on thousands of the sensible, thinking people of this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name?

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask my hon. friend, who is the writer of that letter? I think my hon. friend should lay the communication on the table.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KAY: From another letter I take the following:

I learn that you are good enough to interest yourself in what has become, and proven to be, a great hardship and annoyance to the working classes in Canada. May I ask that you make a special effort this session of Parliament to have daylight saving prohibited in every city and town in the Dominion. . . . It is a fight of the weak against the strong with money influence only. As a mother of five growing children, labouring from six o'clock a.m. sun time every day in the year, you will appreciate how a thing like this wrecks one's nerves, especially women and children, not speaking of the hardship worked on the many who go to their daily occupation at a very early hour. The movement is purely a pleasure one to benefit those with time and money. It inconveniences no one by the abolishing of it. And why should the poor and less fortunate classes of this country be bumped around to please a certain set?

Here is a quotation from another letter:

Your proposed prohibition of daylight saving is the first actual attempt that I have seen to stop the growth of the idea that the farmers are a class of ignorant peasants whose interests do not deserve any consideration when they conflict with those of the superior beings who dwell in the cities.

Another letter contains the following:

As a reader of the Parliamentary news I wish to state that I am delighted to see that you are taking steps to prevent the further imposition upon this country of what is known as "daylight saving." Your action, if successful, will prevent further interference with "Standard Sun Time," and from what I personally know of conditions, I feel sure that you should receive the support of every member, whether Liberal or Progressive or Conservative. Personally, I feel that any member failing to support you would surely be untrue to his constituents. The farmers are the backbone of our country, and it is the time requirements of the farmers which should therefore be considered first, last and always.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rise to a point of order. In the first place, I desire to ask a ruling upon the question whether or not the hon. gentleman is in order in reading anonymous communications, particularly communications reflecting upon members of the House. It has been held, I think, upon more than one occasion that this is entirely out of order, and should be deleted from Hansard, and, on previous occasions such letters have been deleted from Hansard. I also desire to raise a question as to the competency of the House to deal with this matter. If we cannot deal with the question properly and authoritatively, we ought not to waste our time. I desire a ruling as to whether this matter is within the competency of the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. PARENT: No point or order—it is a speech.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is asked is that the municipalities should be prevented from changing the time. I would like to know whether we have anything to do with that, and whether that is not a question of provincial authority?

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the second point, I think the hon. member from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) is perfectly in order. The daylight-saving legislation has already formed the subject of several debates, if my memory serves me well. At least on two occasions this question came before the House. In the first instance the House took the view that as a war measure the time should be altered. Later on, as a result of petitions which were sent from all parts of the country, the question was now entertained. At all events, in my humble judgment, I think the question is one which can be debated in this House, as it affects not only the time in certain municipalities, but the time all over Canada.

As to the first objection raised by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), an hon. member speaks to the point if he quotes an opinion in support of his resolution. Of course, if he quotes from correspondence it is always available, and must always be available, to the House, and no anonymous letter should be read to the House. I have followed the letters read by the hon. member for Missisquoi, and I do not think there is anything in any of these letters reflecting on the character of any hon. gentleman. But I would ask the hon. member not to repeat the reading of these letters as I think one or two letters will cover the point. There should be no tedious repetition of letters even as supporting an argument.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the signatures of these letters must be given.

The SPEAKER: The custom is, when a letter is read to the House, that the signature must be given.

Mr. KAY: I was going to deal with the question of the golfing enthusiasts in a short time. I quite understand that the member from West York, (Sir Henry Drayton) being a very enthusiastic golfer, would strenously oppose any curtailment of daylight saving in this country. That, Sir, gives some support to the articles I was going to produce with reference to daylight saving, and those who are chiefly in favour of it. As far as I can find out, those people who have a good deal of leisure, those people who are so fortunate as to be able to come down to their offices at nine or ten o'clock in the morning and to leave at four or five o'clock in the afternoon are the people who are most strongly in favour of daylight saving, and in that class I place my hon. friend from West York. It is a curious thing that those people in this country who have the greatest amount of pleasure are the people who are most keenly in favour of daylight saving. On the other hand, I find in the cities as well as in the country that people who rise early in the morning and get down to work at seven o'clock are almost unanimously opposed to daylight saving. After all, Sir, it is the toilers who work the longest hours who should be considered in a question of this kind. I do not know, Sir, whether your ruling is that I should not read any more letters, but I have three or four letters here, and, as my hon. friend from West York is not in his seat, perhaps I may continue reading one or two. My next letter reads:

> I was very much pleased to read in this morning's paper of your intention to bring in a resolution to prohibit this daylight saving fad in any part of the Dominion. I have always thought that is the proper place to deal with it and put an end to a hardship for the many who are affected by it. The confusion of time throughout the Dominion caused by this fad is to say the very least a nuisance and in many cases an actual loss to commercial and other men.
>
> Years have been spent in a successful effort to work out a standard time for the Dominion which is most satisfactory and no local faddists should be allowed to interfere with it.
>
> P.S.—I hope your resolution will become law and be applicable to 1922.

Then another letter reads as follows:

> You are on the right track, and I hope you succeed in obtaining legislation that will abolish fast time for all time. Looking back to a period before standard time came into existence, and having in mind the chaos that existed in time regulations, I would opine that the majority of present-day citizens have little idea of how or why standard time was adopted.
>
> The daily routine of ordinary life could be carried on in any community under any standard time, but when business interests became interlocked over the country, a set time for all became an important item. This was a matter that affected railways more than any any other line of business. Railways were the first to seek a remedy. Standard time was the outcome of conferences in Canada and the United States. In 1883, an International Conference of railwaymen of the United States and Canada, was held at Washington, D.C., October, 1883, and adopted standard time to take effect at noon on November 18, 1883. The general public fell in line with the railways and standard time was almost universally used throughout the United States and Canada. Many of the States passed laws for its adoption. It does not seem we have a Canadian statute making standard time a legal time for the whole Dominion, which is desirable.

I agree with the last remark that a standard time for the whole country is most desirable. I am told that, in the city and also in the country, daylight saving time is very injurious to the health of children, for the reason that children cannot be made to go to bed by daylight saving time. They wish to stay up until the usual hour, as they know it under standard time, arrives. Mothers of large families find it very difficult, under daylight saving time, to get their children off to school and to ensure that they receive the required amount of rest, and this, Sir, in my opinion, would alone be a sufficient reason for the prohibition of daylight saving in this country. The future of Canada rests with our children the rising generation; and if they are deprived of sufficient rest, they will become unhealthy, nervous and unfitted to carry on their work as the future workers of this country. If this Parliament has not power to prohibit daylight saving time or to enforce standard time throughout the country, I would strongly recommend that the British North America Act be amended to give this Parliament that power.

As I said in my opening remarks, it would be even better than the state of confusion through which we passed during the previous summer, to have one standard time; and if the majority of the people desire to have daylight saving time, I would regretfully acquiesce in its being passed, so long as that time is legal throughout the length and breadth of the land. I am sure I need not tell hon. members that the farmers of this country cannot successfully carry on their farm work under daylight saving time. One often hears golfers and other city men, who are so much in favour of daylight saving, say: "Why cannot the farmers go on the old time? They

are not obliged to go on daylight saving time on their farms." But many farmers, who ship their produce to the cities, are obliged to rise in order to catch the early morning train into the city, and as the railroads advance their time one hour, the farmers are compelled to rise that hour earlier. It is not a fad with the farmers to object to daylight saving; they do not object to the city men getting an extra hour for their golf; but during the harvest season, it is absolutely impossible for the farmer, if he is operating on the early time, to get his crops in, because the sun does not rise on the crops any earlier on account of our putting our clocks forward one hour. The sun goes on the same old time and the crops are cured by the sun, so that if we are working on daylight saving time, we lose an hour of the best time of the day. Another argument that I have heard is: "Oh, well, the farmer works from daylight to dark anyway, so what difference does it make to him what time it is by the clock?" My experience, as a farmer, is that nowadays men do not work from daylight to dark; they stop work at the same time as other workers do, and I would not feel that I was doing my duty if I asked my men to work eighteen to twenty hours a day, because the farmer is entitled to the same hours of work as any other labourer in this country.

I hope this resolution will receive the support of many hon. members. I am not so optimistic, as some people who have written me are, who expect that ninety per cent of the membership of this House will support the resolution. But I feel that this is a very serious question, a big question for the country; and, notwithstanding the opinion of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) who thinks we are wasting our time in this House by discussing it, I for one, feel that it is a question which deserves the serious consideration of this House at this time.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I had not intended taking part in this debate, but since the hon. member has deemed it fit to read an anonymous letter from a newspaper, I think it my duty to say a word or two on the subject. I was surprised that the hon. gentleman should read such a letter, because it is contrary to the rules of the House; and I shall ask you, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude to give a ruling on the question. This letter appeared in an evening newspaper of Toronto,

a newspaper that for two years advocated daylight saving, not only from the health and economic standpoints, but for many other reasons. Now, I did not introduce daylight saving in the city of Toronto. The railways started it one year and the city followed. The people voted on the measure and it carried by a majority of ten to one. We had petitions from all classes; from the working people in the city over which I had the honour to preside, from the health officers, from the soldiers' organizations, and from others; and it was during the war that the principle was introduced. The military authorities, the board of trade of the city, the patriotic societies, the railways, and many other public bodies were unanimous in the request that the mayors of the municipalities should, by proclamation, introduce daylight saving in their various localities. There was no federal or provincial law on the subject, nor were there any municipal regulations. The municipalities adopted the scheme simply through proclamation by their mayors. I shall not go into the history of daylight saving, which had its inception in Germany in 1914, about the time the war broke out. At that time Great Britain also adopted it, the House of Commons and the House of Lords unanimously favouring the principle. France, Holland, and twelve other European countries followed suit, and today daylight saving is observed in the Mother Country and on the Continent. Great Britain a short time ago passed a measure making for uniformity with France and other countries. The principle was thoroughly investigated by a committee of both Houses of Parliament in the Mother Country, a copy of whose report I have here. This committee made a study of the practical working of daylight saving in England, Germany, France, Holland, and other countries which had adopted it of necessity, because of considerations of health and economy, and they unreservedly recommended it for Great Britain as well. The difficulty in connection with the practice of daylight saving in Canada is not due to any inherent defect in the system itself, for all the large cities in Canada adopted the principle by large majorities; and I know that it has proved a success in the city over which it was my privilege and honour to preside. The first year it was introduced I did not receive a single complaint from any public body or any private individual; and, as I have said, the letter which the hon. member read was published in a newspaper that for two years favoured daylight saving in Toronto, but, evidently

currying favour with a certain section of the labour organizations—the socialistic section—afterwards changed its attitude. There were four anonymous letters published in that newspaper, written in the newspaper office, one of them being the anonymous communication which the hon. member has read. The second year the plan worked just as satisfactorily as before, and we asked the people to vote upon it, the result being that they endorsed it by a huge majority.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of enforcing daylight saving in this country is due to the lack of co-ordination between the various parts of the Dominion and to lack of nation-wide enactment. As I say, the principle itself is perfectly sound, and in practice has proved a success in Europe and the United States, as well as the other countries I have named. It was investigated by the United States Senate, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Chamber of Commerce at Washington,—which has a membership of between forty and fifty thousand business men—and by various boards of trade throughout the country. These bodies were all agreed that from the standpoint of health, from the standpoint of economy, in the saving of light and power, and because of the benefit that accrues to the children of the country, to the farmers, to the business community, daylight saving is not only desirable but necessary. In the absence of federal or provincial law on the subject in this country, many municipalities adopted daylight saving, largely for health reasons and because of the recreation it afforded the labouring population, as well as for the reasons I have stated; and in Montreal, also in my own city, and in other places in Canada, the children have benefited to a very great extent by the lengthening of the day. In 1917, Sir George Foster introduced a nation-wide bill which, I understand, did not pass. It is a pity that that measure was not adopted, because it sought to make the application of daylight saving nation-wide. If it had carried, I believe that even the farmers would not have the objection which they seem to have to daylight saving in some parts of the country. Technically speaking, the railways have no daylight saving, but in practice they have, because in summer they advance their timetable an hour in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London and other places, so that the smaller centres have to fall in line. If the United States have daylight saving our time should synchronise with theirs.

4 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear a supporter of a Liberal administration speaking in favour of prohibition in this regard. We had a declaration the other day from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in which he said that he was opposed to prohibition in this country. And I agree with him. After all is said and done, there are too many prohibitory laws and interferences with the liberty of the subject to-day; if we keep on in this course, pretty soon men will have no liberty whatever. A man should be able to do what he pleases so long as he interferes with nobody's rights and interests. I contend that this Parliament has no power under the British North America Act to pass the legislation which this resolution recommends. At any rate, if it is passed, I trust it will be treated as a mere "scrap of paper," because there can be no law to prohibit me from advancing my watch ten minutes or ten hours if I choose to do so. Soon we shall have laws prohibiting a man from going to church or going to work. I really cannot see any reason why this resolution has been introduced. Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto and other cities have had daylight saving, and I have read in the last few days that the municipal associations in the country are in favour of the system.

Daylight saving has been a great success wherever it has been observed, and if we made it nation-wide in Canada I have no doubt that its benefits would be appreciated. Any defect in its operation is due to the lack of a nation-wide enactment co-ordination between the various parts of the country and the United States. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the other day, in answer to a question I asked, said that it was not the intention of the Government to adopt a measure of national daylight saving, but he said that where a municipality had adopted daylight saving, the local government offices, such as the customs house, the post office, etc., would conform. The government of Ontario have adopted this policy and all provincial government offices are under daylight saving where a municipality so endorses a daylight saving measure.

Now, Sir, I am going to ask for a ruling as to whether an anonymous letter can be read and incorporated in the records of the House. I feel this to be contrary to rule. Latterly the railway companies have been communicating with the municipalities, ask-

ing them, if possible, to have their daylight saving run concurrently with the summer-time schedules of the railways. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a ruling on that point of order before the debate closes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that the letter in question might be read during this debate, because I find in it nothing reflecting upon the character of any hon. member. If there were anything in it of that nature, I certainly would not permit the reading of it. Bourinot says that while a member should not during the course of a debate abuse the privilege of reading letters and documents, he may, subject to certain limitations, read extracts from documents, books or other printed publications as part of his speech, provided that in so doing he does not infringe any points of order. I do not see any point of order in the present instance, because the letter in question bears directly on the subject which is now being debated, a subject which is a matter of public interest, affecting the whole of the Dominion. On the whole, and without prejudice, I think the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) has presented a fair case, without in any way reflecting upon the character of any hon. member. If anything in that letter did reflect upon the character of a member of the House, I would have it expunged from Hansard.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not rise to question at all the propriety of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that this motion is not out of order in the sense of contravening any of the rules of this House, because, in the first place, your Honour's ruling has been given, and, in the next place, I think the ruling is right. I am of opinion myself that a resolution proposing to do even what is beyond the competence of Parliament is, nevertheless, not for that reason a resolution that is without the rules of Parliament. This House might resolve to do something which was purely within the powers of the provincial legislature, or might express opinion by resolution thereon. Certainly, the provincial legislatures have adopted the practice of resolving on many things that are wholly within the competence of this Parliament—such as reciprocity in trade, reduction of railway rates, and the like—and it would follow from that, if from no other reason, that we would have corresponding rights here.

[Mr. Church.]

But what I do rise to say is this—this resolution and the debate upon it are necessarily and manifestly futile. There can be no question, to my mind, that this Parliament has no right to restrain any municipality or public body that desires, if it chooses, to adopt within its limits daylight saving. I do not think any member of this House would say that we had any colour of right to act in that respect. We have certain rights, as you, Mr. Speaker, have defined, in relation to the daylight saving question. We could, for example, establish daylight saving within those institutions under the control of this Parliament. Possibly we have still further rights than that; I do not need to discuss that question—we have that right, anyway. But to say or suggest that we have any right to pass legislation putting it out of the power of a municipality to adopt daylight saving—well, is to suggest something that does not admit even of argument or of serious consideration. Consequently, where are we going, what are we doing, when we are absorbing time of this Parliament in discussing such a resolution as this? I submit, it is waste, and that we would do ourselves better credit, and would better discharge our duties if the debate, without further discussion, were to close.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has "changed arms," as we say in military phrase. I remember a hot debate which took place in this Chamber a very few years ago on this same question, and the right hon. gentleman then fought the battle of the measure that we now oppose. A bill was introduced by the then Conservative government under the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden. It was introduced by Sir George Foster, who exercised himself for over two hours to convince the House that the measure should pass in the interests of the whole country. I remember that quite a few hon. gentlemen who were sitting then behind the Treasury benches, and who are still in the House, sitting behind their hon. friend on the other side, had to be whipped in to vote for the measure, even though it was a government bill. I remember, for instance, if my hon. friend will allow me, the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) rising and saying: "I am against the measure; I stand for freedom."

Mr. MANION: May I correct my hon. friend? I am sure he does not wish to misquote me. The only two times—in fact,

I think the only time—I ever spoke on this question in the House, I supported daylight saving.

Mr. VIEN: Yes; I was just going to say in what way the hon. gentleman did support it. He stated that he was against the introduction of legislation in favour of daylight saving, but that if it were a question of confidence he was not going to put the administration out of office on a measure relating to daylight saving.

Mr. MANION: I think my hon. friend is misquoting me. I may be wrong, but I do not think so. I would like to have him quote me, if he will.

Mr. VIEN: I will get Hansard and I will quote my hon. friend's very words, in a few minutes. But the hon. gentleman will not contradict me when I say that he stood up in the House and asked the then leader of the Opposition, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, if it was a question of confidence. Sir Wilfrid Laurier answered that it was not a question of confidence. A few minutes later Sir Robert Borden came into the House and objected to an hon. member sitting behind the Treasury benches inquiring from the leader of the Opposition whether or not the question involved a vote of want of confidence.

Mr. MANION: May I again interrupt my hon. friend? I am sure he will permit me, because I know he does not wish to be under a misapprehension. I remember the incident he speaks of; it was not with regard to daylight saving at all, but with regard to titles. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), I think, remembers that very well. It was with regard to the question of titles that I took that stand, not with regard to daylight saving.

Mr. VIEN: I think my hon. friend's memory does not serve him well. At any rate, I remember that Sir George Foster had a hard time to convince his own friends, and only by a long and laborious exercise could he summon around him sufficient support to have the measure introduced. My right hon. friend who now leads the Opposition was not at that time objecting to the measure. He thought then it was quite within the powers of this Parliament to enact such a measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member not permit a question? The measure was a federal measure of daylight saving, within the powers of the federal parliament. It was no measure endeavouring at all to restrain the rights of municipalities. That is a wholly different question, and the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, knows it as well as I do.

Mr. VIEN: At any rate the questions involved were the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. VIEN: The object was similar, and the principle underlying the measure introduced by the late government was the very same. The question was of introducing legislation to compel people to advance their clock one hour in order to save daylight. Now, in the province whence I come, daylight saving is repugnant to public opinion, for several reasons. In the first place, it is hypocritical, because you advance your clock one hour, you know that you do it, you know that your clock lies to you, and yet you go by that clock. In our province hypocrites of any kind are not well liked. Daylight saving is like a number of other measures—prohibition, for instance, of which my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Church) spoke a moment ago. Prohibition is repugnant to us because we do not like anything which restricts liberty, and prohibition does restrict liberty. It does not make men any better; it makes them hypocrites, and if I am well informed, it has not increased the number of saints in any province where it has been adopted, not even in that pious Queen city of Canada.

There was also another objection to daylight saving, connected with the patron of the measure, Sir Robert Borden. In the rural ridings of Quebec—and I am the humble representative of one of them—we used to distinguish standard time from daylight saving time by calling them respectively, "l'heure du bon Dieu," and "l'heure de Borden"—the good God's hour and Borden's hour—and we were opposed, of course, to Borden's hour usurping the good God's hour.

The measure was also repugnant to the rural ridings, at least—and I shall limit myself to speaking on their behalf,—because it was anti-liberal. The word "liberal" means freedom, and daylight saving is not a measure that makes for freedom. It is compulsory in its character, and founded on a lie. It rests on a false principle; it is anti-liberal; it is hypocritical in its character.

It is fraught with many other evils, so far as the rural population at large is con-

cerned. In the rural districts, at all events, you cannot advance the hour of sunrise by advancing your clock, yet your work must be regulated by sunrise and sunset. Even if you advance your clock one hour, the dew will not dry off the fields any earlier, nor until the sun has done its work; and those of us who have to engage city labour very often find that the city labourer likes to follow the hours he has been used to in the cities. He takes advantage of the fact that he has no work to do early in the morning under daylight saving time, and when the clock strikes six at night, when it is only five o'clock standard time, he wants to go home or get an extra hour's pay. In that respect, therefore, the measure is fraught with evil so far as the rural ridings are concerned.

Even in the cities, where daylight saving has been much advocated, it causes a great deal of inconvenience. Take the educational institutions, for instance. They have regular hours for opening and closing. The usual hour for closing is nine o'clock, because at that time it is dark and the children can go to bed and get to sleep immediately, but under daylight saving, if the children retire at nine o'clock, when it is really only eight, it is still full daylight and the children do not sleep. The personnel of the institution is consequently kept awake, but they have to get up in the morning no matter whether they slept on retiring or not. I know as a positive fact that that was a serious objection to the adoption of the measure in some of our cities. I know as a positive fact that our educational institutions object to daylight saving to-day because they contend they cannot compel the children to go to sleep in daylight, and they have a lot of difficulty in keeping them ruly and quiet.

There is the same objection from the mothers. They have to get up in the morning at six, and if you advance the clock they are compelled to get up at five to prepare the meals and get the children ready for school. At night the children want to play in the streets as long as daylight lasts, and the mothers have great difficulty in getting them home and to bed at a proper hour. That also causes a great deal of inconvenience.

What is the reason for wanting this change in the cities? What is the cause of the whole trouble? As my hon. friend the mover of the motion (Mr. Kay) has pointed out it is to allow those who like to enjoy the evening hours to leave off work at an earlier hour. There is nothing to prevent them doing that now, without daylight saving. Let them get up and go to work an hour earlier, and retire an hour earlier at night. It may be urged in reply, "If everybody would do that well and good, but you cannot compel your neighbour to get to his office at eight if he is used to getting there at nine. I would do it if everybody else would." I say that there is nothing to prevent the civic authorities of any city advancing their work one hour; there is nothing to prevent the banking institutions from advancing their opening hour, if they choose to do so. There is nothing to prevent the public bodies in any city or province from getting together and making an agreement that all the public offices shall open at a certain hour; but they should not compel their neighbour to do what he is not inclined to do or what will inconvenience him to a great extent. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because daylight saving is badly patronized, because it is hypocritical in its nature, because it is antiliberal in its compulsory character, and because it is attended by many evils and inconveniences for the cities as well as for the rural districts I am opposed to it and am strongly in favour of the motion. As the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the resolution only seeks to express the opinion of the House; and if the Government finds it appropriate to introduce legislation along the line suggested, surely they will see to it that such legislation is confined to those powers which are within the purview of Parliament. For all these reasons I shall gladly support my hon. friend's motion.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): It is not my intention to debate the merits or demerits of daylight saving as a principle, but I find it difficult to appreciate the argument advanced by the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien). He argues in favour of freedom. He says that if the clock is turned forward we are hypocritical —that the clock lies. Does he not know that whether we adopt daylight saving or not the clock lies all the time in most parts of the country? The clock as we have it in this Chamber does not exhibit the time according to the sun. It does so only at certain fixed places; so that that point, it seems to me, is not well taken. My hon. friend speaks in favour of freedom and refers to daylight saving as being a measure for compulsion. There is no law in this country to-day for daylight saving;

there is no intention to enact such a law. If there is anything compulsory in what is before us to-day it is the motion of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) who would exercise prohibition, which is compulsion, and who would prohibit municipalities and others from adopting daylight saving if they wish to—a matter of local freedom, I submit. The hon. member for Lotbiniere declares that the province of Quebec is opposed to daylight saving. My hon. friend says that province is opposed to prohibition. That is the privilege of the province of Quebec. If the hon. member for Lotbiniere, after making his argument in favour of freedom, had said that he was opposed to the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper, then I think he would have been quite consistent. My hon. friend says there is nothing to prevent the city folks from getting up and retiring according to daylight if they wish without changing the hands of the clock. That is perfectly true. On the other hand it is just as true if applied to the people in the rural sections, because they can do exactly the same thing. I am not making an argument for or against daylight saving but I do contend, and in this I agree entirely with the leader of the Opposition, that this Parliament should not have the right to dictate to the people of any city, large or small, with regard to this matter. If the people of the city of Toronto, by a vote of nine to one, declare that they desire to observe daylight saving I do not deem it to be within the province of this Parliament to combat that desire. In my own city of Kitchener the people have voted upon this question and have declared in favour of daylight saving. I know that many of the farmers in the country districts in my riding are opposed to daylight saving; and I think their position would be quite well taken if they resisted compulsion on the part of this Parliament to the enactment of daylight saving. But there is no compulsion on them to observe daylight saving. If they desire to leave their clocks as they are that is quite within their right, and I for one am prepared to defend that right at any time. On the other hand, I think it is just as logical to say that if the great majority of the people of a town or city desire to put their clocks forward at a certain specified time upon the proclamation of the mayor it should remain their right to do so. I do not desire to be misunderstood. I am not arguing the relative merits or demerits of the principle but my point is this entirely—that we should not interfere with a city or of a town if it locally desires to turn the clock forward one hour in the spring and to turn it back one hour in the fall. There is no compulsion in favour of daylight saving now; there should be no compulsion against it. For that reason I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I submit that unless there is uniformity in a matter of this kind it will tend to create a great deal of confusion. As an illustration of that, we have only to look at what the effect of the law relating to banks and banking would be under daylight saving. We find that the banks are compelled to remain open at certain hours of the day for the transaction of business. Now, let us suppose that in a certain municipality the clocks are put one hour ahead, whereas the farming population allow their clocks to remain at standard time. A farmer drives to town, having business to do with a bank probably in the way of meeting a note or something of that kind and, as he thinks, gives himself sufficient time to do so. But when he arrives at his destination he finds that the bank has closed for the day because the town is running on daylight saving time and doubtless the note he intended to take up has been protested owing to non-payment. I submit it is not in the best interests of Canada to have the towns, or urban centres, adopting daylight saving when it is not carried out in the country districts.

The leader of the Opposition has made a statement with respect to the relative rights of the provinces and of the Dominion as regards the enactment of such a law. The right hon. gentleman is a lawyer of great standing in the country, and has been instrumental in placing many laws upon the statute books. I submit, however, with all due deference to the excellent legal acumen and ability of the leader of the Opposition, that it is a debatable point whether the provincial legislatures or the federal Parliament have the right to enact such legislation as a daylight saving act. In the legislature of Nova Scotia I remember it was a debatable question; and some two years ago, if I am not mistaken, a bill was enacted providing for the exercise by the Lieutenant Governor of such power as he might have, or which could be given to him by the legislature, to put such an act into force. Now, I maintain that this is a debatable question and was so held by the Nova Scotia legis-

lature; and when the leader of the Opposition tells us we are only wasting time by debating a question of the kind, that is only his individual opinion. We have had addreses from one or two men who are probably equal to the leader of the Opposition in legal ability and they do not regard it as a waste of time to discuss such an important matter. The question is an important one, let us not get away from it. It is a matter which affects the people—those who live on the farms of the country and those who labour in our industries. The only good thing that I can say of daylight saving is that it makes the farmer and the labouring man rise an hour earlier in the morning in order to enable the city people to put on their golf and tennis clothes and go out and enjoy the summer evenings. I submit that in the interests of the producers of the country it is fit and proper that we should debate a resolution such as this in order to get the opinion of Parliament; and I hope that opinion will be that the tillers of the soil, the men who bear the burden and the heat of the day shall have laws enacted in this country which will be for their welfare and not simply in the interest of an oligarchy.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I wish to state on behalf of my constituents that they are unanimously against daylight saving. I have discussed the matter with them on various occasions, and they have refused to agree to the daylight saving proposition. The whole of the province of Quebec, the rural parts especially, and some of the towns, refuse to advance the clock, and it remains at standard time. This remark applies to municipal institutions, and so on. Of course, this action resulted in confusion generally throughout the province. The rural parts of Quebec are a unit against daylight saving. I had the honour to be one of the administrators of the city of Montreal, and, at the request of the commuters, who leave the city and go out to the country in the summer time, and the railways, we agreed to it, but the experience is not satisfactory. Later we received protests from all parts of the city. I know that in my own household I was very much blamed for having granted the request. I think that, under the circumstances, an expression of opinion from this Parliament would go a long way to bring back normal conditions, and if a vote is taken, after the experience I have had, I will vote in favour of the resolution.

[Mr. Martell.]

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I wish to associate myself with the mover of the resolution and with hon. gentlemen who have supported the proposal which it embodies. I recollect quite well the actual experience when the former bill, which gives rise to this resolution, was introduced, and daylight saving was forced upon the people of Canada. Evidently the debate which took place in this chamber was very, very exhaustive, and many arguments had to be presented before Parliament would allow the resolution to pass. It seems to me that, when hon. members attempt to compare our conditions here in Canada with conditions in France, Great Britain and the older countries of Europe, the comparison is unfair. When daylight saving was introduced in the West and forced upon us, we, as agriculturists, living in sparsely settled districts, met with many difficulties. It worked to our injury as a class in the western country. I am not speaking simply for dwellers in rural districts, but for those in small villages and towns. Later on, it must have been recognized that evils did arise from that legislation, for a form of local option was adopted which permitted municipalities to exercise their choice in this matter. While local option did cure many of the evils existent at the time when the law was federal in its application, many of these evils still obtain in the country. Some of these have been cited in this debate. Others will occur to hon. gentlemen. A few of them were related by one of the members from Nova Scotia, and they obtain all over Canada. It seems to me this is largely a question between city dwellers and rural dwellers, because I have noticed that many of the urban dwellers can see nothing whatever except the idea of daylight saving, and endeavour to force their will upon the rest of Canada. It may benefit the people who claim the privilege of donning their golf clothes late or early in the afternoon; but it is a fact that we who dwell close to towns that in the exercise of their local option have adopted daylight saving, suffer inconvenience, in that often we find business places closed up when we get into the town, at an hour which is early according to standard time. It is no use for gentlemen to argue that it does not affect us, for it does affect us, and injuriously, too. It seems to me that if daylight saving were as beneficial as it is claimed to be, the business people who now favour it would have initiated it years ago. But, in fact, they had to wait until some individual in

this House explained to them the benefits that would accrue to them by adopting the daylight saving plan. I do not know whether that Scotch poet, Harry Lauder, had daylight saving in mind when he said, "Oh, how I hate to get up in the morning."

An hon. MEMBER: Don't call him a poet.

Mr. GOULD: It is certain he could not have had the "benefit" of daylight saving in his mind. Whether he spoke as a labourer or moneyed man or rural dweller, certainly the thought occurred to him; and I wish to associate myself with him, and, as one who has had to get up very early in the morning, object to any law to compel me to get up any earlier.

I wish to associate again myself with the sentiment expressed that we do not want any more laws which gives privileges to certain districts, but we want general universal laws. I think the sun rises plenty early enough for us. It was the idea of the Creator when the sun rose at a certain time that we should abide by that and conform to it. When we do that we will find that we have time for a full day's work and no more. I believe the sentiments expressed by those supporting the resolution are the sentiments of those people of Canada as a whole, and I am quite sure the people who have sent our little group down here would stand unanimously by the sentiments expressed in the resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): With regard to the point of order raised by one hon. member, I did not understand that the speaker ruled that a name had not been given when asked for. I believe the practice in the past has been—and I hope to see it preserved—that the name should be given when so requested. I do not believe there has been any change in practice. If a letter is read and an hon. member asks the name of the writer, I believe he is entitled to get it, and I do not understand the ruling this afternoon destroys that right.

Hon. MEMBERS: Louder, Louder.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I say that if a member asks for the name of the writer of a letter he is entitled to get it. The impression might have been left in the House this afternoon—although the Speaker's ruling would not justify any such impression—that we are not entitled to have the name, but I hope the right to have the name will be preserved.

In regard to daylight saving, I have not very much to say one way or the other, but I think we ought to have standard time in this country. A more important question is the one which has been raised in this debate: has parliament jurisdiction in regard to that question? The question in regard to measurement of time has been raised in a good many parliaments in Europe, as to the acceptance of the Julian Calendar. I do not know whether we would have the power to deal with the question, but the question is coming up in this House. I understand the feeling in Europe is in favour of its reform, and Cardinal Mercier had charge of the proceedings. These questions of time, while they have not been defined, perhaps, by the British North America Act, will have to be dealt with, and the reform of the calendar will have to be considered. We will have to do what they have been doing in the States, and in other countries, in the way of getting a standard time. We must have standard time in this country if for no other reason than that our railways are a national proposition; they are certainly within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and it would, therefore, be a mistake if we had several kinds of time in this Dominion. Accordingly, we must have some standard time, and some legislature in this country must have charge of it. I believe this matter is well within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and it is not wise to have local authorities changing the clock, because it is in the general public interest that our time be standardized. While I think there is good reason for the adoption of daylight saving, I am rather surprised that the farmers in this House have not expressed their views on the subject. I thought the main reason given for its adoption was that it was in the interest of the farmers; and if that is not the case, I think the House is entitled to have the information. Perhaps, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) would be prepared to express the opinion of farmers in regard to the matter. What I wish to say mainly now is that some legislature in this country ought to have charge of the time; that the law should be uniform, and that the time throughout the country should be standardized.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the resolution under discussion at the present time is entirely unnecessary. For this reason: I am in touch a good deal with conditions in

rural districts and smaller centres such as villages and small towns, and so far as I can understand, public sentiment is at present so strong against daylight saving that there is not much danger of our small urban centres adopting it. They have found it detrimental to the best interests of business affairs in those small centres. Therefore, I have no doubt that what we have known in the past as daylight saving, which has been adopted in many urban centres, will very soon fall of its own weight, and we shall not hear very much more about it.

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, it does not appear to me that the question of the merits or demerits of daylight saving is under discussion. That was discussed in this House a few years ago; and we know that the rural sections of the Dominion are not in favour of it, and that some of the larger cities are in favour of it. The hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Woods) has just said that there is not much danger of rural municipalities and smaller towns adopting daylight saving, and I think the Government will be entirely unwise in passing any legislation prohibiting any municipality from putting daylight saving into force. I was surprised at an hon. member from the province of Quebec speaking in favour of prohibition. The people of Quebec are not in favour of prohibition. This is a prohibitory measure and we already have enough of prohibition in this country. We want no more of it in other lines, and it would be very unwise on the part of the Government to put on the statute books of this Dominion a prohibitory law with regard to something that is not in existence or in force at the present time. I am therefore opposed to the resolution.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing something that I deem much more important than some other things that we have been spending time on. I live in a district where we can read a newspaper at half past ten o'clock in the evening without any artificial light, so why should we want to save daylight? I am a farmer, and I know conditions that exist on the farm are such that daylight saving would not be of any advantage. We are supposed to be an agricultural nation; at the present time more than half of our population is on the land, and I should like to see more there instead of less. If we are an agricultural nation, I am quite positive that daylight saving is not to the best interests of Canada. Some things have been said regarding disturbance of work on the farm, and I have heard hon. gentlemen state that the dew will not go off earlier in the morning even if you set your clock ahead. There is no difference with regard to that; but the loss of that hour in the evening makes a difference. When harvest time is on in my district, we are not very often able to go to work with a binder before ten o'clock, and if our men cannot be properly employed in the morning, there is a difference if we have to pay for the extra hour at night. We have a legal time in this country, namely, standard time. While I feel we have no right to say to people: "You should not set your clocks ahead;" I believe we have as good right to say that they can get up an hour earlier in the morning as they have to say that we must disturb our time by setting our clocks ahead. If the banks are closed when one gets to town, there is a difference, —it makes a difference whether the banks close at two or at three o'clock. It does not make the day any better to close the banks at two o'clock instead of at three. We have a legal time for children to go to school; our children are supposed to be in school at nine o'clock in the morning; and if that means eight o'clock instead of nine, we are interfering with what is already legal time as regards school hours.

There is no question that our work on the farm is more or less disturbed by having town time different from farm time. I live close to the city of Edmonton, and if I go into town and find that the stores have closed an hour earlier than they usually do, surely that makes some difference; it disturbs time. In a district where one has to work as long days as they do in that part of the country, we have daylight enough without setting our time ahead. Nature has arranged our time; we have to work with nature more or less on the farm, and if farmers in that district are interfered with, there is an interference with the advantage and benefit of the whole country. We are yet an agricultural country, and I do not think agriculturists anywhere in Canada are asking for the time to be set ahead. People who want to play golf and to have longer time in the afternoon can get up an hour earlier without disturbing us in any way. We do not object to their getting up earlier, but we object to having our time set ahead.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, this discussion is somewhat pro-

longed, but the matter is an important one. I think, however, the wording of the resolution is a little bit unfortunate inasmuch as it tends to develop the debate along two lines. I think that opinion in Canada is against daylight saving, and if the resolution had been confined to that, I am sure there would have been very little opposition to it. But it involves the other feature, of a prohibitory action on the part of this Parliament in a field of doubtful jurisdiction. It does seem strange that we should attempt to prohibit a municipality from adopting daylight saving if in its wisdom it considers it expedient, in its particular circumstances, to do so. I think that the peculiar wording of the resolution has led to this conflict in the debate. If the resolution had been worded somewhat to the effect that in the opinion of this Parliament daylight saving should not be adopted unless it were made universal, then I think we could all agree with it. Great confusion and inconvenience undoubtedly arise because of the adoption of daylight saving in some localities and not in others. Speaking for the constituency I have the honour to represent, which is about half rural and half urban, I am well satisfied that the opinion is strong against daylight saving, and I sincerely hope that it will not be adopted in this Parliament. At the same time, I do not think that Parliament should go so far as to say that it will prohibit any municipality in Canada from taking action along a line which is perhaps well within its jurisdiction.

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): No matter what some people may do with the hands of the clock, no matter what some municipalities may do, and no matter what resolutions some town councils may pass, the men and women who are engaged in farming and in rural occupations cannot leave off work early in the afternoon. They are compelled to work until late. They would be only too glad to quit early if thereby they could make ends meet under present conditions in Canada. For that class whom often, when we want to flatter them, we describe as the bone and sinew of the country, there is no daylight saving. The tendency in Canada to-day is for people to leave the land and flock to the cities, and we believe that that is against the best interests of the country. We all say that, and I suppose we all believe it. One of the tendencies of daylight saving, one of its worst features, is to make young men and women dissatisfied with farm life and rural conditions, and consequently to lure them from the farms and locate them in the towns and cities. This is one of the effects of daylight saving; it emphasizes the difference in conditions between farm life and city life. I think, therefore, that it was a very unfortunate thing indeed that the daylight saving fad was ever introduced in Canada,—because, after all, it is only a fad. If there are groups in the cities, such as golf or other sporting clubs,—or clubs of any other kind, which are of course, quite legitimate,—that desire to exercise the rights and privileges of citizenship and to arrange among themselves to play golf, say, in the afternoon, there is no reason in the world why they could not select any hour they please for this purpose instead of changing the hands of the clock. They could select four o'clock or five o'clock, or three o'clock, or any other hour that would suit them. But why act this childish part of pretending to ourselves that it is five o'clock in the afternoon when we know that it is not so? Those women of the country who have to do their own work, take care of their own households, prepare breakfast and other meals for their men folk, and after breakfast get their children ready for school, find it very hard indeed to rise at any early hour in the morning. Nevertheless, they are obliged to get up at six o'clock, and in some cases perhaps earlier; and it is an unwarrantable hardship to compel them to get out of bed an hour earlier than their accustomed time, simply in order to conform to a condition of things that is not real.

There is something else to be considered, and that is the effect of daylight saving on the convenience of farmers in their relations with the railway service. Throughout the country districts, I believe, the railway stations are closed about four o'clock in the afternoon, and the farmers find this too early, when they have to leave their work to transact any business at the station, either to deliver or take possession of freight. But if they find the stations closed at three o'clock their condition is so much worse. Whatever other people may do, I would ask the railways at least to observe the regular time, and try to manage their business in such a way as to suit the convenience of country people. I know that a great deal of hardship has been experienced by farmers who have driven seven and eight miles to get some special business done at the railway

station, only to find that the
5 p.m. station was closed five minutes before they arrived. Sometimes it happens that the station master is just closing the place, and, as an hon. member suggests to me, refuses to do any more business. This is a matter that inconveniences a large number of people. I repeat, the emphasis that daylight saving lays on the difference between country and city life tends to drain the farms of young men and women. Daylight saving is one of the things that tend to make the young people think that conditions in the cities are so much better than they really are, while it increases the feeling on the part of the rural population that they are supporting an idle and pleasure-loving class in the cities. I agree with the hon. member who immediately preceded me, that this resolution is badly drafted. That is unfortunate, because we can hardly support it in its present form, seeing that it interferes with the rights of others. At the same time, I am in favour of the idea of the resolution, and if it stated that in the opinion of the House daylight saving should not be adopted unless it were made nationwide, then I think it would pass. At any rate, I want to put myself right; I intend to vote for it, even as it is. But I would ask the mover of the resolution to change the wording of it, if he can do so.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I hope that whatever form the resolution may take, it will not be adopted by the House in the form in which it has been proposed. It is a direct challenge to, a direct interference with, powers which under the British North America Act are sacred to the local legislatures. It may be that daylight saving has been dealt with by Parliament or the federal government on a previous occasion; if so, it would be only under the extraordinary circumstances of war, which seemed to give some extension of the federal power. Perhaps it did give such extension, and perhaps not. But take the case of my own province: there we have an act which makes the time of New Brunswick the time of the 60th meridian. It has the effect of giving daylight saving, if you will, for an average of about twenty-four minutes throughout the province. Certain municipalities adopt what they call daylight saving. There is no authority of law; they simply adopt it by resolution or by-law, and it binds no one except their own officials, but usually the community conforms to the wish of the local municipality in that respect. Now, the House is asked to adopt this resolution, and what would the Government do if, in accordance with the resolution, it acted as it naturally would be expected to act? It would introduce a bill to prohibit the legislatures of the respective provinces from varying any form of standard time. That is an impossible thing; the Government could not, I should think, consider for a moment any such legislation. Now, this is not a question of party tactics; it is a question, I think, of the common sense of the House. If every member of the House would like the time to be in accordance with the meridian of the place in which he lives, what is the sense of asking Parliament to pass legislation which it is not competent to pass, forbidding the provincial legislatures to deal with a subject which is entirely within their jurisdiction? That is not the way to get at the problem; it is only a way to make ourselves ridiculous.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I also have received numerous letters similar to those read to the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay). I have received protests from various parts of the province of Quebec, especially from the district which I represent, the counties of Charlevoix and Montmorency, with regard to daylight saving. Daylight saving as adopted in 1918 was largely a war measure; in the United States, Europe and other countries it was thought necessary to have a measure of this kind in order that the needs of the war could more readily be met. But now that we are in the post war period it would, in my opinion, be a serious mistake to bring in any measure providing for daylight saving. It is true that last year and the previous year some districts, some municipalities, towns and cities, adopted a system of daylight saving. But many unfortunate results have come from its adoption in some of these places. In the city of Quebec the clock was advanced one hour, but in my county, a comparatively short distance away, the time was the standard time. Great troubles and misfortunes have been experienced by different persons on account of these differences in time. I think that, on the whole, the people of this part of the country, particularly in the province of Quebec—and I speak especially of the rural districts, as did the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the hon. member

for Missisquoi—are against daylight saving. There are many hon. members from rural districts in the province of Quebec who will bear out my contention that any measure which would put daylight saving in force would be against the will and the wish of the people of those districts.

The resolution now before the House is a good one, but, in my opinion, it might have been drafted in better form. As has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen, it would restrict the power of municipalities, towns or cities which would like to enact a measure of daylight saving. It would have been better had the resolution simply stated that in the opinion of the House it would be better not to introduce any further measures of daylight saving. But the resolution is before us, and, although it is not framed in the best possible terms, I submit, for the reasons which I have given as well as those which have been put forward by hon. members who have preceded me, that we should support the resolution in its present form.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, if the mover of this resolution (Mr. Kay) is desirous of getting an expression of opinion as to whether daylight saving is a proper thing for this country, I fear that he has couched his resolution in the wrong language. If the resolution simply stated that in the opinion of this House daylight saving was or was not a good thing for this country, one might vote upon it with the idea of expressing either his support of or his opposition to daylight saving. But in the resolution as drawn you are asked to prohibit local areas from giving expression to their desire to have daylight saving. While I am myself against the principle of daylight saving, I shall have to vote against this resolution, because we in this House have no right to prohibit either the provinces or such local areas as incorporated villages or towns from expressing their view, by resolution in council or otherwise, for or against daylight saving.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) said he was in favour of the resolution because he did not like prohibition in any form. Well, if he votes for this resolution he is voting for a prohibition; he is voting to prohibit a city or town or organized district from adopting daylight saving. I think that the hon. member who brought this resolution to the attention of the House would be well advised if he changed its language in some respects and simply asked for an expression of opinion on the question whether we should legislate either for or against daylight saving. I am not, of course, advising my hon. friend to take that course, but I believe if he did he would get more support than he could otherwise obtain.

Much has been said about putting the clock ahead or putting it back. Some hon. gentlemen have said that they did not desire to be placed in a position where they would have to put the clock ahead to meet the views of their friends. Well, I am one of those who think that the very greatest freedom should be given to all in the matter of what time they get up in the morning. If daylight saving were made effective in this country to-day, it would not change the natural inclination of the person who wants to get up at four o'clock instead of at five, or of the person who wants to get up at six o'clock instead of at seven, or at seven o'clock instead of at six.

I rose merely to say, however, that I entirely agree with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and other hon. members who favoured the idea that he presented to the House, that no expression of opinion either for or against daylight saving can be had by voting for or against the resolution as proposed by the hon. member for Missisquoi.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought we should have wanted to turn this discussion to something of importance, to some practical purpose. Surely it is perfectly plain that Parliament is not going to interfere with the provinces which already have their statutes and their regulations fixing the time in their respective districts, some being in advance of and some behind the meridian. I would have thought it perfectly clear that municipalities, creatures as they are of the provinces, are entirely in the hands of the provinces. It is idle to refer to what was done under the War Measures Act. That may have been right or may have been wrong, but it is obvious that any jurisdiction taken under the War Measures Act is something that is past and gone. We cannot now pass legislation upon this subject unless we seek, without the shadow of a right, to infringe upon the provincial prerogative. There is one practical way in which the Government, if it desires, can register its views upon daylight saving. The city of Ottawa

has adopted daylight saving to go into effect on the 30th of April, and the only practical thing that can be done with this resolution by gentlemen who have taken their stand upon the subject is to say that the ordinary rules shall not apply, that the House will pay no attention whatever to the daylight saving regulation passed by the city government. That is one practical thing we could do, but I apprehend the view that the Government will be, as I think they have already expressed it, that as this is a provincial and a local matter, the provincial and local time shall prevail.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. gentleman tell me where he finds his constitutional authority for the statement that this is a matter wholly of provincial jurisdiction?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would point out to the hon. member that we have been a Confederation now for some time, that we have provincial laws dealing with the subject of standardizing time, but no Dominion law, and if any such law was introduced in conflict with what has been the custom and practice of the provinces, it would undoubtedly be an interference.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): It seems to me that we have had a very interesting discussion on this subject this afternoon. We in this House who are laymen can come to only one conclusion, and that is that we are not quite clear whether we should vote for or against this resolution. One thing, however, I think we are satisfied of, and that is that this resolution revolves around the clock. In view of the fact that I am not quite clear about this matter, in view of the fact that many constitutional lawyers and legal men of high standing in this country have said that this resolution has not been properly drawn, and for certain other reasons, before I sit down I intend to move an amendment.

As far as I personally am concerned, and as far as my constituents are concerned, we do not care whether we have daylight saving in Canada or not. Most of my constituents do not go by the clock. They work from daylight until dark, or from before daylight until after dark. We have no six-hour men in my constituency. We have farmers, and labourers and fishermen, who start work before daylight, before they can see the clock, and work until after the sun has set, and they have to light the lamp to see whether it is time to quit.

I do not know very much about farming, but I am told, and I think it is a fact, that farmers in this country cannot work by daylight saving time. They must get up very early, at daylight or before, to look after their work on the farm. They cannot make hay by the clock in the summertime; they have to arrange their work to take advantage of the sun. It would be a nice state of affairs in this country if, when four or five o'clock, all the hired men on the farms were to down tools and say, "In the cities the Civil Service officials have all gone to the golf links or for an automobile ride, so we are going to stop forking any more hay into the barn for to-day."

Somebody has said that it would not be fair to interfere with by-laws or regulations passed by city or town councils. That is all well and good, but my idea of legislation is that it should be based on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number, and in my humble opinion, when a city or town passes a by-law advancing the clock one hour from the 1st of May to the 1st of September, it is not in the best interests of the great majority of the people in those towns and cities. It may have been done in the past, to allow certain gentlemen to leave off work at three or four in the afternoon and to go to the golf links or for a long motor ride or take some other form of recreation, while we poor people have to slave from daylight to dark, but I say that it is not good legislation.

While we cannot perhaps pass an act to prohibit daylight saving being brought into force in different parts of Canada, as it might interfere with provincial and municipal rights, it seems to be that this House should express the opinion that daylight saving is not in the best interests of the great majority, and I think we should by our votes show to the people of this country that we are standing for the rights of the common people.

What shall we find when daylight saving is adopted in the city of Ottawa? As we leave our work in this chamber in the afternoon—it would be five by the clock—the city officials would have all left their work, but it is a well-known fact that the flags on the public buildings cannot be hauled down until sunset. Why should the poor man who is getting two dollars a day to raise and lower the flag have to stay till sunset when you and I can leave our work at five o'clock and go and enjoy ourselves for the rest of the evening? Even on the farm they tell me that the cows know when it is time to come home to get milked; if

you leave them alone they will come in themselves at sunset to be milked.

If we cannot pass a law on this subject, we can at least give a clear expression of opinion. I said at the outset of my remarks that as far as my constituents are concerned we do not care whether daylight saving is in force or not. We do not care very much about the sun, for most of my constituents work by the moon and the stars. Some of them work by bells, getting up at eight bells in the night and working till four bells, and then resting till the bell rings eight times again. We do not require any clock. It is not fair that there should be any distinction in this free country, so that some people can go to work and leave off at a certain time by the clock, while other people have to work from daybreak till dark. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Turgeon:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and replaced by the following: In the opinion of this House it is not desirable that daylight saving time should be adopted in any part of Canada.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Jacques-Cartier) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity that I have had to address this House since you were chosen as Speaker. With the consent of the hon. members, I wish to say, Sir, that I was pleased and happy to witness your election to the speakership of this House. I have been your comrade for twenty-five years and more. I have always taken an interest and pride in your career and you have done credit to us wherever you went. You have been in political life for twenty-five years, and unfortunately, I have spent already forty years in the same way. This will convey to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not without knowledge as to what has transpired in your career as well as in the country at large. I shall restrict myself to these few remarks, as I fear I might be out of order; however, what I have said will prove to you, Sir, that your humble servant was one of those who rejoiced the most at your elevation to the Speaker's chair.

My learned friend who moved this resolution, the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) accused the hon. leader of the Opposition of having altered his views. Well, let us give him the benefit of the doubt and say that he has not changed his opinion on this question. Nevertheless, I must admit he was dangerously near doing so. Another hon. member was less generous towards him, he expressed himself very well, only he used rather a harsh word, when referring to the leader of the Opposition, he said it was but hypocrisy on his part. It was perhaps going too far. Let us give these gentlemen the benefit of the doubt; let us call it "camouflage". The Toronto members are not hypocrites, but they have very odd ideas which makes it rather difficult for us to agree with them.

As an hon. member so well expressed it, we have in the country where I also live two different designations of the hour: the right hon. Sir Robert Borden's time and God's time. There was a great fuss as to which we should adopt. Finally God's time won. People placed more confidence in the latter than in the former, God's time was older and more respectable, we therefore adopted it.

I do not think that amongst all the members of this House but specially the farmer members, there can be found any in favour of this new system. Those who know and understand the economical side of farming cannot possibly uphold this new system, and, I ask myself who is the gentleman that first conceived the idea of altering the time. Let me tell you that he was by no means a genius, and the sooner we abolish it the better. In my own village we were blessed with a good common sense parish priest who rejected this daylight saving system; the mass is held at the usual hour, God's time. It is my humble opinion that the resolution moved by the hon. member for Missisquoi should necessarily be adopted. Most of the hon. members sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker, say this regulation will die a natural death. So much the better; however, there are extremists all over the country, men who are always at variance with others; they hold so-called new ideas—they term this progress—and if we do not check them in their thirst for progress, each session the same question will pop up. Now and then, Mr. Speaker, you will have this question of daylight saving brought up. Why not curb these gentlemen who are always on the look out for proposals which we cannot entertain, that every reasonable being opposes.

It was stated a short while ago that there were men of good common sense in the province of Quebec. That is so, but there are also men of good common sense in the other provinces, indeed a great number of them and we entreat these gentlemen to join and help us. Those who understand the economical side of farming should come forward and support the resolution of the hon. member for Missisquoi. Try, Mr.

Speaker, to have your domestics rise earlier than usual. You will find that it is not an easy task. No, Sir, it is impossible to get them to rise earlier than what is a reasonable hour. Who is the loser in all this? The master. We are forced to submit to the whims of these gentlemen, our employees. If you are not satisfied, Sir, they leave. If they find fault with the old system, they go, and leave you in the lurch. The employers now, are no more masters of the situation, we are governed by the employees. We must submit. If you seek to enforce this new time system on the farm hands, you will not succeed, the thing is impossible. In the morning we cannot start them to work before the usual hour, but in the evening the case is different when six o'clock comes—that is five o'clock—they grab their hat, the pick and shovel drop, everybody stops working, goodbye, it is six o'clock, let us go. In this last instance they do not require to be coaxed. What happens then? Those who understand farming know that the farmer's day does not end with the field work. He goes to supper, takes a little rest while smoking his pipe, but he has to visit the outer buildings, take a look in the stables, in the cattle house, in the pig-sty and in the henhouse; he has to see to everything, look to the doors being closed, the beds made, the cattle properly watered, find out if an animal has not strayed away, finally he has to oversee everything that has to be done. Then if you allow your men to go out too early after supper they dress up, stroll away to the village, and as you are aware in most of the villages there are now moving pictures. The men depart saying: Do not worry, boss, we shall not be long away. That is what they say, but they act differently; they come in late. Do you suppose the work is carried out? No. If the farmer does not go to the trouble to see for himself what is being done, the work is neglected and the men have played you the nice trick of leaving undone what formerly they were in the habit of doing. It is therefore impossible to uphold such a system. Otherwise, close your doors, sell your farms and give up farming, if you do not wish to bring ruin upon yourself. It was clearly established that in the early morning you cannot work in the fields, you must allow the dew to evaporate. No one will contest this fact, the ground is not in a fit condition. You must wait until about nine or nine-thirty and sometimes ten o'clock before starting work in the fields. Well, what are your men doing all this time? Nothing, absolutely nothing. Amongst all the western members, who are practical and business men, there is not one, I am sure, who wants this change in time, for if it were otherwise they would only show proof that they do not understand farming. I have now been farming for the last forty years and have always had farm-hands on my land which comprises an area of about 200 acres. I therefore know what is going on. I have a very good knowledge of the economical way of rearing all kinds of cattle which are to be found on a farm, and I say that to make some success, it is necessary to rise early and retire late.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say unpleasant things to any one, it is not my practice. I am getting too old to pick up new habits, specially when they are not good ones. I asked myself who is the gentleman that invented this new daylight saving system. I do not contend that the idea originated amongst lazy people, but it must have originated amongst those who shun work and wish to be free to seek pleasure after five o'clock—old time. These pleasures conflict with the interests of the farmer as well as those of the employee himself. Why do we meet with so much evil? Why do we witness so many crimes? Why do we see immorality invade specially the large centres? It is because youth is allowed too much time to joy ride. Youth takes advantage of these conditions and craves for pleasure. It does so against its best interests, to the detriment of its health, transgressing the laws of sobriety and heaping upon itself all kinds of misfortunes. Formerly, we watched over the employees. We were able to follow a little their movements and gave them good advice. To-day artisans in cities drop work at six o'clock in the evening. Then after having taken supper they leave, between seven and seven-thirty, to enjoy themselves at the movies, at the theatres, or in doubtful company. At present you are unable to guide or control any one, yet we know what is taking place. Crime in large centres is on the increase from year to year, and where lies the blame? It is mostly due to too much liberty we allow the workmen, and, it seems to me that instead of seeking all kinds of methods to protect these gentlemen, we should as much as possible hold them in check. We are asked why trouble about this legislation? We should not enforce it, it will be a dead letter. True, but it would not be so if everybody were reasonable, if every one would help; unfor-

tunately there are extremists not only in this House but everywhere, even in municipal councils. In the latter men are to be found who specialize and seek by all means possible to create obstacles. It is therefore to prevent these evils that it is necessary that the resolution of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in the country we cannot have any fixed hour which would be convenient to the farmers. When the weather is threatening, do we cease work at six or seven o'clock? We work up to eight or nine o'clock if it is necessary. Rain is threatening, the haycocks are ready to be drawn. If the farm hand refused to carry out his work before the danger had disappeared or the hay had been drawn to the barns, he would simply be dismissed. Let him rest during the morning or through the day, if necessary; but when the danger is near, the rain is coming, at any cost, the crop which is ready must be brought to the barn.

The same thing applies to the cold weather. When we are threatened with frost and the tobacco is in the field in right condition for curing, do we stop work at six, seven or eight o'clock? No, we would work up to midnight if need be; we draw as long as it is necessary to protect ths crop that lies in the field. You therefore, see, Mr. Speaker, under what conditions the farmer labours. The idea of fixing a set hour for farm work should not be entertained.

Those who work in large cities, in trades for instance, are perhaps exceptions. There is no rule without exceptions. Those who are employed and are at liberty to leave work early may be considered lucky; but they are in the minority, and all laws in a community should aim to protect the majority. The latter consists of the farming class in this country. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is not necessary to add anything further so as to persuade the hon. western members, and those of all the different provinces who are connected in some way with the farming class, but I specially appeal to the members of the province of Quebec, to put an end to this discussion, an unfortunate one, and to adopt this resolution. I agree with the hon. member of Missisquoi and shall support with pleasure this resolution.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Before the debate closes, I should like to correct my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) in regard to the quotation which he made from my remarks in Hansard. I stated when he was speaking that I thought he was mistaken. Since then I have looked up the Hansard report of the debate on daylight saving on the previous occasion, and I find he has misquoted me entirely. I did not take the attitude that he stated I took. While I am on my feet, I should like to say that I do not agree that we in this House have any right to prohibit any municipality from doing anything in a matter of this kind. Taking the case of my municipality, Fort William, or, at least, the central municipality of my riding—because my riding is about two-fifths rural—I may say that it has had daylight saving for some ten or twelve years, as has Port Arthur, and they have found it very satisfactory. Therefore, I personally do not think this Parliament would be within its rights to tell the city of Fort William or Port Arthur that they must not have daylight saving which they find desirable. I admit, some of the agriculturists surrounding the cities are not in favour of daylight saving; as an hon. member from the West said, they suffer from the inconvenience of sometimes finding the stores closed when they come into the cities expecting the stores to be open. At the same time, while the farmers have a perfect right to take that attitude, the people in the cities should not be ruled by the people in the country on this question. If a city such as my own or any other city in Canada chooses to have daylight saving, to advance the clock an hour, it is the privilege of that city to do so, and it should not be prohibited from doing so either by this Parliament or by the members of the agricultural community. That is my attitude on the matter, and I think it is a much more liberal attitude than that taken by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien). I believe this is a question in which each local municipality should be permitted to do as it chooses.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to take part in this debate but after listening to the different speakers, I deemed it my duty to express my views on the present subject. In my opinion, it is more a question of expediency than a constitutional one. Briefly, it may be summed up in this: Shall we have a uniform time in this country? I shall not take up the legal aspect of this question—I did not bring my civil code with me this afternoon—because, it seems to me, there is a more important question

which interests all the electors of this country. It is this: by the experience we have had, these last years, in regard to the daylight saving bill imposed by this Parliament, and, by the experience of the years following this legislation, during which lack of uniformity and confusion took place, Parliament did not think proper to continue this custom. It allowed the different municipalities, cities and towns, to act according to their wishes. Is it expedient that we should continue putting up with this lack of uniformity and confusion? I repeat it, I believe that the question of uniformity of time is paramount, and I am in favour of it for the whole country. The motion of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) has this aim in view. After having heard the opinion given by the Minister of Finance, he admits that Parliament will never pass any further law as to daylight saving and he expresses the hope that there will not be any cities or towns, in any part of the country, altering their time. I certainly respect the authority and freedom of all municipalities. They are perfectly at liberty to alter the time but they should, however, act in concert with other municipalities.

I incline to favour the larger municipality, the whole country, rather than any particular municipality or city. If such municipality or city wishes to take advantage of this right would it be advisable for it to decree a change of time? If we lived under the old order of things of a hundred years ago; if we had no railways, telephones or automobiles, I can understand that the fact of altering the time would be of little consequence. In those days, local intercourse was rather restricted, we then lived somewhat at a distance from one another; it was not a matter of so great inconveniences as at present to alter the time. But to-day, in 1922, we must bear in mind all the modern inventions which bring the neighbourhood in closer touch. If for instance, we arrive by railway in a town where the hour has been changed, must we undergo all the inconveniences which result from the lack of uniformity of time? In my opinion, I believe that the time should be the same all over the country if only on account of this extension of local intercourse. At present the village has not the same restricted horizon as in the past; its outlook, to-day, extends over the whole country. Through this easy access to all parts we are constantly in touch with everybody. On the principle that we should have the same time at home in order that the house be well regulated, I contend that the same should apply all over the country, for the welfare of every one. I, therefore, shall support the resolution of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) because it seems to me to have for its object to establish uniformity of time throughout this country.

Mr. ALFRED STORK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the amendment because my observation has shown me that all attempts to interfere with the workings of Father Time have been failures. The only man who made a success of altering time was Joshua, when he made the sun stand still. We have had daylight saving in operation in the past in the province of British Columbia, and I think I can speak for the people who live in that western province when I say that they have not found it to be a success. In a province where we have daylight enough to read a newspaper by at eleven o'clock at night, I think ample time is given for labour, for rest and for recreation, and daylight saving simply makes more confusion. Where we have different times, where the railroad operates on one time and the factory and foundry on another, that does not make for municipal progress. I have particularly in view the cause and the welfare of our children. Children going to school are, under daylight saving, compelled to rise an hour earlier in the morning; they do not go to bed at night at the accustomed time, and as has been pointed out before, the mothers taking care of the children are penalised to that extent.

I remember in British Columbia some years ago a liquor prosecution was on, and the whole trial hinged on the question of time. A charge was laid that a violation of the act took place at a certain specified hour. After a lengthy and expensive trial, the case was dismissed on the ground that standard time was set at Victoria and in the eastern part of the province of British Columbia, and that this infringement had not taken place within the specified time. We have fire insurance policies issued in this country, and if any one who has a fire insurance policy will read it, he will find that it reads that "this policy is for one year from a certain date to a certain date and expires at twelve o'clock noon."

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 20, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FILLED MILK AND CREAM

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill at the present Session of Parliament, prohibiting the importation into, and the manufacture and sale in Canada of what is termed in the United States, filled milk and cream, described in and petitioned for in a resolution passed by the National Dairy Council of Canada and forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: If it is found in practice that our pure food or health laws do not protect the public from filled milk or cream, then legislation may become necessary at an early date.

S. S. CANADIAN FREIGHTER

*Mr. NEILL:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that the Steamship Canadian Freighter, one of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, recently brought a cargo of Japanese coal to Vancouver, and that twelve hundred tons of the said coal were transferred to Steamship Canadian Prospector?
2. If so, what was the cost of this coal in Japan?
3. What is the estimated cost of transportation of this coal across the Pacific to Vancouver?
4. What is the estimated cost of transferring it by barge from one steamer to the other?
5. Is Cumberland steam coal recognized by the Imperial Navy as being a high class steam coal?
6. At what price could good steam coal from the Cumberland Coal Mines, Vancouver Island, have been obtained and delivered into the bunkers of Steamship Prospector at Union Bay?
7. Has the Government been advised that the mines at Cumberland are only working half time on account of lack of market for their coal?
8. Will the Government take steps to see that the steamers of the Government Merchant Marine hereafter use only British Columbia coal on the Pacific ocean?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The S.S. Canadian Freighter took on board at Muroran, Japan, 1,000 tons of coal for ballast, as it was impossible to obtain a return cargo for the ship. The Canadian Freighter is an oil burning steamer, and the coal had therefore to be transferred to the Canadian Prospector on arrival at Vancouver.

2. $7 a ton.

3. No transportation cost. It was considered more economical to bring home coal on this ship than to purchase 1,000 tons of ballast. The saving claimed by the management is as follows:

	Per ton	Per ton
Price of ballast, including loading and discharging (approximately)	$3 25	
Price of coal at Union Bay, B.C.	7 65	$10 90
Price of Japanese coal	7 00	
Cost of transferring coal to Canadian Prospector	2 17	9 17
Approximate saving by purchasing coal for ballast		1 73
or, for 1,000 tons		$1,730 00

4. Approximately $2.17 a ton.

5. No information.

6. $7.65 a ton trimmed in bunkers was the price paid for coal taken by a Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessel at Union Bay, B.C., on March 8.

7. No information.

8. As far as they can possibly do so, steamers of the Government Merchant Marine will hereafter use only British Columbia coal on the Pacific ocean.

CHIEF ARCHITECT'S BRANCH, PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. What is the name, position and salary of the chief architect's branch representative, Department of Public Works, on Board of Appeal?
2. When was he appointed in the department?
3. Is he British?
4. Where was he born?
5. Was he engaged in any military service?
6. If not, why?
7. Regarding the election of the branch representative of the chief architect's branch on the Board of Appeal, were there any instructions posted and sent outside directing that all the employees were entitled to vote?
8. Did these instructions authorize those who had made no appeal to vote?
9. By whom were they signed?
10. Were these instructions issued by the Civil Service Commission?
11. If so, by whom?
12. Had the said representative made any appeal?
13. Did he have any interview or receive any instructions regarding the disposal of the appeals before they were held?
14. If so, from whom?
15. On what date, month and year?
16. On what date, month and year did the Board hold the appeals of the chief architect's branch?
17. Were there any temporary employees who had left the service, called back to appear before the board?
18 If so, what are their names?
19. What amount of salary did they receive before their appeals were heard?
20. What amount of salary were they granted?
21. How much back pay did each receive?
22. What are the names and nationality of those who were granted their appeals, and where were they born?

23. Were the employees who protested the findings of the board, answered by the secretary of the commission that the decision was definite and final?

24. Were they also refused to have their case taken to the Board of Hearing?

25. Owing to the numerous protests in the service were there any forms of declaration prepared?

26. If so, (a) of what nature? and (b) by whom prepared?

27. Were the employees who obtained these forms, told by the acting chief of the organization branch, Civil Service Commission, that if sufficient discrimination was found they would be called to appear before the full Board of the Commissioners?

28. Were they also informed that they would be questioned by the commissioners under oath?

29. How many employees were brought before the commissioners?

30. How many won their cases?

31. Are there any employees who received back pay to April 1, 1920, and others to April 1, 1919, in chief architect's branch?

32. If so, why should some receive back pay to April 1, 1919, and others to 1920?

33. On what chapter, section or act has the commission based their decision?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. A. J. Barclay, senior construction architect, salary $3,060.

2. June 5, 1911.

3. Yes.

4. Montrose, Scotland.

5. No.

6. He was a married man.

7. Yes.

8, 9. All officials were entitled to vote, and instructions were sent to all employees, and were signed by the chief architect.

10, 11. Yes, by direction of the Civil Service Commission.

12. No.

13. No.

14, 15. Answered by No. 13.

16. For the inside service, June 20th-July 16th, 1921; for the outside service, at various dates arranged by the representative of the Civil Service Commission.

17, 18, 19, 20, 21. No.

22.

Name	Where born	Nationality	Classification applied for	Classification granted
Hennessey, G. F	London, Eng	Br. Canadian	Chief Clerk	Head Clerk.
Lefort, P. A	Montreal	Canadian	Const. Arch't	Const. Arch't.
Taylor, J. G	Banff, Scotland	Scotch	Increase in salary	Head Clerk.
Dube, W. A	Napierville, Que	Canadian	Prin. Acc't Clerk	Sr. Acc't Clerk.
Dionne, J. G	Riv. de Loup, Que	"	Ass't Arch't	Ass't Arch't.
Ralph, J. H	Sault Ste. Marie	"	Elec. Engineer	Elec. Engineer.
Rogers, G. G	Ottawa	"	Ass't Arch't	Prin Clerk.
Dubois, A	St. Johns, Que	"	Sen. Clerk	Sen. Clerk.
Davis, A	Cornwall, Eng	English	Ass't Arch't	Ass't Arch't.
Barrett, A. E	Birmingham, Eng	"	"	"
Chalmers, W. C	Perth, Scotland	Scotch	"	"
Owen, J	Blaneau, Festinoig, North Wales.	Welsh	"	"
Heiser, J. A	Lunenburg, N.S	Canadian	Prin. Clerk	Prin. Clerk.
Wright, Arthur	Ottawa	"	Jun. Arch't	Jun. Arch't.
Thompson, J. W. D	"	"	"	"
Boucher, A	Riviere Ouelle	"	Higher classification.	Jun. Arch't.
Thorburn, D. L	Lindsay	"	Prin. File Clerk	Sen. File Clerk.
Kent, Miss H	Ottawa	"	Sen. Clerk Sten	Sen. Clerk.
Brosseau, Miss B	Montreal	"	Clerk Sten	Clerk Sten.
McGee, Miss K	So. Gloucester	"	"	"
O'Donnell, Miss M	Hull, Que	"	"	"
French, Miss M	Ottawa	"	"	"
Schrybury, Miss J	Levis, Que	"	Clerk Typist	Clerk Typist.
Laurin, Miss L	Alexandria, Ont	"	Clerk Sten	Clerk Sten.
Arthur, Miss E	Summerside, P.E.I	"	"	"
McLean, Miss B	Chatham, N.B	"	"	"
Kenny, T. W	Ottawa	"	"	"
McLean, W. L	"	"	Sen. Clerk	Sen. Clerk.
Tasse, C. D	Sault aux Recollets	"	Senior Messenger	Sen. Messenger.
Scrim, W. H	Ottawa	"	Sen. File Clerk	Jr. File Clerk.
Hearndon, A	Windsor, Eng	English	File Clerk	File Clerk.
Sturgess, A	Reading, Eng	Br. Subject	Prin Clerk	Prin. Clerk.
Cauchon, H	Left the Service			Jun. Arch't.
Moore, H	Redditch, Eng	English	Sen. Ass't Arch't	Clerk of Works.
Morin, H. J	Left the Service		Jun. Arch't	Jun. Arch't.
Hickey, W. J	Ottawa	Canadian	Ass't Elec. Eng'r	Asst. Elec. Eng'r.
Purvis, Mrs. M	Vars, Ont	"	Sr. Clerk Typist	Clerk Typist.
Rouleau, R	Sorel, Que	Fr. Canadian	Prin. Acct's Clerk	Acc't Clerk.
Reid, G. B	Alwyn, Que	Canadian	Jr. Accountant	Sen. Clerk.
Croll, R. O	Ramsayville, Ont	"	Supt. Rideau Hall	Supt. Rideau Hall

Name	Where born	Nationalty	Classification applied for	Classification granted
Brawlet, R. (London)	Glasgow, Scotland	Scotch	Clerk Works 3	Clerk Works 3.
Wright, J. C. (Vancouver)	Liverpool, Eng	English	" 3	" 3.
Curren, Miss A. (Winnipeg)	Ottawa	Canadian	Senior Clerk	Sen. Clerk.
Paririe, P. (Marieville, Que.)	Marieville	Br. Subject	Caretaker, full term.	Caretaker, full term.
Andrews, J. (Calgary)	London, Eng	"	Fireman-Labourer	Fireman-Labourer
Gall, T. (Calgary)	Allva, Scotland	"	Caretaker, full time.	Caretaker, full time.
Bridger, T. (Toronto)	London, Eng	English	Clerk	Clerk.
Wallace, W. (Toronto)	North Gore, Ont	Canadian	Stat'n Eng'r I	Stat'n Eng'r I.
McCartney, M. (Toronto)	Ballymena, Ire	Irish	" I	" I.
Hall, W. (Toronto)	Kincardine, Ont	Canadian	" I	" I.
Pearse, W. R. (Toronto)	Bristol, Eng	English	" I	" I.
Cassiday, P. (Toronto)	Toronto, Ont	Canadian	" I	" I.
Weir, A. (Toronto)	Ballymena, Ire	Irish	Caretaker	Caretaker.
Stringer, W. (Toronto)	Auchnacloy, Ire	"	"	"
Major, E. (Toronto)	Portadown, Ire	"	"	"
Moore, C. (Toronto)			Cleaner helper	Cleaner helper.
Carey, M. (Montreal)	Montreal	Canadian	Sr. Stores Clerk	Sr. Stores Clerk.
Wickham, M. (Montreal)	"	"	Clerk	Clerk.
Harper, W. C. (Montreal)	"	"	Supplies Clerk	Supplies Clerk.
St. John, R. F. (Souris)	Souris, P.E.I	"	Caretaker, full time.	Caretaker, full time.

23. In certain instances, yes.

24. In certain instances, yes.

25. Yes.

26. (a) In cases where employees claimed that there had been misrepresentation of material fact in the presentation of their appeals, employees were allowed to make statutory declaration of such. (b) The Civil Service Commission.

27. Yes, either the Commission or the Board of Hearing, provided misrepresentation was evident.

28. Commissioners or Board of Hearing, yes.

29. None; three cases heard before Board of Hearing.

30. None.

31. Yes.

32. Because of changed or increased duties.

33. Sections 43, 45b, 11, Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, and regulations made thereunder.

STONY RESERVE SCHOOL

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many Indian children are there at the present time of school age on the Stony Reserve at Morley, Alberta?

2. What provision, if any, has been made for the education of such Indian children?

3. Where are the schools, if any, located?

4. If no such provision has been made, has any application or applications been made therefor since 1st April, 1921?

5. By whom has such application or applications been made?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Approximately, 110.

2. No provision since boarding school was closed in 1908 and the last day school closed in 1919.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

THE CANADIAN NAVY

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What units compose the Canadian Navy?

2. How many officers and men serve on the ships of the said navy?

3. How many men are employed in this branch of the service?

4. What is the total yearly cost of this navy?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The Royal Canadian Navy consists of the cruiser Aurora, the torpedo boat destroyers Patriot and Patrician, and the submarines C. H. 14 and C. H. 15, constituting the fleet; a submarine depot at Halifax to which the submarines C. H. 14 and C. H. 15 are attached; the Royal Naval College of Canada; officers in training in the Imperial Service; the Youths' Training Establishment at Halifax; the Naval Executive Staff at headquarters; the Naval Dockyard at Halifax, and the Naval Dockyard at Esquimalt.

2. Officers 33, men 510.

3. Civil employees 278, officers and men 797.

4. The cost for eleven months ending 28th February, 1922, was $1,791,129.

IMPORTS OF BRITISH GOODS

Mr. MacLAREN:

What is the value of goods, the manufacture or produce of Great Britain, imported into Canada during the years 1919-1920 and 1920-21, through each Customs port in Canada?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

TOTAL VALUE OF IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN, ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN CANADA THROUGH EACH CUSTOMS PORT, DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED MARCH 31, 1920 AND 1921.

Ports	1920 Value	1921 Value
	$	$
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	43,698	118,791
Summerside	30,072	118,791
Total, Prince Edward Island	73,770	237,582
Amherst, N.S.	86,431	171,799
Annapolis	2,632	1,597
Antigonish	3,166	1,191
Arichat	41	2,900
Baddeck	46	.....
Barrington Passage	40	688
Bridgewater	9,865	1,305
Canso	7,300	8,558
Digby	1,758	2,051
Glace Bay	99,617	119,580
Halifax	1,911,702	2,537,030
Kentville	2,690	18,025
Liverpool	664	8,449
Lockeport	59	270
Lunenburg	4,930	6,818
Middleton	1,348	1,393
New Glasgow	85,357	229,497
North Sydney	85,145	117,080
Parrsboro	9,473	289
Pictou	12,335	9,794
Port Hawkesbury	302	324
Port Hood	4,756	4,266
Shelbourne	1,931	13,233
Sydney	348,431	697,160
Truro	610,631	465,568
Weymouth	1,342	2,536
Windsor	12,207	43,914
Yarmouth	29,309	30,286
Total, Nova Scotia	3,333,508	4,495,601
Bathurst, N.B.	2,884	9,588
Campbellton	2,424	2,784
Chatham	10,260	16,467
Fredericton	47,537	70,543
McAdam Junction	93	230
Moncton	177,387	755,358
Newcastle	4,931	8,874
Sackville	2,989	4,321
St. Andrews	2,934	8,274
St. John	2,096,040	4,458,602
St. Stephen	71,210	110,370
Woodstock	946	8,310
Total, New Brunswick	2,419,635	5,453,721
Abercorn, P.Q.	175	.....
Athelstan	498	273
Beebe Junction	158,956	155,700
Coaticook	73,153	243,143
Gaspe	13	.....
Highwater	.....	.....
Hull	575,142	386,278
Lake Megantic	.....	585
Mansonville	187	148
Montreal	46,002,582	76,600,338
Paspebiac	3,398	17,476
Percé	.....	2,894
Port Burwell	.....	.....
Quebec	3,817,731	6,515,251
Rimouski	2,447	9,599

[Mr. Rinfret.]

TOTAL VALUE OF IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN, ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN CANADA THROUGH EACH CUSTOMS PORT, DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED MARCH 31, 1920 AND 1921—*Continued.*

Ports	1920 Value	1921 Value
	$	$
St. Armand	45	27
St. Hyacinthe	92,191	177,104
St. John's	267,273	653,685
Shawinigan Falls	59,807	300,592
Sherbrooke	345,343	515,181
Sorel	15,754	5,052
Three Rivers	385,264	702,730
Valleyfield	50,221	86,508
Total, Province Quebec	51,850,180	86,372,564
Amherstburg, Ont	13,643	18,745
Belleville	36,787	162,670
Bowmanville	32,238	19,682
Brantford	599,376	683,767
Bridgeburg	6,546	23,455
Brockville	37,842	87,970
Chatham	66,859	72,726
Cobourg	1,127,256	1,181,877
Collingwood	130,125	120,432
Cornwall	90,060	169,189
Deseronto	34	1,956
Fort Frances	4,026	17,567
Fort William	24,441	65,488
Galt	1,218,960	1,590,961
Gananoque	3,414	7,958
Goderich	114,785	265,671
Guelph	948,486	1,044,110
Hamilton	3,472,526	6,168,518
Ingersoll	5,217	14,376
Kenora	152,031	463,036
Kingston	193,467	372,325
Kitchener	1,603,092	1,657,265
Lindsay	16,957	21,302
London	1,141,240	2,574,740
Midland	39,247	103,075
Morrisburg	25,196	42,681
Napanee	3,333	5,381
Niagara Falls	68,801	234,590
North Bay	411,186	741,444
Orillia	94,677	120,441
Oshawa	96,915	525,032
Ottawa	1,526,896	2,569,563
Owen Sound	14,274	39,748
Paris	418,091	840,782
Parry Sound	1,670	3,179
Peterboro'	1,381,261	1,670,710
Picton	4,833	8,576
Port Arthur	25,702	69,919
Port Hope	10,210	43,047
Port McNicholl	.....	8,728
Prescott	8,014	18,374
St. Catharines	239,581	583,020
St. Thomas	457,977	640,038
Sarnia	20,971	38,388
Sault Ste. Marie	15,592	43,668
Simcoe	48,913	54,612
Stratford	344,822	900,914
Sudbury	125,829	84,142
Tilsonburg	1,333	4,881
Toronto	36,905,525	57,876,667
Trenton	755	30,711
Wallaceburg	6,969	21,573
Welland	57,160	44,120
Whitby	110,938	133,365
Windsor	151,796	475,338
Woodstock	75,628	275,212
Total, Ontario	53,693,503	85,057,705
Brandon, Man.	131,785	197,071
Emerson	143	247
Gretna	15	.....
Portage La Prairie	30,545	56,177
Winnipeg	6,627,197	12,393,266
Total, Manitoba	6,789,685	12,646,761

TOTAL VALUE OF IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN, ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN CANADA THROUGH EACH CUSTOMS PORT DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED MARCH 31, 1920 AND 1921—*Concluded.*

Ports	1920 Value	1921 Value
	$	$
Moosejaw, Sask.	58,238	278,952
North Portal	139	25,179
Prince Albert	17,881	23,687
Regina	423,624	2,092,208
Saskatoon	125,052	404,354
Total, Saskatchewan	624,934	2,824,380
Calgary, Alta.	780,943	2,790,566
Edmonton	546,451	1,973,316
Lethbridge	69,501	290,665
Medicine Hat	15,189	26,210
Total, Alberta	1,412,084	5,080,757
Abbotsford, B.C.	520	446
Cranbrook	5,377	36,247
Fernie	23,311	106,786
Grand Forks	298	8,171
Greenwood	1,834	889
Nanaimo	61,273	93,104
Nelson	20,164	52,196
New Westminster	38,177	72,972
Penticton	38,078	68,975
Prince Rupert	18,705	161,454
Revelstoke	102,325	234,425
Rossland	15,823	9,622
Vancouver	4,957,498	9,274,826
Victoria	875,842	1,680,902
Total, British Columbia	6,159,225	11,801,015
Dawson, Yukon Territory	2,494	2,559
White Horse	231	917
Total, Yukon Territory	2,725	3,476
Grand Total	126,359,249	213,973,562

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What were the total Customs collections received by the Port of Parry Sound, Ontario, during each year, from 1911 to 1921 inclusive?
2. What towns or cities in Canada, having equal or less average Customs collections, have public buildings used for Customs purposes?

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Shortly before we adjourned for the Easter recess the Prime Minister was good enough to say that he would fix a day for the discussion of the resolution dealing with oriental immigration, and I was wondering whether he could let me know to-day.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If a week from Monday, that is the first day of May, would be agreeable to other members of the House, it would be entirely agreeable to the Government.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Could it be made the eighth of May?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of course, my hon. friend understands that the Government cannot dictate in this matter, but if it meets the convenience of the House, the Government will do all it can to facilitate the motion being reached on that day—the eighth of May.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I know that a great many members desire to speak on this resolution and they have asked that a date be fixed, if possible.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Sir Lomer Gouin (Minister of Justice) Bill No. 25, to amend the Penitentiary Act, was read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Department of Agriculture—Fruit, $157,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Before we take up this item I would like to ask the leader of the Government when the railway estimates will be considered?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will let my hon. friend know later on.

Item agreed to.

Health of Animals—administration and enforcement of the Animal Contagious Diseases and Meat and Canned Foods Acts, $1,710,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would like to ask the minister: What is the exact situation in regard to mange in Alberta and Saskatchewan at the present time?

Hon W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): There have been cases recently in Saskatchewan. We expect these outbreaks to occur from time to time. We cannot eliminate a contagious disease like mange all at once, but the situation is well in hand.

Mr. CARROLL: The item is quite large and I would like to get some understanding from the minister as to how this money is to be used?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a large item. About half a million of the amount is to be expended in connection with the accredited herds. The object is to clean up tuberculosis especially in the pure bred herds and to compensate owners for animals slaughtered under this system. The method

employed is thought to be practically the only way of dealing with this matter. We may have been a little late in taking it up, but "better late than never." The amount asked for is the same as last year. I anticipate that we will be able to cover more ground with the present vote, by reason of the fact that cattle have gone down in price, and the chances are that before the session is over a bill will be brought down providing for a reduction in the amount of compensation in proportion to the present value of cattle. Consequently the present vote will cover a larger number of herds than the larger amount of compensation given for animals last year under the conditions which then existed.

Mr. SEXSMITH: What percentage of the value of the stock is given by way of renumeration?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For pure breds two-thirds of $250. The payment being in proportion to the value of the animal. Not a great many receive the maximum, but some do. In the case of grade animals the maximum compensation is two-thirds of $80.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Would the minister enlighten the committee as to the working of the accredited herd system, to which about a half a million of the present vote will be devoted. How the system is administered; If operative in the nine provinces? How many herds were inspected last year, and what percentage of those inspected were found to be diseased?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The system is in vogue in all the nine provinces of the Dominion. Naturally, in the older provinces that have been devoting their attention to dairying the greatest degree of tuberculosis is found and the system is taken advantage of to the greatest extent. I have not the exact figures as to the extent of the disease; the proportion varies. Some herds are found on inspection to be entirely tuberculous. When one-half or three-fourths of a herd are tuberculous it is practically the same as if the whole herd were affected, and you might as well clean up the entire lot. Of course a large proportion of an infected herd may still be fit for human food. They may be reactors and therefore subject to elimination, and yet pass inspection at the abattoir. The number runs from one hundred per cent down to a very small percentage.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Is the disease found to be more prevalent in dairy herds than in beef breeds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. It is essentially a stable disease and the more animals you have in stables, especially where the stables are unsanitary, the more disease you have. Out on the prairies, where it has been the practice for the cattle to winter out, we have had very little of it. The disease operates quite like tuberculosis among human beings—it is a house disease among humans and a stable disease among cattle. Where the stables are ill-ventilated, even though the condition in other respects may be good, and the animals are kept under dairy conditions, you get a lot of tuberculosis; on the other hand if the cattle are out in the open air, as they were in the West up to lately, you do not have so much of it.

Mr. TOLMIE: In that particular connection, very interesting experiments were carried on by Dr. Rutherford, when he was Veterinary Director General, in feeding tubercular and healthy animals together out of doors, and he found that where the animals were fed on the ground that they readily became infected, and that is one of the reasons why, on our ranches to-day, we find cattle affected with tuberculosis where this system of feeding is followed. The hay is thrown on the ground, and the cattle trample on it and the droppings infect the hay. The germs are taken up by the animals and consumed, and infection takes place through the intestines. If the feeding grounds are changed frequently, where tuberculosis exists in the herd you can avoid it to a certain extent, but it is quite possible for animals to take tuberculosis in the open air or under such conditions as I have described.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The number of animals tested was 48,022, the number of reactors was 4,105, and the number slaughtered was 4,057. That would mean that a larger number of the herds were quite free, than would be the case if the contagion ran through the whole bunch.

Mr. TOLMIE: May I have an answer about the expenditure in the three years?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not the information.

Mr. COOTE: Is any part of this sum to be spent in a campaign to encourage the farmers to raise bacon hogs?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That activity comes under a later heading in regard to live-stock, not under this.

Item agreed to.

International Institute of Agriculture, $15,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I am about to say would have been more appropriate on the previous item, or indeed, two items back, but I think I should say it. With the diminishing number of animals passing through Canadian abattoirs and being inspected there under the hon. gentleman's department, there will, it seems to me, be opportunity for much less expense in the way of inspection. I have information that, with that diminishing number, particularly in other cities in the East, there are easily double, or nearly double, the number of inspectors that the hon. gentleman under present circumstances need continue.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I presume the hon. gentleman refers to the inspection of the animals as they are killed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is surprising how very few less inspectors will be required. An inspector is there and he can do a certain amount, and if the inspection is cut in two, you will still require the inspector. In a great body of business, where three or four inspectors are required, if the business were cut down, the number of inspectors might be cut down, not necessarily proportionately, but to some extent. I do not know that we have found it necessary yet to make very much reduction in the number of inspectors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the trouble?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the number going through the abattoir gradually, constantly and continuously decreased at the same rate, then a certain reduction could be made; but, inasmuch as they are bunched going through, sometimes a great rush and then quite a slack time, you have to keep the necessary number of men for the rush season. But if the reduction in the number of animals continues, I have no doubt we shall be able to make some reduction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In a small plant in Winnipeg—I can give my hon. friend the name if he desires, but he certainly ought to know it—my information is, that four ought to be sufficient.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Gordon Ironsides.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If there are more men there than are required, I know some places where they are required. The hon. gentleman from Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) tells of the need of, not so much an abattoir inspector as a veterinary inspector, because of danger of tuberculosis there. If these men are qualified for that work, we can transfer one. But these abattoir inspectors are not necessarily qualified for other work. I will look into that.

Mr. TOLMIE: What is the reason for the increase in the vote for the Institute of Agriculture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the year that the delegates are sent over to the assembly of the Agricultural Institute. Besides, like all other concerns, this institute is costing more year by year to operate, and the institute has made the request that we supplement the amounts that we have been contributing. The amount that used to be contributed for animals was $1,800. The old grant, up to a year or two years ago, was $1,800 plus $1,200, making $3,000. Now the requirement asked for by the assembly in addition to this is $5,790. Up to the present time we have been contributing more and more as it was required of us. However, the delegates who are going over this year, before they promise any more, are going to make a special report to my department as to whether they think this service is worth more, or whether we are getting any real value commensurate with the expenditure at all. I do not know. It is a very nice thing. It was a gentleman named David Lubin that inaugurated this institute. I would not for a moment make any remarks disparaging of it at all. I simply do not know enough about it to do that, but I have doubts in my mind as to whether the statistics we are getting are sufficiently valuable to us in Canada to make it worth while increasing the expenditure year by year. The institute compiles the crop statistics of the entire world at Rome, and disseminates the knowledge thus gained back to thirty-odd countries. The theory is that those engaged in agriculture will consult the statistics, and, if these show a world surplus of any kind of grain this year, they will be a little bit shy about sowing so much, and may sow less so as not to increase the glut. On the other hand, if the statistics show a shortage, the inference is that the farmers, of their own accord, will sow a

little more. That sounds all right in theory, but it does not work out in practice. Farmers, as a rule, do not consult statistics before they start spring operations; they generally sow their land in accordance with what it has been prepared for and what they think will suit the market.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The minister should say that he is "from Missouri" and have those delegates prove to him the necessity for this institute.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why not strike out the item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I made it quite plain that the two delegates who are going over this year, will investigate conditions and bring back a special report, with which I shall come to Parliament next year, and say whether this appropriation will be continued or discontinued. I do not know enough about the matter now to make a definite statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this the trip on which the two delegates are going around the world?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are not going around the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is pretty nearly around the world. If the minister will make the appropriation large enough, they will get around the world.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Whenever anyone is going to take any trip, my right hon. friend's imagination seems to get at work. I think, before he got through with Duncan Marshall, he had him down in Mexico. Money is valuable, and we endeavour to kill as many birds with one stone as we can. One of these gentlemen is already on his way overseas, and the last thing I did, before coming to this House to-day, was to dictate a letter instructing him to spend two days in London, to call upon the new High Commissioner there with respect to the embargo question, and, through him, to seek an interview with the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, because I have a feeling there are developments in the air with regard to the embargo question. If Mr. Wilson can supplement the activities of the hon. gentleman who preceded me and other gentlemen with respect to this question, and also attend the institute, we shall be able to cut down the expense of the institute meeting. He will not travel around the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why send two delegates? I am saying this for the benefit of my hon. friend, because I can assure him that, in the short time that he will occupy his post, he will have requests from a number of his officials to send them somewhere, and if he starts out by sending two to an institute in Europe, I do not know where he will end. Why should one not be sufficient?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The proceedings, I understand, are conducted in French, which is still, and likely will continue to be, the language of diplomacy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then send a man who speaks French.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are taking advantage of the services of one man who has been in the employ of the Quebec Government and who is going over to England anyway. We are getting his services at about half or one-third of what it would cost if we sent him specially for ourselves. A representative of Mr. Caron's department is going over to England anyway, and we are getting him for a flat sum of $500 to go on to Rome and act in the capacity of a delegate. The other gentleman, who is going over primarily to visit Rome and to bring back a special report, cannot speak French. Between the two of them, they will be able to get the information. If our people could all speak French, as I hope some day they will be able to,—and, of course, speak English too—we would not require two delegates. But, as I understand from the records, it has been usual to send two delegates, and I should not like to place on any one person's shoulders the full responsibility of bringing back a report and saying whether this institute is good or not. We are sending over two delegates, one at one-third the expense of the other, and the other with a double errand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What can the Englishman do that the Frenchman cannot do? Is this Mr. Wilson, who speaks English alone, going over to carry out the mission that Mr. Drury threatened to perform about a year or so ago? Is that not really his only object in going over?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know what Mr. Drury was going to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the whole world knew that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand the minister to say that $500 will be the expense to this Government or this department for this one particular delegate

at this conference. Why the increase of $5,000? Is the balance of $4,500 to cover the expenses of the other delegate?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly my hon friend was not in the House, but I explained that this sum of $500 is merely travelling expenses, but there is increasing expense in maintaining the institute. There is a permanent body, something like an executive, there the year round, and each country, of some thirty countries in the world, contributes a certain amount towards the maintenance of that permanent body. The request is that the amount be increased to $5,790. As I intimated, we are not going to promise any more increases until we find out whether we are to continue supporting this institute or not. That is why I want a special delegate there.

Mr. GARDINER: What was the total contribution to this institute last year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was $9,200.

Item agreed to.

Live Stock, $1,000,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: This appropriation for live stock is one of the most important that have appeared in the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture. I think it is generally admitted now that we cannot hope for a proper development of the agriculture of Canada until we reach a time when farmers generally adopt a system of mixed farming, with live stock playing a most important part. The history of the cultivation of this continent has shown us that, as the valleys were taken up and cultivated from time to time, where a one-crop system was followed, we had exhaustion of the soil resulting, and we found our settlers moving west from the Genesee valley in New York down into the corn belt, from there to the Pacific coast and then finally up into Canada. Let us compare this for a moment with results obtained in Great Britain where a system of mixed farming has been carried on for hundreds of years. Not only have the people of Great Britain produced and maintained in a high state of perfection more breeds of horses, cattle, sheep and swine, of high quality than all the rest of the world combined, but in Great Britain the yield of cereals per acre is greater than it is in Canada. That shows how important it is that we should get down to a system of mixed farming in this country at the earliest possible date.

A brief review of the live stock industry may be of interest on this occasion. We have in Canada about three and a half million horses, a great many of which are light horses. Although the automobile has driven a great many of them out of use, we find them, in many of the western provinces, quite a menace to the pastures, and as we cannot raise them at a profit we have to get rid of them. The enterprising Minister of Agriculture of Alberta even proposed to put them in pickle and send them over to the Belgians for food, but those people refused to have them, and we therefore have no market in that direction. There were some 26,000 head of these light horses in that province alone. The heavy horse is still much in demand, particularly on the farms of Canada, and there will be a good demand for this class of animal for many years to come. The market is getting barer every day, and it behooves breeders of heavy horses to see what can possibly be done to raise these heavy horses to a greater extent to meet the demands of the future.

As to cattle, we have about ten million head altogether, three and a half millions of which are dairy cows. It is an astonishing fact that at our abattoirs, where inspection is carried on and cattle are slaughtered for export and for home consumption, less than ten per cent of the animals slaughtered are good enough for export across the Atlantic. A great many of them are too small, too poor in quality, and altogether unsatsifactory in condition. The farmers thus suffer a tremendous loss by reason of the low standard of quality of the animals they ship to the market. Just the other day in the Toronto market, for example, the cheapest steer that was sold fetched 4½ cents per pound, compared with 10 and 11 cents for the best, and, in one instance, 13 cents for an animal of first class condition. Farmers who send animals to market in poor condition lose heavily, first in the lower price they receive, and, secondly, in the lower weight of the animal as compared with stock in better condition. Farmers crowd animals on the market in the fall of the year, thus making conditions much worse than they would be if their shipments were spread over a longer period. Our 3,500,000 dairy cows last year produced wealth to the extent of some $260,000,000; and in this connection I might remark that I was very much interested the other day to hear, on the floor of the House, the statement that our dairymen could not hope to succeed unless they

worked their wives and families in the dairy. I do not think that this statement is applicable to the dairy districts of Ontario or British Columbia. I know that in British Columbia we are able to import our bran and shorts, the rough feeds, such as barley and oats, from the prairies, in many instances get our alfalfa from Washington, paying duty in addition to freight, and are able to make a profit, and, as well, have a hired man to help us. We cannot, however, hope to accomplish this with poor-quality cows. These 3,500,000 cows average only about 4,000 pounds of milk per cow per year. Now, we have certain animals in Canada that have made records of over 32,000 pounds per year, or eight times as much as the production of one of these average cows. This means that the man who wants to produce 32,000 pounds with scrub cows will require to maintain no fewer than eight of these animals, providing housing and feed, and giving them all the general attention necessary in a dairy. At the end of the year the man with the 32,000-pound cow will have made a substantial profit, while all that the other man gets with his scrub cattle in the way of profit is simply the fresh air and the exercise. This shows how necessary it is for us to improve the quality of our animals. And if there is any farmer in any part of Canada who requires more information along these particular lines, if he is anxious to improve his herd and feed it at a profit, all he has to do is to make inquiry of these much-criticised establishments, the Dominion experimental farms.

We have only about 3,725,000 sheep in Canada, which has a larger area than the United States. As against this comparatively small number of sheep in this country, Great Britain has some 27,000,000, the United States 40,000,000, and Australia between 80,000,000 and 90,000,000 sheep. It is true that wool is very low in price, and in view of conditions such as that, there is a general tendency to get out of the sheep business. On the other hand, mutton and lamb fetch a good price, and if the farmers had bought thin lambs last fall and fed them over the winter on much of the cheap food we hear them talking about, they would have been able to do this at a profit, besides obtaining a much larger figure per bushel for their grain.

We have about 4,500,000 hogs in Canada, which is a poor showing compared with the United States. Only last fall a feeder on the Pacific Coast wanted to purchase 6,000 head of hogs for feeding purposes, desiring the supply extended over six or seven months, and he could not secure this number. It is interesting to know that while many of the farmers went out of the hog business because, as they claimed, hogs did not pay when grain was as high as it was during the period of the war and in the years immediately after, the hogs produced a profit every year at the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. If the farmers of Canada desire to know how this was done they can obtain this information also absolutely free of charge.

If there is one thing more than another that injures the farmers as a whole in this country, it is the in-and-out system of farming; that is to say, going in at the high price and tumbling out at the low price, and losing both ways. We must be consistent. We must adopt a system of mixed farming carried on consistently, and stand by it through the lean years as well as in the good years; and in the long run the farmer who does that will come out ahead of the game. It is also important that we should make a careful study of the market so that we may dispose of our goods to the best possible advantage. In connection with the Live Stock branch, we have a first class marketing organization that keeps in close touch with the markets throughout the country and also with the export markets, and the farmers can obtain the fullest information from this branch before disposing of their live stock. In my opinion, there are two great requisites for the live stock industry of this country: First, to obtain for our producers the best possible markets, on which they can rely at all times,—because the greatest inducement to the producer is the knowledge that when he has turned out a good article he can dispose of it at a satisfactory figure;—and second, we must improve the quality of our stock. As I have pointed out, there is great room for such an improvement in connection with not only our beef cattle, but also our dairy animals. We must also standardize our live stock product so that it can always go upon the market of the same high quality and in sufficient quantity to interest the buyer. Of the various export markets that we have, the nearest and most convenient is the United States. I have no objection to shipping our goods to that market; in fact, I think we should support any reasonable measure that could improve that avenue to the Canadian farmer. A year ago last January, I had the pleasure of addressing the American National Live Stock Association at El Paso,

Texas. That association represented all the range cattle men of the states extending from Texas to California, north from California to Washington, and from Washington, east to the Dakotas. The range interests of the United States were, therefore, well represented. I attended the convention for three days and listened with interest to the discussions, and I came to the conclusion at that time that those men wanted protection. Apparently, from what is going on at Washington, they still want it; and I feel that we are going to be faced with the problem incident to that protection in the United States for some years to come. That, at least, was the opinion I formed after carefully studying the feeling of that convention. They discussed the whole situation and concluded that their export markets in Europe, being now in such a condition that they could not absorb the surplus of the United States, it was best for that country, for a few years at any rate, to consume at home as much of its products as possible. There was one thing that struck me as I listened to the discussions at that convention, and that was that while the American farmer, with the large markets at his door, is a protectionist, the farmer on this side is not so much interested in that question.

Another market that is offering to us is the British and it is a more suitable market, for the reason that there is less chance of any tinkering with the tariff. At the present time, as hon. members are perhaps aware, we can dispose of our live animals at Birkenhead and Glasgow on condition that they are slaughtered within ten days of arrival. This, of course, is not a very advantageous way to sell our live stock. As can be readily understood, with the shrewd British dealer at the other end, and the owner of the cattle three thousand miles from home, with only ten days in which to sell them, the advantage is decidedly on the side of the dealer in England. But the embargo has not yet been removed and we have therefore to sell under those conditions. However, this market is useful at the present time. It may be asked: Why does it not pay us to kill our cattle on this side and send them over as chilled beef? The answer is: Simply because we cannot face the competition of the Argentine. She is able to put chilled beef on the British market at a very much lower price than we can and of as high quality, and the Britisher will pay a great deal more for fresh-killed beef than for chilled beef. So it pays us to ship our cattle on the hoof rather than as chilled or frozen beef.

That brings me to the point: Why do we want the British embargo against our cattle withdrawn? For the reason that in Canada we do not possess either the facilities or sufficient trained men for the finishing of our cattle so that we can ship them to the British market in a fat or finished condition. In 1919 we sent 500,000 cattle to the United States to be fattened. These feeders were taken over by the Americans and put in shape in Pennsylvania and in the corn states and then sent to the British market. In 1920 we sent 312,000 feeders to the States for the same purpose. Until we can get our men trained and install the necessary equipment to feed the stock at home, it will be necessary to look for a market for such stock.

I am very glad to hear from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) that he has been impressing on the British Government the desirability of lifting the cattle embargo. Perhaps a brief history of this embargo would be interesting. It has been in operation now for about thirty years, having been first imposed on the assumption that in a shipment of cattle from Canada to Great Britain one animal was found affected with contagious pleuropneumonia. That disease had never been known to exist in this country, and it did not exist at the time, nor has it ever existed here since. This animal was traced to the farm from which the shipment originated, and all the other cattle there were found to be absolutely free from the disease and in a general healthy condition. It is now acknowledged that the diagnosis made at that time by the British veterinarians was erroneous. However, the embargo has been maintained for all these years.

I might give a brief resumé of the efforts made to have the embargo removed. I think the honours are about even, inasmuch as every Canadian government, and every federal Minister of Agriculture since the embargo was put on thirty years ago has made all possible efforts to have it lifted. These efforts were abated during the war, but were renewed with increased vigour immediately after the armistice. The withdrawal of the embargo was strongly urged by Sir Robert Borden, who in 1917 was successful in obtaining a promise from the then British Minister of Agriculture to the effect that the embargo would be lifted. About that time or shortly after Professor Roberston, representing the De-

partment of Agriculture, and Mr. Arkell, the present Live Stock Commissioner, also carried on, with the consent of the British authorities, very valuable work in Great Britain along the same lines. A brisk campaign was carried on during 1919, 1920 and 1921. While no advertising was done, and while no attempt was made to make political capital out of what was done by the federal Department of Agriculture, I am quite sure the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) will back me up when I say that a continuous campaign was carried on during those years with the British authorities for the purpose of having the embargo removed. In 1921 the British commission appointed to deal with the matter gave its decision in favour of Canada. This was a very important step towards the lifting of the embargo. In addition to this a great deal of very valuable work has been accomplished by various associations in Great Britain. Allow me to mention a few of these organizations: The National Farmers' Union of Scotland; the Central Highland Association of Scotland; the Free Importation of Canadian Cattle Association of Great Britain; the Scottish Federal Meat Traders Association; the Live Stock Traders' Association of Great Britain; the Journeyman Butchers' Federation of Great Britain; the Union of London Meat Traders, whose President, Mr. Edwards, has carried on a very vigorous campaign for many years for the lifting of the embargo. Mr. Henderson, of Coupar Angus, Scotland, also has done very valuable work along the same lines. So it is quite clear that efforts to remove the embargo have been practically continuous on both sides of the Atlantic.

It is rather interesting, then, under these conditions to hear on the floor of this House and to note in a certain section of the agricultural press, that to Hon. Manning Doherty, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, is due most of the credit for what has been accomplished. One enthusiastic paper in fact crowned him "The Embargo King." It is very doubtful indeed if the results obtained by Mr. Doherty were not overshadowed by the resentment created in Great Britain by his action there. His campaign was looked on as an uncalled-for interference on the part of a provincial minister in what was strictly federal work, and that he acted without any authority or any standing whatever in dealing with what was a strictly federal matter. In fact, the situation became so acute that the British Minister of Agriculture at that time issued a statement to the effect that when he got ready to deal with the embargo question he would do so through the proper channel—the federal government—and not through any provincial minister.

Let me give the committee a quotation from the British Live Stock Journal relating to Mr. Doherty's activities. It is as follows:

Mr. Doherty Departs
Resentment at his visit

The Hon. Manning Doherty, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, before leaving Liverpool for Canada, on Saturday, said it was practically certain that the British embargo on Canadian cattle would be removed. It was expected that the removal would take place after the Imperial Conference, in London, in June next. All that Canada had to do was to see that all cattle for shipment were free from disease, and this could be easily done. When cattle shipments from Canada were in operation, meat prices were sure to drop, added the Ontario man. Just what is thought of Mr. Manning's dash to England to meddle in this affair is reflected in the Toronto World, the editor of which writes:—

"Resentment is very naturally being expressed on the appearance of Hon. Manning Doherty in England. Mr. Doherty went ostensibly as a private citizen, but it is impossible to disassociate him as a member of the provincial government in this way. Now that the question of the Canadian cattle embargo has already entered British politics it is neither political etiquette nor common decency for a Canadian to butt into British affairs under the circumstances."

Mr. HAMMELL: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. gentleman tell us what that line of argument has to do with the particular estimates we are dealing with?

Mr. TOLMIE: It appears to have a great deal to do with these estimates, because the item under discussion is for $1,000,000 expenditure on live stock. This matter is strictly along these lines.

Mr. Doherty is presumably representing Canadian farmers in England, but he surely cannot refuse to give the English farmer the same right of controlling and handling his own market as the Canadian farmer has.

"There is no discrimination against Canadian cattle in England any more than there is against any other outside cattle, and, consequently the Canadian representation can have no standing in this particular. Premier Drury was misled in allowing one of his ministers to leave the session at this time, especially for the purpose which Mr. Doherty is working on, and a quick cable from this end would be the best method possible for the provincial Premier to take to adjust a situation which is not to the liking of the old country people.

The question of the cattle embargo in any event, should be left entirely in the hands of the federal authorities, and Mr. Doherty's representation, if justified, should have been pressed on the Ottawa administration. The old country has been exceedingly considerate to

Canadians who have become domiciled there, but it is an entirely different matter for a Canadian who has no standing to attempt to dictate internal politics in that country."

Without doubting Mr. Doherty's sincerity at all, from what I saw and heard in Great Britain I am of the opinion that so far as the British Government is concerned our case would have been in a much better position had Mr. Doherty refrained from interfering in federal affairs.

It was shortly after the coronation of Mr. Doherty that Mr. Drury, no doubt feeling somewhat envious over his colleague's ascension to the embargo throne, issued a statement at a meeting in Ontario to the effect that the British embargo would be lifted even if he had to go over there himself. I am quite sure he must have been joking. "It's not done," as the Englishman would say, for any one to go over to England and try and compel these men on their own ground to do what they do not want to do. It has become a little out of fashion. The last man that made a success of it, I think, was William the Conqueror in 1066. One has only to see men like the Right Hon. Lloyd George, Right Hon. Winston Churchill, Lord Birkenhead, and a few more of those big guns in action, and then merely to think of Mr. Drury, to really enjoy the humour of the thing.

I think with the minister that there is a good chance of having the embargo removed, but we cannot hope to gain any success in this direction by any such methods as have been followed by any of the gentlemen I have mentioned. We cannot hope to accomplish anything by the creation of "embargo kings." We cannot hope to get anywhere by extravagant articles in the press nor by any cheap bluster. We must meet these men and negotiate with them in an orderly, decent, businesslike way, and I am quite sure that if we do they will give us a good hearing and be glad to deal with us. But if we do not do that, if we adopt the other method I have just outlined, all we can expect is that we shall make a laughingstock of this country and not get anywhere.

There was another criticism launched against the late government in some of the agricultural press to the effect that we were not properly represented at the embargo commission. We were criticised particularly because we did not have a legal representative there. You can quite understand that it was no part of the business of the commission to lift the embargo. That could only be done by an amendment to the Animal Diseases Act of Great Britain. The commission sat for the purpose of taking evidence and coming to a decision. We won one hundred per cent on that decision; we got everything we expected; so I do not see how a more favourable verdict could have been reached. Again, in ordinary business life there are two classes of people I have always carefully sidestepped: the lawyers, and plumbers. I can see no reason why we should have had legal representation before the commission, because we had no legal fight with the government of Great Britain. They were simply giving us an opportunity of presenting our case clearly before them; that we did, and as I say, we got a very satisfactory verdict. So we did not lose anything by not having a legal representative.

While the embargo in Great Britain is imposed on cattle coming from all countries, the excuse has been made by some Britishers that if they permitted cattle to come in from Canada, that would necessarily mean that all other countries would have the same privilege. But it was clearly pointed out to them in the presentation of the Canadian case that this need not be so. In fact, it was clearly proven before the commission that Canadian herds were freer from contagious disease than any other herds in the world. Therefore, it would be a very easy matter indeed to pass regulations on a disease-free basis, so that by naming the various diseases Canadian cattle could easily be permitted to enter Great Britain without allowing cattle from other countries to get into that market.

It might be interesting just to give a few of the points in connection with the arguments used by the British people. In the first place, Canadian stores can be shipped to the United States, France, Belgium, Switzerland and Germany, but we are not allowed the same privilege as regards Great Britain. Since the embargo was imposed thirty years ago, no less than 3,000,000 head of cattle have been landed on British shores from Canada, have been slaughtered under careful inspection, and not one single case of contagious pleuro-pneumonia or foot-and-mouth disease has been found. Why should we not have the same privilege as Ireland? Ireland is clamouring to be given the same dominion status as Canada, but still she objects to the entrance of Canadian cattle to Great Britain. The fact is that in Ireland they had foot-and-mouth

disease only a few months ago; they may have some now, whereas the only occasions when Canada had the disease on her shores was in 1884, when a ship called the Mississippi landed at Point Levis quarantine station in the month of May with cattle. Another ship, the Oxenholme, landed there a few months later. Both of these consignments were stopped there and dealt with at the quarantine station, and foot-and-mouth disease never gained a foothold in Canada. Strangely enough, both these shipments came from Great Britain.

The argument has been made that there is a possibility of disease coming in from the United States. That was met by this argument. In Canada, along a boundary of about 4,000 miles, about 1,700 of which is water, we have quarantine stations situated at various points, presided over by fully qualified representatives of the Health of Animals branch who make a careful inspection of all animals coming from the south, and even though they have had three outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, the last in the year 1914, when their losses amounted to millions of dollars, not one single case was permitted to cross the line and gain a foothold in Canada. So that the fact that we have been able successfully to protect our boundary line against disease from the United States for many years past, and are doing it today, is a sufficient guarantee of what we can do in the future.

Another point brought up was that once we get access to the British market, the United States might ship their cattle to Canada, and then across to the British market as Canadian cattle. That argument was met by this: it would be quite easy for the Department of Agriculture to brand permanently every animal coming in from the United States, except pedigree animals —which are readily enough recognized, and in any case would not be shipped as stores —and so make it utterly impossible for United States cattle to be shipped across to the British market as ours. The next argument was that there was a great danger of Canadians glutting the British market and lowering the prices. Now the Canadian would be the last one to want that to happen, because he is under heavy expense in sending his animals over there. In fact at the present time if a 1,200 pound steer is picked up in Calgary and shipped to the British market the sum of $55 would have to be paid in freight alone which should be at least a sufficient handicap to export and sufficient protection for the producers of store cattle in Great Britain. Now we admit that the Britisher has every right to protect his own market, but it is well to bear these two or three points in mind. In the first place we have had a distinct promise to the Prime Minister of this country that the embargo would be lifted. That promise has not been fulfilled. We have had a favourable finding by the Embargo Commission appointed by the British Government to inquire fully into this whole embargo question, and in the finding of that commission they not only declared that Canadian cattle were very free from contagious disease but that there was no danger to British herds from contagious disease from this country.

There is one other point I would like to draw to the attention of the minister, and that is that, while it has been clearly shown that there is no danger to British herds from disease from cattle coming from Canada, our cattle are still kept out of Great Britain by the Animals Diseases Act, an act maintained for the purpose of protecting British herds from disease. Before leaving the subject of embargo I would like to take this opportunity to thank the British Embargo Commission, headed by Lord Finlay, for the courtesy extended to the Canadian representatives. They gave us every opportunity to present our case as fully as possible and treated us with the utmost fairness. I also wish to take this opportunity to thank Sir George Perley, the Canadian High Commissioner at that time, and his assistant Mr. Griffiths, for many services rendered. Sir Howard d'Eggville, Secretary of the Empire Parliamentary Association, was another gentleman who did everything possible to make our trip to England very pleasant and gave us every assistance and all the information we required in presenting our case. Hon. Duncan Marshall, who was then Minister of Agriculture for Alberta, presented very valuable and practical information before the commission. Lord Beaverbrook, a Canadian who owns a string of newspapers over there and who has persistently fought for the lifting of the embargo has rendered Canada good service along this line.

While I was in Britain I took advantage of the opportunity to study the situation in the British market for Canadian live stock products. I found that we are faced with brisk competition in that market, the competition coming from Denmark, Sweden, Holland, the United States, Argentina and New Zealand. If we are to obtain a strong foothold and be able to com-

pete with these other countries our goods must be high and uniform in quality and of sufficient volume to interest those men on the other side. The European shipping his bacon to the British market has a decided advantage over us to a small extent in price in that he is able to put his goods on the market so much sooner than we can. He can put his bacon there with a lighter cure and this is preferred by the British consumer. I found the British traders very shrewd people; they are anxious to patronize the British dominions just as long as those dominions can furnish them with goods of high quality and just as cheaply as they can get them from other countries, and they cannot be blamed for this.

While over there I was very pleased to note that there was a strong move to increase trade within the Empire, and that in 1923 an exhibition will be held in London at which an opportunity will be given to all the dominions to exhibit their products and their manufactures, and I sincerely hope that the Government will take advantage of this opportunity to make a good strong exhibit of Canadian products. I understand that the delegates appointed to make the necessary arrangements will arrive here in a short time and I think they should be given every possible attention.

With reference to the other markets offering, I may say that on the Pacific coast there has been a start, even though in a small way, in the shipping of pure bred cattle to Australia, New Zealand, the Hawaiian Islands, China and Japan. This does not give promise of any immediate development, but it nevertheless offers possibilities for the future. With regard to the proposal to send representatives to South America, mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture a day or two ago, I think it is a good move. The representation of the beef men should, however, be spread among the breeds. Not only should the Shorthorn men be represented but also the Hereford and Polled Angus breeders. Mr. L. O. Clifford, of Oshawa, is one of the best breeders of Hereford cattle in the country. Mr. J. D. McGregor, of Brandon, is one of the largest breeders of Polled Angus in the world. On several occasions he has gone to the exhibitions in the United States and carried off prizes. Either of these men would make a very good representative. In addition, the dairy interest should be represented as I pointed out a day or two ago.

A far better plan to promote the development of the live stock industry—and I am fully aware of the difficulties in the way having had a little experience in the Department of Agriculture—would be to use all our pure bred stock at home. As I have pointed out, the quality of our beef cattle on the whole is poor, and the same thing may be said of our dairy cattle. While there are some excellent specimens, and while, perhaps, our cattle are as good as the average in other countries, still there is a great deal of room for improvement; I think everything possible should be done to have nearly all the pure bred stock retained in this country because there is an excellent field here for development.

One other point before I close, and that is with regard to the matter of grants for exhibitions referred to a day or two ago. I think it is very inopportune to cut this grant at the present time, particularly for the smaller shows that qualify under the present regulations of the Government, or as they existed a year ago. There were poor crops last year, and the exhibitions will be on before our farmers have had an opportunity to realize on the crops of 1922. The result is there is a general tightness of money in the country and the receipts of these exhibitions will not be as good as usual. I have already pointed out that notwithstanding what they have done in connection with the live stock business there is room for a great deal more development along this line, and the expenditure of $180,000, such as the minister mentioned the other day, to assist the cattle shows which have a value of from one and a half to two billion dollars is not a very large sum. I understand, too, that these men have not received notification of the change determined upon and consequently they will suffer great hardship in meeting the situation this year when the markets are flat and prices are low and the demands are not very good for pure bred stock. Therefore every possible effort should be made to interest people in exhibiting their live stock, particularly at the present time. Why? Because there never is a time when it is so desirable that there should be good stock as when prices are low. When that is the case there is always the possibility of making a little money out of a good animal but no prospect at all of making any out of a scrub.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thank my hon. friend from Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) for his very concise and comprehensive resumé of the live stock situation in Canada, more particularly for his remarks concerning the cattle embargo, with the exception of his strictures with respect to the Hon. Manning Doherty. I was on the farm busy trying to make both ends meet at the time the incident occurred to which he has alluded, and therefore I am not familiar with the facts and cannot say whether his remarks are justified to the fullest extent or not. I can say this, however, that all my relations with Mr. Doherty since I came down here have been both satisfactory and pleasant. So much for that.

The rest of my hon. friend's remarks were excellent and I want to thank him for them. We do not have sufficient speeches of that character. We have not yet realized in the West, and perhaps in other parts of Canada, that, after all, the corner-stone of agriculture in Canada, as elsewhere, is the live stock industry. We are gradually getting to it, not by choice always, but sometimes by compulsion, by the stern necessities of the case, by the climatic conditions and the soil conditions, lack of fertility and otherwise; and a speech such as my hon. friend delivered accelerates the action in that direction. I will not try to improve on it at all, for fear I should spoil it. I will simply try to accentuate one or two points. First, there is the necessity of paying more attention to quality in our live stock, both beef and dairying. Let any man take a trip to any of our abattoirs—the one, particularly that I am familiar with, in Winnipeg—and he will see a lot of fine stock there. But the rubbish which will be found there is distressing, especially in a dry year. They will hardly pay for their haulage to Winnipeg, especially during the recent years. As a matter of fact, I do not think some of them do pay for haulage. But if we can keep such good stock as some of these animals are, get along at all, and not go into debt, then it should pay to keep them.

As regards the dairy interests, the keeping of more and better live stock in some of our prairie provinces is very important, and upon that depends the future of southern Alberta and southwest Saskatchewan. There is no question about that. We must go into live stock, dairying, associated with siloing and the construction of silos. The drought there makes necessary the feeding of cattle in summer and winter, and the only way I know of by which they can obtain the necessary provender is to have an abundance of silage, not only during the winter but also till the middle of summer. That is not a new view in regard to live stock. Forty or fifty years ago, as a youth, I cut corn with a sickle, and fed the animals after school in the dry times, all summer, in order to keep up the flow of milk. If you go round Ontario, you will hardly find any feeding, except in the silo. They have a drought all over Canada, but not for so many consecutive years as in the prairies, and I am just as satisfied as I can be of anything that with due attention to the proper quality of beef and dairy live stock we can succeed. On those portions of the prairie we hear a great deal about the great drought, and it is terrible; unless you experience it you know nothing of it. But the cultivation of fodder—corn, sunflowers, sweet clover and all such plants—accompanied by the construction of silos, will be the salvation of agriculture in that important and unfortunate part of our western prairies. They are just on the balance now. A touch, or almost a breath, would send them the wrong way, but a little nursing will bring them back and put them on the highway to a reasonable development and to prosperity. I am satisfied these remarks will apply to many parts of Canada besides the particular area I have in my mind, and I am thankful to my hon. friend for stressing this feature of agriculture as he has done, if it is only for that particular aspect of the agricultural situation.

My hon. friend referred very briefly to the necessity of markets. There is no use lamenting the loss of the American market. We lost our chance, Mr. Chairman, and I do not know whether we will get it again or not. Every man who has an animal to sell, every hour of the day and every day of the week, thinks of what might have been. I do not want to be pessimistic, but the worse it looks in that direction—and I think it looks pretty bad—the more necessity of looking to the British market and the removal of the embargo. There are other markets, but they are only minor compared with those two great markets. It may be that our American friends will come to themselves later on, as we have come to ourselves, and that some time we may meet when we will

both see alike, and may consummate a bargain of a sensible nature. But to-day we might as well realize the position and look elsewhere for the markets of the immediate future.

My hon. friend's references to the in-and-out system of agriculture, especially with regard to hog growing, is apt and timely. We have been going in and out ever since I can remember, but our friends the Progressives will tell you there are other reasons why they went in and out. I am not going to refer to that very much. I think, possibly, if we remained a little bit more steadfast, as my hon. friend suggested, and took the shadow with the sunshine, we would hit it sometime. Jumping in and out continuously, you may miss it every time, but if you stay with it you will hit it sometime or other. I do not want to go into the question of why this is so. We have been doing it for fifty years, and the average man will tell you he is justified in doing so. Sometimes we go out of a thing simply because of anger. We get so provoked when we have something to sell, and cannot sell it, that we throw it to one side and say "I'm not going to bother with it." I do not think that is a wise course, but it is the natural one.

With reference to the embargo question, we have listened to a very interesting and, I think, very thorough, recital. I will not dwell upon the matter now but will only say that I intimated, when we were discussing this matter the latter part of last month, that as soon as the new High Commissioner arrived in London I wrote him on the subject of this embargo. Before he left I had a long conversation with him. He is very much interested in it himself. He does want to be useful to Canada, and he sees no way he could be more useful immediately than by assisting in the removal of this handicap. I immediately wrote him, therefore, suggesting certain measures to secure the entry of our cattle into London, or to the outskirts of London, as that would make an immense market, and, I have instructed the representative of the Agricultural Department to call upon Mr. Larkin as soon as he arrives in England, and discuss the matter with him in the light of the present day events. I have asked him to seek an interview with Right Hon. Winston Churchill, because he is the gentleman who is at present in the limelight on this important question. I observe that he is making speeches indicating the likelihood of some changes on the part of the Government there. They expect to have an open, free-for-all vote on 3rd May on the question. Knowing something of governments, it seems to me they are simply preparing for a change and they are going to throw the responsibility on Parliament to make the change, and I am in hopes Parliament will act wisely with regard to this particular question primarily, and incidentally also with respect to ourselves. In addition to that, I think I would be justified in telling the committee—although I cannot give them anything very definite at this time—that this Government is in cable communication with the highest officials in Great Britain, and has been for the last week, with respect to this important matter. Later on in the session we may be able to place those cablegrams before this House, but it is not in the interest of the movement itself to say very much about it at this particular time.

Now we come to the question of grants to exhibitions. Here we have an illustration of how hard it is for a government to reduce expenditure. We all have to try that out sooner or later. If you go to dismiss some unfortunate civil servant that you think you can dispense with, who is not much good, before nightfall every friend at Ottawa is clamouring on his behalf. Now what are you going to do if you have a heart at all?

Mr. CALDWELL: Put it into cold storage.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I certainly have great sympathy with the representatives of this city in this House. Things are bad enough for the rest of us, but I do not know how they exist to-day.

With respect to these grants, I think I made it quite plain before, on the civil government estimates, that we had in mind cutting these grants in two, on the assumption that the various exhibition authorities had been notified. It was my impression that they had been notified; but I find that they have not been, and it would be rather drastic, without proper warning, to cut those grants in two all at once. I think, however, a very good principle to adopt would be that adopted by the late government with respect to reducing the bonus to civil servants by 25 per cent. I do not know whether, if they had had the opportunity, they intended to continue cutting down the bonus until it all disappeared, or how they proposed to deal with it, but they started all right; instead of

taking a hatchet and smashing the bonus all to pieces at one blow, they tempered the wind to the shorn lamb by reducing the bonus gradually. In the first place, I take the ground that the question of grants to agricultural societies is strictly a provincial matter. There may be a few exceptions, winter fairs or something of that nature as regards which I would not care to express an opinion offhand; but, generally speaking, I think this should be a provincial and local matter. I am not going to criticise my predecessor. I think it was Hon. Mr. Burrell who introduced these federal grants with, no doubt, the best of intentions; but that was a day of spending large sums of money; that was a day when small contributions from individuals were hard to get, and there was some justification for his putting his hand into the public treasury and being liberal to these exhibitions which found it hard to finance during the early days of the war, and later. That, however, is no justification to-day for continuing these grants. Some of the exhibitions have now substantial surpluses as a result of these grants. I know a city in Saskatchewan—I will not mention the name; it is not the one that I represent anyway—that receives from this Parliament a grant of $5,000, and, in addition to that, receives $11,000 from the provincial government. Now that we are getting these gilt-edged highways and high-powered cars, people come scurrying into these centres from a hundred miles around and if exhibition day is fine, the authorities take in all kinds of money. They pay their secretaries high salaries and put everybody else in the air who does not get the same amount for his services. Farmers complain, with some ground, that salaries paid in the cities make it difficult for them to compete in the labour market. That is exactly what we are doing ourselves with respect to these exhibition grants, making it difficult for other people to get help when these high salaries are being paid. If we had oceans of money, it might be all right to shovel it out, but we have to cut down expenditure as much as possible. I see my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) smiling. He knows as well as I do how difficult it is to rub along. Things may improve, but in the meantime, we must keep close watch on all expenditures. My good friends, the Progressives, sometimes want to know what is the necessity of all this expenditure on statistics and what not, and yet they will come blithely at me and ask me to continue these grants. Well, that is about all they can do, and I presume it is what I would do myself; but this simply means that I have not to take them too seriously when they want this, that or the other item cut down, because you cannot have the money and spend it at the same time. After discussing the matter with my deputy and others, I think that possibly, instead of cutting these grants in half, we shall be able to do with a 25 per cent reduction. The exhibition managers will receive 75 per cent of the grant that has been in vogue in the past, and they should be able to get along lacking the 25 per cent. That is what the Civil Service had to do last year, and I do not know yet what they will have to do this year. That is the principle that has been laid down and it seems to be a rational one. Perhaps, next year, the grant can be cut down another 25 per cent, and the last two cuts will, perhaps, come more easily. I am not criticising the introduction of these grants because I was not here then, and it may have been all right; but, at present, when the sources of revenue for exhibitions are more than they were and revenues much more buoyant, when roads are in better shape, when many more people have cars, and when, if exhibition day happens to be a good one, there is no trouble in financing the affair, this sum of $180,000 could be expended on something else that would be productive of better results. In the meantime, what I have stated will likely be our policy, unless this Parliament says that these grants must be continued as before and it votes the money. That, however, will not be on my advice.

Mr. MILLAR: Before asking a question of the minister, I wish to refer to some advice given by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). He referred to the necessity for having good stock and of going into mixed farming. In fact, I think his address all through was very commendable, and I was pleased to hear it. I should like, however, to relate the experience last fall of a friend of mine in connection with dairying. He had taken the advice, given many times, that dairying was going to be the solution. He secured a number of good dairy cattle, and arranged with a company in Regina, large users of milk, to supply them with milk. He was assured that they would take his milk the year round if he started in at a certain period. But, in the course of about three months he was notified that they could take no more milk; the quantity of milk being offered by farmers around Regina

was far more than the company could consume. The result was that he had to give up the industry in which he had started in very good faith. Just at that time I was given an opportunity of reading a letter from a gentleman living in Regina, and in the letter, the writer alleged that at the very time that milk was being refused by, well, I will say the Co-operative Creamery Company of Regina, carloads of Klim were being used, the manufactured milk being sold in competition with real milk. I will not say that is correct, but that was strongly alleged, and I wondered if the minister could give us any information as to the extent to which Klim was coming into competition with real milk.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I cannot give the extent of that competition, but I can assure my hon. friend that Klim is, I think, milk spelt backwards. It is really milk, only it is skimmed milk which is then evaporated and put on the market in a powdered condition. It does enter into competition with milk, but it is milk with the butter fat content mostly taken from it and then evaporated. In fact, it is cleaner and more sanitary than real milk, because, as a rule, greater precaution is taken in the manufacture of it than in the actual putting of whole milk on the market, especially in the winter time. It is usually made from summer milk which, as my hon. friend knows, can be got more cleanly than winter milk. There is an impression that Klim is simply chalk or something of that nature. It is not; it is milk, and very rarely is it adulterated. If it were adulterated, it would be illegal to sell it. There is a good deal of it used in the cities, and I am aware that there is a lot of objection to it. It is not very popular; people are afraid to use it, just as they are averse to oleo.

Mr. MILLAR: Can the minister say whether or not it has driven the farmers out of business in the cities?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think so. I do not think it is having any effect on the farmers at all. At least there is no agitation against it that I know of. My hon. friend has spoken of the disposition of milk at the co-operative creameries at Regina. The reason for the situation to which he referred is that they have been giving such good prices for milk that they were simply overstocked and had to cut down a certain number of their new customers, retaining the old ones. I myself have been delivering milk at that creamery for a number of years, and I am informed now that Saturday's and Sunday's milk is being refused, even from old customers, simply because the attractive prices for dairy products, including milk, have had the effect of overstocking the market. Farmers do not like to acquire the necessary equipment to make butter. The simplest way of disposing of the product of a milch cow is to sell the milk straight. Otherwise the farmer has to get separators, smaller cans for delivery, and other necessary equipment, and they do not like to do this.

Mr. SALES: I can substantiate the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar). I know that milk has been refused in Regina this year. I was speaking with the president of the Co-operative Creamery on this subject, and he said that so many dairymen are finding themselves in the hole that they were acting on advice and going into mixed farming. He said that the supply of milk was more than he could handle. I raised the question of Klim, and he assured me that it was more expensive than milk. Klim is used only when there is a shortage of milk. Now it seems to me to be the old, old story, told over again, of the farmer being advised what to do, by everybody that is not a farmer. We were told long ago by a former Minister of Finance, who I believe is now in the other Chamber, of the advantages of mixed farming. We also had advice on the subject of raising hogs and sheep; and the member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) himself has some experience in the matter of sheep raising and the marketing of wool. The trouble is that every time we follow this advice we get it where the chicken got the axe; and we are getting pretty well tired of this kind of advice from people who do not know anything about the subject upon which they are advising. I venture to say that if every farmer were to raise two sows this year, pork would be just where it was before. I have marketed dressed pork in this country at five cents a pound, and I know that no man can carry a pail and feed the young pigs and the mother and get any money out of the business. We therefore get it in-and-out as the minister says; we are caught both ways. If we went into dairying and each man had an extra cow or two, the market would be simply flooded with dairy products, which would not be worth handling. I have only just returned from the West, and I can tell you that eggs are fifteen cents a dozen and butter twenty-five cents a pound, and

no man can produce these commodities at this rate and make a profit. That is the situation, and it is no use saying that we must change our farming methods and adopt diversified farming, and do this thing and the other—that is simply useless. We tried the same thing years ago and found it futile.

The minister intimated that some of the Progressive members had approached him with a request for grants for exhibitions, and I heard murmurs of disapproval all around me. One hon. member wanted to know if I was the guilty party. Certainly not. I do not know whether the minister can substantiate his statement.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has not in his constituency an exhibition of the nature referred to.

Mr. SALES: No, I have not; and I have something to say about exhibitions. When I go to these fairs and find that by far the greatest part of the money is spent on horse races, on flying machines, and on midway shows, I begin to doubt the advantage to agriculture of exhibitions of this sort. I think the greatest benefit that the farmer derives from them is the opportunity he and his family have of getting out and meeting their friends. That benefits his morale more than anything else, as it sends him back to his work probably refreshed after a holiday. I do not believe that these exhibitions are worth the money they cost the country. Of course, I know I am running the risk of being criticised when I get back to Saskatchewan, but I will say what I think, nevertheless.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am with you.

Mr. SALES: This is an opportune season to cut out the exhibitions entirely, for the simple reason that the farmers of western Canada will not be able this year to afford to attend them. They have not sufficient money for this purpose. I would urge the minister therefore to take his courage in his hands and cut the whole thing out for this year.

I should like to know whether the distribution of animals comes under this particular head. If it does, I notice in the Auditor-General's statement that there is $22,680.27 for the purpose, and about half of that is spent in one place in my own province, at Qu'Appelle. Does the minister not think that this is another case of duplication by the federal authorities of what the province is already doing? The Department of Agriculture of Saskatchewan is carrying on work in the distribution of live stock. There are six men putting in a lot of time at $6 a day, with their expenses in addition, amounting in all to $10,143, spent at this particular point, besides some other items at other points in the province. Could not this work be carried on in co-operation with the provincial authorities at considerably less expense? I should be glad to have some information from the minister on the point.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The remarks of the hon. member I agree with, except one. In the first place, I have to thank him not only for the moral, but for the real, support that he has given me in the matter of exhibitions. I speak from memory, but I think that his remarks sound the first note of support I have had in reducing the grants. Again I thank my hon. friend, and when we both go back to Saskatchewan we shall be able to stand together on that question, anyhow. With regard to the question of pork, I think my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) was quite right in his resumé of the whole situation. Sooner or later we have to adopt some phase of the live stock industry as the foundation and chief corner stone of our agriculture. And we shall do so, not as a matter of choice, but of necessity. All countries that I know of have had to do the same thing. Probably in the valley of the Nile they may not have done so; but, speaking generally, this is the case. I am sure the hon. member will agree with me with respect to the necessity of this.

I should like to refer for a moment to a personal matter with respect to dairying, wherein I think my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) is mistaken. As I said before, the Co-operative and other creameries are refusing milk; but they are not refusing cream. There is an unlimited demand for cream to manufacture into butter. The British market is getting only two and a half per cent of its butter supply from Canada, so it is evident that there is practically an unlimited market for our butter in Great Britain. Therefore, do not be weary in dairying because your milk is refused. I have never yet heard of butter fat being refused; there is an unlimited demand for it. With regard to milk, I am sure that what I am about to state will be interesting to the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). Last year I kept an account of milk from one ordinary grade Holstein cow, and in nine months I sold to the same creamery $329 worth

of milk. This year at the reduced prices, if that cow keeps up her record to the first of June, she will have yielded me $240 to $250 worth of milk. If you had ten cows like that, Mr. Chairman, you would not feel just so " up against your luck " as some of our farmer friends do at present. Where would the farmers of this province, in which I was born, be to-day if it were not for their dairies? For one dollar they get from any other farm product, I believe they get five dollars or six dollars, if not ten dollars, from the products of the dairy. The real trouble is we do not like dairying. One of the primary reasons for going out West was to get away from chores; but if I were still on the farm—as I was a year ago—I would find myself compelled to drift back into dairying in spite of myself. We have got to make farming go, and the man who won't do chores on the farm to-day is going to be in pretty hard circumstances to-morrow; there is no question about it. I know it is exacting work, there is no end to it; but you have to work at anything that is worth while. I would not like to hear anything said, even on the prairies, against dairying, because if you get the right type of cows—cows that will give something and give it freely—you will find it a pleasant job, as compared with keeping cows of the " boarder " type that my hon. friend spoke of. I remember cows that would give hardly anything, and what they did give came reluctantly. You had to hunt them around the yard and switch their tails around your neck and then they gave only a miserable little drop; but these " christian " cows are liberal milkers, and there is all the difference in the world between the two types.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. minister asked a moment or two ago: Where would those farmers of his province have been if they had not gone into mixed farming? I should like to ask him: Where are they now?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not referring to Saskatchewan, but to Ontario.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are they any better off in Ontario?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are on top of the sod, anyhow.

Mr. WARNER: I want to correct the statement of my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) in regard to exhibitions. I have been a director of the Edmonton exhibition for something more than twenty years, and I have yet to learn that the grants from the Dominion treasury go to pay for flying machines and midways. We have not been in the habit of spending our money in that way; it has been put into the prize-list and has gone directly into the farmers' pockets. I am in accord with a great deal of what my hon. friend has said regarding the condition of farmers, but I do not believe we will improve their condition very much by cutting off these grants. The midway promoters have to pay a certain amount to the exhibition authorities for the privilege of holding their shows in the exhibition grounds; no money is paid those promoters to add their attractions to the exhibition. I am not justifying the midway, but I want to correct the statement that grants from the Dominion treasury are paid to midway promoters. Neither do we pay for flying machines out of those grants; that expense is met out of other funds. Understanding these agricultural exhibitions as I do, I believe it would be a mistake to reduce the grants made to them. In fact, I think that the grants are far too small. There might be some room for argument as to how much benefit these agricultural fairs are in a general way to agriculture, but we want to discuss this matter from the point of view of bettering agriculture. To my mind agriculture has been largely benefited by these exhibitions.

It certainly does promote the breeding of better live stock by the neighbour of a farmer who is able to show good stock and gain prizes, for naturally that neighbour wants to be able to equal if not surpass his friend's record. I want to leave that idea with hon. members, that we are not paying these exhibition grants out in any foolish way. I am thoroughly familiar with what is done at Edmonton and other places, and I do not want any misunderstanding to prevail as to how the money is used. If the hon. member from Saltcoats knows that these grants are improperly used in certain places, I have no fault to find with him for calling attention to such misuse, but if he would come to Edmonton he would find that we devote these grants exclusively to the furtherance of agriculture.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the need of getting farmers to engage in mixed farming. I come from a district where we have been engaged in mixed farming ever since that country was settled, and I do not see any difference between the financial status of

our farmers and those of any other district. They are all pretty well on rock bottom financially at the present time. We have heard a great deal, especially from the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie), about shipping our unfinished stock out of the country instead of finishing them at home as we ought to do. The main reason in my opinion why stock is sent out of the country unfinished is not because the farmers want to sell them, but because they have to. Most of the unfinished stock is sent out simply for the reason that farmers are forced to raise money to meet their bills at a time when stock is at a very low figure. Furthermore, the farmer has to spend a certain amount in preparation for feeding stock in a proper way. In my district, where the farmers mostly go in for mixed farming, they have not had the means whereby to fit themselves to feed their stock, and the chief reason why they have not finished their cattle up to the point they should is that they have been forced to meet their bills in the fall.

The hon member for Victoria also said something about sheep, and that lambs were fetching a good price. I want to point out to him that lambs of the very best quality were sold from my district last fall at $6 per head. If he thinks that is a good price, those who are engaged in raising lambs will differ from him. A good deal has been said in regard to the raising of sheep, and that we do not raise a sufficient number in this country. With that statement I absolutely agree. I do not know of a country in the world where sheep can be raised with such success as in Canada, but at the same time when you are in the position that the farmers in my district are in,—and I take it that that district is like many others in Canada—where your returns from your wool are only sufficient to pay for the shearing of the sheep, there is no encouragement to go into that class of farming.

As far as the hog industry is concerned I am absolutely in sympathy with the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales). The only reason the farmers went out of the raising of hogs was because they were starved out of it. Just as soon as the farmers are guaranteed a reasonable profit, not a big one, but a reasonable profit in proportion to the price of the grain they grow, they will go in for raising hogs. But just as long as the packers who control prices can force them to a starvation price when they wish, they are not going into hog raising.

We have also heard a great deal about the cattle embargo. It is something we would all very much like to see removed, and I think if we, as Canadians, were a little more willing to remove the embargo on British goods we might get a little sympathy from the other side.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has mentioned chores, and I was reminded of the fact that the chores in the country are done when those people who favour daylight saving so strongly, are either in bed or at their club. The chores are done before the daylight saver has thought of going to business, and during the greater part of the year by lamp light. Some of the farmers in my district ship cream, and others are milking only enough for their own needs, and the reason is because they have the greatest difficulty in getting labour to milk. They cannot get men who will put in the long hours necessary on the dairy farm when they can get better wages in the cities.

Mr. McCONICA: I want first to say a word in support of the minister. I have reason to believe that he was approached by some of the Progressives on this matter of grants, and that he could readily substantiate his statement in that regard. I happen to know something of an association in my constituency, or rather, just outside, the members of which had made certain contracts. Later they wrote to me, in distress, that they would not be able to carry those contracts out because financial conditions were unfavourable, and they implored me to see if I could not at least save something on this proposition. I did interview the minister, and I felt rather encouraged with the result of my interview.

I am thoroughly in favour of agricultural exhibitions. I happen to be honorary president of an agricultural society that does not get a grant, but it has done more for our country than many other things on which we have spent money. These grants that are made by the Dominion government are beneficial, not only to the live stock industry, but generally to agriculture throughout the West.

I was much pleased with the remarks my hon. friend made as to mixed farming, but I would point out that in days gone by we in western Canada have often been led up to the mountain tops and shown glorious prospects only to find, when we got down to

the valley, that the level pastures were not quite as green as we had expected to find them. Mixed farming is all right if it comes out all right, and raising cattle is splendid if you can raise and finish and sell them at a good price; but when you get them nearly to the point where you want to realize money on them, and then are hailed or frozen out—I have been hailed out seven times in western Canada and frozen twice—how are you going to finish your cattle? That is where the trouble comes in. We very often sell our cattle before they are ready, simply because we cannot do anything else. If it is not the sheriff threatening us, we run short of feed. I have built up good herds of cattle two or three times and have been compelled to sell them for what I could get. I have attempted to fatten cattle during a long and cold winter on feed that was not very suitable to the purpose, and unless you get a very marked increase in the spring over what you paid for them in the first place, you do not make very much money. Mixed farming is all right but take my experience. Why, I sold cream and the price I got last summer was much below the cost of the help to milk the cows. Considering the cost of feed and my own labour I came out with about half of what it would have cost me to get the milking done. That is not a very encouraging prospect.

Now then with respect to sheep. I am a sheep raiser although not in a large way. I went into it three or four years ago. I read in the papers that there was a scarcity of wool throughout the world, that there never would be wool enough to properly clothe the people and I also noticed the skirts were getting shorter and decided something should be done. The first year I sold my crop to a co-operative concern at Regina. I shipped it to them and they said they would give me forty cents a pound in advance and then pay me the balance later. I do not know how much the later payment was; my son got it and deposited it. The next year they wrote and offered me twenty-five cents a pound. Before I got the sheep sheared they said the advance would be only fifteen cents. It did not make so much difference. I sent the wool along with the idea there would be a balance later. When the next letter came instead of sending me a cheque, they stated that they had overpaid me and I must either return the money overpaid or send the next crop. Well, of course, I had spent the money and decided to send the next crop. I sent the wool to them and in my letter to them said: "I am sending you my next crop of wool, and hope it will be enough to pay the debt. If it is not, let me know and I will send you the sheep." Now, this illustrates the difficulties of a sheep breeder. I have not yet heard any more from that firm; perhaps they are waiting for me to winter the sheep. Such experiences as these are not encouraging. I am keeping the sheep. I rather like to associate with them. But that doesn't go as respects hogs; when they get too cheap we unload and quit. In the West we do not raise the kind of feed that is necessary for our milch cows except for about three months in the year. If you try to feed dry feed to cattle six months in the year and make money on it you have a very difficult problem to solve. In that country you cannot tell whether a good steer is an asset or a liability; in fact you can hardly get rid of them. My attempt at mixed farming has not been a success, and the method has not been a success in our country. Out there if we cannot raise grain we are gone. If we can raise grain we can keep some cattle; it is a grain-raising country. I say to you gentlemen that there must be a market for our grain if we are going to make a success of farming in western Canada. Nothing else will do, nothing else will save us. As it is now cattle, sheep, and everything else has failed to save the farmers. In my part of Saskatchewan they are getting poorer and poorer although they are raising good crops. Exhibitions are all right, but they do not put money into your pockets. We need some relief there such as the Government has not yet proposed. We therefore ask the Government to consider the situation very earnestly before this session draws to a close.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I at once still the apprehensions of my friends to the left and tell them I do not propose giving any advice upon farming. Indeed I can go farther and say: Never since I came into public life have I ventured to advise farmers how to farm. But there is a distinction between attempting to do that and coming to a conclusion and expressing it as to public policy in relation to the nation exclusive of agriculture. I rise especially though to say something anent the remarks of the former Minister of Agriculture in relation to the cattle embargo. He made some comment on the action of the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario in proceeding to England and entering on

certain activities there on this question. That comment was taken exception to by the minister and the exception was greeted with considerable applause. Some time earlier in the session I heard from the same quarter comment to the effect that whatever progress had been made in the way of removing the embargo we owed chiefly to that same Minister of Agriculture for Ontario. Now when I discuss this I am not advising farmers how to farm: I am speaking of something of which I have intimate personal knowledge which I have followed closely for many years—anxiously for the last few—and as to which what I say is based on observations of fact. I have no fault to find with the conduct of any government in the past thirty years in their endeavours to have this embargo removed—no fault to find first of all, because I believe it is in the interest of Canada that it be removed. I believe we have a just grievance while the embargo stands on the present basis and that we are justified in proceeding by legitimate means to get it removed; and I further believe, so far as I know, that all governments have, to the utmost of their power, endeavoured to bring about that result.

The embargo, while it exists in its present form, is unjust to Canada not because Canada is discriminated against in any sense. Canada is not discriminated against in the British legislation, it is equally applicable everywhere; but the embargo was imposed at a time when it was advertised that a case of pleuro-pneumonia had been found among the Canadian herds, and the embargo took the form of a protection of British cattle breeders against that disease. So that from its very origin it implied a reflection on the health of Canadian herds. That reflection was either just or unjust. History has shown that it was unjust—that in the first place there was no such contagious disease in any Canadian herd, that in all the years since there has never been any, but that on the contrary Canadian herds have been freest from disease of any herds in the world. So that, as long as the embargo rests on that origin it constitutes in itself an injustice to this country whether it is applied generally or whether it is not. We came closest to success in persuading the British Government to remove it in 1917. At that time, at the Imperial Conference, the efforts that had proceeded for many years were brought to a consummation. There was obtained at the conference, now recorded in language that is of course indelible, the promise of the British Minister of Agriculture that after the war—although the date was not fixed—the Government would remove that embargo. Consequently, after the war we took the matter up. Mention has been made this afternoon of correspondence that has passed between the present Government and the British Government on this subject, and to the possibility that it may be brought down. So far as I am concerned, I hope the Government will see its way to bring down all the correspondence that has passed ever since the war—yes, before it for that matter—on this subject. There may be some of it that may be considered confidential, some of it the Government may feel it has no right to bring down. If the Government so considers presumably I will make no objection, but I hope there may be none of that character and that the full facts will be disclosed to this Parliament and the people.

After the war we took up with renewed vigour the question of the removal of the embargo, basing our position on what we thought was the firmest ground, the ground most likely to bring us to success, namely the promise of the British Government at the Conference of 1917. While we were engaged at this, the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario proceeded overseas. What he did over there I shall refer to just a little later. Suffice it to say that considerable agitation took place in Great Britain at that time, a by-election was held on the question, with the well-known result that nothing was accomplished, but later on the British Government determined to appoint a royal commission for the purpose of inquiring into the whole question as to the effect of the removal in toto, as to what might be done to accord with the promise, and, in general, as to the basic effects underlying the establishment of the embargo and its continuance. Lord Finlay was placed at the head of that commission. We, so far as Canada was concerned, took the position that we already had brought this question to the point of a definite promise, and that, while the commission might be of value to the British government, we did not propose that our case would be weakened by its verdict, no matter what the verdict might be. Nevertheless, we felt it our duty to go before that commission to present the actual facts with respect to Canada, to show there never was cause, in so far as disease was concerned, from the

standpoint of Canada, for the placing of the embargo at all, and to show there never had been since any cause for continuance of the embargo. The case was then under the charge of the then Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Tolmie. That the work was well done is evidenced, not only by the words of Lord Finlay, who, in the most—I would almost say extravagant, but I will say superlative—in the most superlative language stated that the Dominion case had been presented with clearness, conciseness and with strength, not to be improved upon at all.

But if anything else were wanted to show that there was nothing left undone to bring a successful verdict out of that inquiry, it is the fact of the verdict itself. The verdict, in so far as this country was concerned, was, as the former minister expressed it, a hundred per cent successful. The commission found that there had been no cause for the maintenance of the embargo in so far as disease was concerned, that there was no cause for continuance now, in so far as disease was concerned, that Canadian herds were free from contagious diseases, and I think it went so far as to say the freest in the world. Nothing more could have been expected. Considering the subject from the standpoint of protection of industry in Great Britain—that is to say from the standpoint of the British cattle-breeder—certain comment was made as well, but, even in that respect, the verdict, in so far as it was favourable to that protection and against this country, was about all that you could expect it to be. That is what preceded up to that point. Following that correspondence continued, and at the Imperial Conference I took the subject up, and then at the conference of Prime Ministers I rested my case on the promise of the British government, and, resting my case there, I asked, in the name of this country, that that promise be carried out.

Now I desire to say that the principal obstacle I encountered there was the resentment that had been raised in that country by the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario. Why was that the case? And what was wrong with his conduct? I do not for a moment say that Mr. Doherty had not a perfect right to go there; that is if he could go there, a Minister of Agriculture, as a private citizen, and do what he could to persuade the people of the injustice of the embargo. Nor do I say for a moment that he did not go over with the best of intentions, that his only desire was to achieve something and to get it done. I am not at all impugning his motives, but I do impugn the wisdom of the way he went about it. The Minister of Agriculture for Ontario proceeded to England, and what did he do? He commenced on the soil of England a propaganda against the policy of the British government, and appealed to the British people to reprimand the government of Great Britain for the conduct that was pursued by that government. Is there any one in this House who disputes that what I say is right? Did he not take part, even, in the by-election, denouncing the policy Great Britain was pursuing in this regard before the British electorate to whom the British Government was responsible? Is there any one who disputes that? There can be no one who disputes it. Even the Prime Minister of Ontario has, in almost these very words, described the conduct of Mr. Doherty in commencing a propaganda in England against the policy there being pursued.

Is there any one who would suggest for a moment that it is a proper course for a minister, a public man in this country, to go to Great Britain, where certainly they have autonomy just as we have autonomy, and to challenge the conduct of the British government before the British people? Is that a proper course? If it is in the minds of any one that it is, just for a moment consider the reverse position. Suppose a British minister should come to this country, and, in a matter of our domestic policy, even though he felt that that policy did an injustice to his own country, should, before audiences in this country, attack the policy pursued by the Government of this country, what would be thought of such conduct in Canada? I ask hon. gentlemen to let that sink into their minds. Is it any wonder that we found over there not only resentment, but a difficulty which the British government faced caused by the feeling aroused in the minds, not only of ministers over there, but of others in relation to the action of Canada. Now I picture the reverse condition. Suppose that, following that, that minister had gone back to England, had been received there by his Prime Minister, and at a public meeting the Prime Minister of Great Britain declared this embargo, or this policy of the government of Canada, had to stop, and that if it did not stop he

would proceed to Canada and see what he could do about it. I wonder what we in this country would have thought of a speech of that kind from the Prime Minister of Great Britain. But that is just the substance of the speech of the Prime Minister of Ontario in relation to the conduct of the British government; so that it will scarcely be a matter of surprise that action of this kind, taken by the public men of this country before audiences in Great Britain, published in the press of Great Britain, constituted one of the chief obstacles encountered in securing the implementing of the promise of the government of Great Britain back in 1917.

Now if that is removed—and I think it will be removed, and as time goes on the memory of that will fade—the difficulty it engendered will be removed. I have great hopes that at a not very distant date there will be such action taken as will be an honest fulfilment of the promise made in 1917, and I sincerely hope the Government will proceed, and vigorously proceed, standing on that promise, to demand and to ask for its fulfilment, but in the way we always ask for things, in the way we always assert our claims, and press our position before the authorities of Great Britain. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is the head of the department chiefly interested, and the government of Canada is the instrument and the means of communication. It is for the government of Canada to lay its case before the government of Great Britain and for that government to lay the case before the people of Great Britain, and I only add that whatever may have been the intention—and I do not dispute its honesty or motive in any way—the actual conduct was ill-advised, it was ill-managed and mischievous in its results.

I am going to say one word more before I sit down. I do not propose to discuss the tariff question just now at all. It has been referred to by the Minister of Agriculture; it has been referred to by some others on this side, and I can plainly see an attempt being made to explain the present attitude of the American people and the American government as something that could not exist and the present result as something that could not exist had Canada decided differently in 1911; that is to say, that had the reciprocity pact of that day been accepted by the Canadian people, we would not find ourselves now confronted with this attitude of the American people; we would not find ourselves now confronted with the agricultural bloc and their determined policy, nor with the Fordney Bill, with the Young Bill and now with the McCumber Bill that is about to become law. I just want to ask that that one, single indisputable fact enter the minds of hon. members of this committee; that its significance be pondered over, at least, by those who are inclined to take that point of view. We have had for some years back reciprocity in this country in several articles, notably in one, and for the sake of the argument, the one is just as good as ten. We have had since 1918,—or is it 1917?—precisely the same reciprocity with regard to wheat that we would have had with regard to all that other lines of articles embraced in the pact of 1911, had that pact become law. Consequently, if the attitude of the American people, their conduct to-day, their law that now is in effect and that hangs over us, are in any way attributable to the lack of reciprocity in 1911, then it inevitably follows that it would not apply to those articles in respects of which we have had precisely the same reciprocity since 1917. All I want to say is what is even now in the mind of everyone. It applies to wheat; it applies to everything else as well, on which, rightly or wrongly, we accepted their offer in 1917. I will not proceed further—the time will come for a complete discussion of this subject. The American people are to-day in a certain state of mind by reason of the imports of farm products into that country. They have taken certain action. There may have been a time a while ago when they felt like taking an opposite action. There may be a time a few years hence when they will be exactly in the opposite frame of mind, and a few years further on when they will be in a still different frame of mind. That has been the condition of affairs for the past sixty years. But that that varying state of mind of the American people towards Canada will be affected by any reciprocity arrangement, which they reserve the absolute right to change at any time they like, I do not think any seriously-minded Canadian considers for a minute. That is all I have to say on this subject now. I ask that it be remembered that what they are doing applies to the subjects covered by reciprocity when they are doing it, just as to other subjects as well.

Mr. HALBERT: I want to draw the attention of the committee to one or two matters. In the first place, I want to refer

to the long distance roundabout which the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) and the ex-Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) went to get a slap at the Hon. Manning Doherty, Minister of Agriculture of Ontario. It ill behooves either of the two to go so far around to bring in a subject in order to play politics, as every hon. member knows this was brought in purposely at the present time. We have had this embargo for thirty years and it has been left for the Drury government to do something to have the embargo removed. We heard very little about it until the Hon. Manning Doherty went over to Great Britain to make an investigation in regard to the matter. Yet a great fuss has been kicked up about the Hon. Manning Doherty going over there and interfering with British politics, as it was claimed he had no right to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why, the promise of the British government was obtained long before he was ever heard of.

Mr. HALBERT: Just a minute, please; I did not interrupt the right hon. gentleman. While the Hon. Manning Doherty was in the Old Country, he was received by the British Prime Minister, by Lord Beaverbrook, and others just as were the ex-Minister of Agriculture and the ex-Prime Minister, and he was in just as good company as any of them. Before he left Great Britain he had the promise from Lloyd George, that a committee would be appointed. That was before the ex-Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion reached the Old Country. Mr. Lloyd George told the Hon. Manning Doherty that if the committee reported favourably the embargo would be removed. The whole trouble with my hon. friends is that they are afraid that, perhaps, the embargo may be removed and the Hon. Manning Doherty may get some credit for its removal. They can continue playing politics, but the province of Ontario is going to give the Hon. Manning Doherty the credit for placing the matter fairly and squarely before the British people. The British people defeated their Minister of Agriculture because of his attitude on the embargo, and the Toronto World, from which the hon. member quoted, has passed out of existence. It is because my right hon. friend had fooled the Canadian people on the embargo question that the party which he leads to-day has passed into political oblivion. I think the Hon. Manning Doherty will still be on top of the earth when some of the men who are trying to trample him into the mud have ceased to exert any influence upon public affairs.

Mr. EVANS: There are one or two matters which I should like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). At the present time, markets are certainly the pressing need of the live stock men of Canada, and we shall most assuredly have to pay more attention to the type of stuff we raise in order to secure the best markets. On receiving a communication some time ago from a packing company, I had my attention drawn to the fact that the type of hog that is raised to-day by the Canadian farmer is not just what it should be for export. We are looking very largely to the British market for an export trade in hogs, and the type that takes best there is something that will conform to the type used in making what they call Wiltshire bacon. I should like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture the fact that, perhaps, more attention to some kind of education along this line would benefit the country a great deal at this time.

The question of a market for beef cattle is a very serious one with those in the West who are raising cattle for export in large quantities. I believe, with the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), that the United States market was, perhaps, the most advantageous for the farmers of western Canada, and I believe also that we should have done our best to secure that market. Notwithstanding the feeling that is prevalent amongst the farmers and the agricultural bloc in the United States Congress to-day, I think it was the duty of every government in this country to cultivate friendship and trade with the great republic to the south of us. I believe, notwithstanding all the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said, that had we secured that market for ourselves when the opportunity was open to us, the benefits to those on both sides of the line would have been apparent to-day and, perhaps, the Fordney tariff would not be before us as it is. Now there is practically no hope of securing a market in the United States for our live stock, and I believe that, for some time to come at any rate, protection for the farmers in the United States will be the settled policy in that country. So that we are led to look more and more across the Atlantic for markets for our cattle, and the embargo is the principal obstacle in our way to-day. While perhaps some good work may have been done in this matter

—and I do believe that some things have also been done that are rather injudicious —there is one fact, which I would bring particularly to the attention of the Government, namely that there is still one avenue of approach to the British government open to us in the endeavour to have the embargo removed. I refer to the increase in the British preference. I am emboldened to make this statement because of the fact that at the Liberal Convention held in this city in 1919 it was a plank of the platform of the great Liberal party that they would increase the British preference to at least 50 per cent. Now this is a concrete proposal that could be put up to the British government, and if a satisfactory arrangement could be arrived at we should be benefited in two ways. I bring this to the serious attention of the Government and would urge them to leave no stone unturned to secure for us the removal of the embargo, if, by increasing the British preference to at least 50 per cent, this object can be attained.

Mr. JELLIFF: We are discussing an estimate of a million dollars to be expended on live stock work. For some time past I have known that cattle and sheep in the very southwestern part of Alberta have been suffering from the depredations of timber wolves, and it had been my purpose to go over the matter personally with the Minister of Agriculture. I hold in my hand a number of letters I received to-day which I put into my pocket with the intention of interviewing the minister and talking the situation over with him. But as this matter may perhaps be appropriately discussed under this item, I shall now deal with it. The timber wolves in the southwest of the province have their breeding and lurking places in the Dominion parks and forest reserves, and they are emerging and playing havoc with the cattle and sheep in that region. I shall read from a letter I received this morning from a friend of mine with regard to bounties. I do not know what our system of bounties is. If I remember rightly, we have no bounty on timber wolves and coyotes. However, I will take the ground that we should have a bounty for the protection of the people who raise cattle and other stock out there. My correspondent says:

> In regard to asking the Government for a bounty to be placed on timber wolves to aid us in getting rid of them, I am enclosing letters from four stock owners, which only represent a portion of the stock owned, but will give you an idea as to what damage the wolves are doing here. The stockmen located along the Waterton river too, seven miles below the Waterton lake, lost 35 head last year. I lost 5 head, 4 head of yearlings in four days. The range along the foothills that the cattle run on is all partly covered by scrub timber and brush, and, the number of cattle stated in these letters—

That is, those that were killed, I take it.

> —were all seen by the owners, so only partly represent the total loss; yet the number is over one hundred for one year from a few men.

One of the letters he encloses is signed by Sam and John Walburger. It reads:

> We have been asked to state the number of calves lost, and yearlings, in the Dominion park, east of the Belly river. Yearlings, 21 per cent, 7 per cent of sucking calves, during the summer of 1921. And would like to state that the sucking calves got away very light.

There is another letter signed by J. J. West, who states his loss as follows:

> Colts year 1921, 3 head, under 1 year.
> Cattle year 1921, 11 head, from calves to two year olds.
> Colts year 1922, 5 head, under 1 year.
> Cattle year 1922, 7 head, from calves to two year olds.

Another man last year lost 14 head, from yearlings up, and 10 head of calves. I will not go into all these letters, because the time is short. I want to impress upon the members of this House, however, and especially upon the minister, that it is quite as important to protect our live stock from the dangers to which they are exposed from wild animals, as it is to take measures to prevent tuberculosis and other diseases. The minister did me the kindness to mention the fact that I had called to his attention the tuberculosis situation in the Lethbridge district. I was very much interested in that matter. I am also greatly interested in the present subject I am discussing, and I will ask the minister to see that provision is made in some way for an adequate bounty to put a stop to the loss which the stockmen in this district experience from wolves. They made an effort themselves, and I see by one of the letters that they donated quite a sum of money for the purpose. But I imagine that their efforts were of no effect, one reason being that the breeding grounds of the wolves are on Dominion property, and I do not think that the stockmen are allowed to go on these reserves with their guns. One of the letters says:

> The stockmen in this district four years ago met and offered a bounty of $60 for each female and $40 for males and $20 for pups. Since that time we have only been called on to pay bounty on seven pups, one female and one male.

So that they do not seem to make any progress through their voluntary efforts, and some arrangement should be made to rid these public reserves and parks of the wolves that are coming out and preying on herds of stock. We are trying to develop a good stock and dairy country in that part of the Dominion. In this immediate neighbourhood, which comes within the district of my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote), they are developing an irrigation project covering some 23,000 acres, one of the main purposes of which is the encouragement of dairy and stock raising. I take the ground that these people should not be subjected to losses incurred by reason of wild animals preying on their stock. I hope the minister will take this matter under advisement and make such provision as will protect farmers and stock-raisers against these losses. To enable him to deal with the matter I intend to turn these communications over to him.

Mr. COOTE: I wish to back up what the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) has just said regarding this matter. The constituency which I represent is bounded almost entirely on the west side by forest reserves, and the ranchers who live in that district, some of whom pasture their cattle on the reserves, are at certain times subjected to considerable losses from the depredations of timber wolves. If the department can do anything to keep down these depredations, I think the money will be well spent. Indeed, I would suggest that if the hon. minister is hard pressed to find the money for this purpose he might well take it from the exhibition grants, which would be making a better use of the money.

I have had sent to me by a constituent a newspaper clipping which he has asked me to present to the House, and I think this is the proper time to do so. It is very much to the point and deals with the campaign for producing a certain type of hog. The discussion this afternoon has wandered over almost every phase of agricultural development, but there is no subject which would furnish more food for debate on these estimates than the hog. This article expresses a view which I feel should be brought before the House. It states, in part:

> Will increased production cause a decrease in the price that will put the hog raiser where he has found himself several times before, following campaigns for greater production?
>
> A factor in the building up of our overseas bacon trade which might bear looking into, in view of the fact that governments in this country are advocating farmers to produce a particular kind of hog, and are therefore parties to the enterprise in a sense, is the manufacturing of bacon in this country. Much has been told regarding the production methods of Danish farmers. Might it not be too that the Danish packer has something on his Canadian competitor when it comes to the production of the kind of bacon the Old Country trade requires? Possibly he has not and on the other hand he may. The matter is worth looking into. Packers in this country are not any more likely to be the super-packers than are Canadian hog producers likely to be superior to the Danish hog producer. We have been frequently told that our production methods are inferior, so often that we have come to regard it as a fact. It might not be a bad thing to look into the curing of bacon as well as into the producing of hogs. If the Danes know something about curing which our packers have not found out, if some of the quality of their finished product is due to better methods in curing and handling, it is important that our packers should know of it. Thus far in this country campaigns for the improvement of Canadian bacon have been confined to encouraging the production of a particular type of hog. Governments have been at this since the early nineties. Why not look into the curing business a little and see if better methods there might not accomplish something? We should be absolutely sure of our ground in all points connected with the problem, with the curing of bacon as well as the production of a particular type of hog.

An hon. member stated this afternoon something about the amount of money there is in hogs. One of my constituents gave me his experience when a similar statement was made to him. He said, "Certainly, I believe there is money in hogs. There is a bunch of hogs: I have put more money in them than I can ever get out. So I am quite satisfied there is money in hogs." I hope the hon. Minister of Agriculture will give some thought to the question of the curing as well as the production of bacon, because the farmer cannot cure the bacon; that is the work of the packer; and I think that maybe the packer needs education in curing bacon as much as the farmer does in producing the bacon hog.

At six o'clock the committee took recess

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GOOD: I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but I must express my regret that two hon. members of this House, the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen), should have dragged into this discussion in the way in which they did, the name of the Hon. Mr.

Doherty, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario. I am sure the significance of the attack upon Mr. Doherty and the government of which he is a member cannot have escaped the notice of the House, and I feel sure that the two hon. members in question will, in their better moments, regret having spoken as they did. Mr. Doherty is quite able to defend himself, so I do not propose to go into the question in respect to which criticism was levelled against him. I am sure that if he were here he would be able to present the other side of the question, and there always is the other side. I do not think it matters very much who gets the credit for any particular good act that is done. I, for one, and I think all the members in this part of the House, will be very grateful to anybody who does anything to secure the removal of the embargo. It seems to me rather picayune for anybody, I do not care who he is, to try to gain credit for doing anything in this direction. Mr. Doherty may not have acted strictly according to Hoyle, but I certainly think that he secured some results, and when the history of this agitation comes to be written, I believe that his name and his work will receive a fairly prominent place in the record.

The right hon. member for Grenville referred in his remarks to certain obstacles which he alleged had been created in Great Britain owing to the mission and journey of the Hon. Mr. Doherty. I only wish to point out in that connection that it depends a good deal upon the parties to whom one goes for information as to what kind of an opinion one will receive. The hon. member for Victoria City quoted an article this afternoon from the Toronto World. If he had gone to the Telegram, I am sure he would have discovered something even more emphatic, more sensational and spicy than the article which he quoted. Possibly the hon. member for Grenville may have approached the wrong parties in Great Britain, and have received from them a somewhat biased opinion, one not representative of the average opinion in Great Britain. That is all I wish to say in regard to that matter. I again express my regret that this phase of the matter has been discussed in this House.

With regard to the estimates, I am not in a position to criticise the work of the Live Stock branch. In fact, as the present Live Stock Commissioner has been a personal friend of mine for years, and as I regard him as a man of the highest integrity, I would be disposed to trust a great deal to his judgment, but I do feel more or less inclined to venture this criticism in general. In the Department of Agriculture there is a tendency to devote more and more time and attention to what might be called exhortation to the farmers. This savours of what might be called governmental paternalism, and I, for one, have seen a good many of the evil effects of this kind of thing in Canada. I would suggest to the minister that he go very, very carefully about expanding the work and scope of the department in the way of advising the farmers what to do. This matter was touched upon this afternoon and some rather good advice, I think, was given by some hon. members. I know that a great deal of information which can only be secured by experts is needed by the farmers, and I think that the work of the department ought to be confined more and more to the securing of information which farmers cannot get for themselves, and that less emphasis should be placed upon what I call exhortation. I am not in a position to criticise the amount of money that we are requested to vote for this particular line of work, but I do feel that it is unwise to be continually expanding these activities, and I would suggest to the minister the wisdom of scrutinizing very closely indeed any expansion along that line.

Mr. REED: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion this afternoon. I notice that a great many have spoken of mixed farming. I believe that it is a very wise course for any farmer to take. Many have also spoken of the raising of hogs and sheep. Others have spoken of the dairy and beef cattle industry. All these activities tend to make farming profitable. I would like to express the hope that the minister may deem it wise—we hope he will at any rate—to make a fairly liberal grant to the fair association of the city of Kingston. That association is very much in need of help, and if the minister could see his way clear to carry out my suggestion it would materially promote the work which it carries on.

Mr. CALDWELL: While we are considering the live stock industry I would like to direct the minister's attention to a very great handicap upon the development of that industry in the maritime provinces. That is the lack of abattoir and cold storage facilities for that section of Canada due to the fact that our live stock, even that which is raised for home consumption in the maritime provinces, must be

shipped to Montreal to take advantage of the abattoir and cold storage facilities there, from which city the product is shipped back again to the consumers in the maritime provinces. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will realize that with the present very high freight rates such a condition results in too wide a spread between the producer and the consumer, a spread you cannot get away from under present conditions. I have taken this matter up during the last two years with the Department of Agriculture in this city and with different abattoir firms in Toronto and Montreal. Several firms have signified their willingness to establish abattoir and cold storage facilities in the maritime provinces if either the Dominion government or the provincial governments concerned, would guarantee them against loss on their investment for the first three years. The live stock industry will never be developed in the maritime provinces without these facilities, because, owing to the conditions I have pointed out, the farmer cannot get the cost of producing the animal, and the consumer has to pay a high price for the product. That product has to be first brought to Montreal and stored in times of plenty so as to have it available for periods when the farmers do not have a supply to put on the market locally. I would like the minister to take this matter into consideration.

With regard to the grants to agricultural societies I think the minister's suggestion is a very good one. There is an agricultural society in my constituency that has possibly one of the best exhibition plants in Canada. Although the society got the Dominion grant last year it experienced a loss on its exhibition—that is a loss on its whole operations, including the initial outlay and the expense of running the exhibition. The society is looking forward to getting the Dominion grant again this year. Now if this grant were cut off entirely, as some hon. members have suggested, it would mean that this society would have to materially change its plans, or encounter a larger deficit than it did last year. I think with the Dominion grant in all probability the society possibly this year will come out a little ahead of the game. I want to say that I believe our exhibitions down there have been a great help to agriculture. Such an exhibition is a fine stimulus to the farmers to even get together and compare their stock. Whether they get a prize or not, they will go home determined to beat the other fellow next year and it is an incentive to them to produce better stock. I know that these exhibitions alone have wonderfully stimulated the live stock industry in the maritime provinces in the last ten years, and I think it would be very unwise to cut this grant off entirely in one year. I do think, however, the minister would be justified in decreasing the grant gradually, and possibly to the vanishing point, at some future time.

Mr. FORTIER: I approve of the policy of the department in determining to economize as much as possible. That is a sound policy which has been adopted by this Parliament; but I do not think there is any possibility of reduction in the case of the agricultural industry. In that instance we should follow the Progressive policy and give as much consideration as possible to the agricultural movement in Canada. I hope the minister has not pronounced his final decision in the matter of grants to exhibitions which should be encouraged not only this year but in the future. The present is not the proper time to reduce grants to agriculture. Exhibitions have always tended to greatly encourage that industry. We were told during the discussion on the previous item that mixed farming is a good thing to adopt in Canada. That remark applies with special force in eastern Canada and particularly in the province from which I come. I understand that in some parts of the Dominion not much encouragement is given to exhibitions, and probably it is for the reason that mixed farming is not practised in those districts. Grants to exhibitions were given by the late government as well as by the present administration. It is doubtless a good thing to encourage exhibitions in cities, but I would like to see a substantial subsidy given in order to help to establish fairs or exhibitions in the rural districts because it is in those districts that such grants would have the most beneficial effect. The minister also stated in his speech that these agricultural societies are already encouraged by provincial grants. Well, in my opinion agriculture should be fostered by both the provincial and federal governments. It has certainly always been the aim of the federal government to encourage agriculture at all times even when grants were forthcoming from provincial sources. We have seen in the past federal legislation enacted whereby grants

of many millions were given by the federal government to different provinces in order to encourage agriculture. Now if grants are to be voted to agricultural societies they should be devoted towards the establishment and development of fairs in the newer districts. I speak especially for the colonization district of the county of Labelle, where no fair of the kind has ever been held in the past. It is only fair and just that if other parts of the province of Quebec, or of the Dominion for that matter, have received federal and provincial grants for the creation and maintenance of fairs that the new districts, and especially the colonization districts, should share in the same privilege. In the county of Labelle, which I have the honour to represent, there is what is known as la region Labelle, the colonization district par excellence of the province of Quebec. The Government has already assisted agriculture in that district by establishing and maintaining a demonstration farm in the southern part. I think it would be only fair and just that in the northern part of Labelle, in the district of Mont Laurier, a demonstration farm should be established and a grant given in aid of an exhibition. It is not the amount of the grant that is of importance; it is the fact that the district is being encouraged by the federal government. I have no doubt that provincial aid will be forthcoming, but if a subsidy were also granted by the federal government it would be appreciated for all time. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will do his utmost towards the establishment of that fair in the county of Labelle.

Mr. STANSELL: I would like some information on one or two points from the minister or his deputy. Some one has remarked that in connection with this vote a great deal of ground has been covered and this question of fairs has been very much in the limelight. I am reminded that most of our large fairs have one day set apart as farmers' day. This is evidently a farmers' day in this institution. Naturally those interested in that industry are greatly concerned over estimates of any thing in connection with live stock or agriculture. I was pleased with the remarks made before six o'clock by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert). He evidently arose to champion a minister of the Ontario cabinet whom he thought was unfairly criticised. This is a very nice thing, I think, because, unfortunately, it is customary to sometimes criticise a little unfairly men in public positions. I am glad the hon. member for North Ontario realizes this, but I must say that since I last heard him campaigning in my county of East Elgin he must have experienced a wonderful change of heart. I do not want it to be understood that I am advocating increased expenditure in any line, because realizing as we do the decreased revenue from many sources—which is bound to occur—the demand for economy is great, and I, for one, am somewhat disappointed that the Estimates presented have not shown more economy than they have. I had not intended to advocate increased expenditures, but I desire to point out that, in connection with these estimates for agriculture, there are increases in very many items; whether they are justified or not I am not prepared to say. Possibly they are. In the estimates of many other departments there was a number of increases. In connection with the Experimental Farm vote there is an increase of over $44,000. Also in the item for entomology there is an increase of $2,000. In the administration of the Plant Diseases and Insect Pest Act, there is an increase of $45,000. No doubt this is very important work and a great deal can be done by experimentation to find out the best method of control of insect pests and plant diseases. But we must recognize that, in spite of the importance attached to that question, after all these are largely controlled by climatic conditions. That is obvious to any one who studies the question, so that the control, so far as we are concerned, can only be partial. In connection with fruit there is an increase of $12,000, and for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act there is an increase of $10,000. I understand that this Agricultural Instruction Act was passed in conjunction with the Dominion grant of $10,000,000 to agriculture, which, I believe, expires very soon. In the administration of that act, a commissioner of agriculture was appointed, and, I believe, possibly the remuneration may have come from some such source as that. However, I have inquired, and received the information, through Hansard, that there is no such appointment now, but, in spite of that fact, there is an increase of $10,000 here, making a total increase of $127,360. Yet the vote for live stock is absolutely the same as last year; there is no increase. There are increases in many branches and services of the department. So far as the diseases of plants and the control of insect pests are concerned, there is a direct increase of $45,000,

but when we come to the diseases of animals, and everything that can possibly be done under this head for the improvement and betterment of the live stock industry as well as the health of the animals there is no increase. When we are speaking of the health of animals, remember that, because live stock, especially cattle, supply a large proportion of the total food of this country, we are dealing, not only with the health of animals but with the health of our families especially the children. Therefore, I think, this important department is not receiving the consideration it should.

I am only going to point out two particulars that occur to me. Under this vote I understand we have the administration of what is known as the "Canadian Record of Performance." This was established some 17 or 18 years ago in a small way, I believe, under the Laurier regime, and in the opinion, I presume, of many hon. members of this House, that would be a sufficient guarantee of its high standard of perfection. This work is something that naturally grows from year to year and it is a work I have intimate knowledge of. I have been told by many who are taking advantage of the work of this department, and by many on the staff, that the work is not being properly done at present for lack of sufficient inspectors and the lack of staff is attributed to the lack of money. I can hardly overestimate the value of this work. So much has this work been appreciated by the stock breeders that, since Parliament has been in session, a delegation representing various live stock associations met with the Live Stock Commissioner to talk over this question, and, though you may be surprised to hear it, so much did they appreciate this work that, although the money has been granted, and the expenditure has been carried on by the department, these men have given a cash grant of somewhere between five and ten thousand dollars, in order that this work may be carried on. It is an illustration of the importance of the work when these men offer to contribute this sum of money, unasked, to assist in properly carrying out the work. I have only to point out that these men were farmers and, not being members of a certain provincial government, they were real economists, and were willing to tax themselves five to ten thousand dollars to assist in the work. Can the minister inform me whether the needs of this department can be properly met without increasing the amount?

Then there is the subject of the accredited herd, which comes either under this or the health of animals vote in which also there is no increase over the vote of the previous year. I have been told that many who have made application under that system have been refused. Although the accredited herd plan has been established and maintained by the Dominion government, and we have been urged to avail ourselves of it, these applications have been refused because of lack of money. I was told no later than to-day that one man who applied was informed that he was ninetieth on the list and that it would be twelve months before they could send an inspector out to take up the work with him. If this work is worth doing, I submit it is worth doing in a more prompt manner than that, and we should not be compelled to wait twelve months before availing ourselves of this system of getting our herds accredited free from tuberculosis, because the matter is of far too great importance to allow such a delay. In view of this fact and the urgent need for money to carry on these two branches of the work of the Department of Agriculture, and in view of the fact that there has been an increase of about $127,000 in connection with other branches, is the work in connection with live stock, if I refer to it alone, going to be carried on in the manner in which it should be with the grant which we have at present? It is hard for me to understand that there can be sufficient money to increase grants in almost every other branch, the total increase in other branches of agriculture being about $127,000, and yet that the grant for live stock remains just exactly what it was before.

Mr. MARTELL: Coming back to the discussion in regard to grants, I should like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that, in our part of this country, we deem it most desirable that the federal government should aid county exhibitions. In the western portion of Nova Scotia, we have an exhibition held annually for the three counties of Hants, King's and Annapolis. One year the exhibition will be held in Hants, the next year in King's and the following year in Annapolis, and the only grant that the people get for that exhibition is a small grant from the provincial government. The provincial government of Nova Scotia is an excellent government, and I submit probably no other government in

Canada, has within the scope of its financial ability, done more for agriculture than has the Government of Nova Scotia. But the demands that are made upon the financial resources of that province in order to encourage all industries, because we have diversified industries there, are so great that it is unable to give a great annual sum to those county exhibitions. The municipalities also encourage county exhibitions, and private funds are subscribed, collections being made from people who are interested. I believe it would be in the interest of the farming and fruit growing industry of Nova Scotia, were the federal authorities to give an annual grant for the encouragement of those county exhibitions. It is all very well to give grants for large provincial or Dominion exhibitions; but the majority of the people, who should be and who are encouraged by those county exhibitions, have not the time, nor have they the means to go to the places where provincial or Dominion exhibitions are being held. If the minister will come down next year to the county of my hon. friend and deskmate, the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Lovett), because I believe the exhibition will be held next year in the county of Annapolis, we will show him what sort of county exhibitions we put on; and when he sees the friendly rivalry that is produced by those exhibitions as regards the question of growing fruit, I am sure he will say that any grant, no matter how large it may be, is not being given in vain. Therefore I humbly beseech the minister, in the interest of fruit growing and of all other agricultural pursuits of Nova Scotia, that he deem it prudent and not against the interest of economy to give us a substantial grant for the encouragement of those county exhibitions.

Before taking my seat, I desire to reiterate the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Caldwell), as regards the question of abattoirs. We, in the maritime provinces, and particularly we of the western counties are exceedingly anxious to have established in Nova Scotia an abattoir where the people could send their meats and other perishable goods. As the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton said, we are at the mercy of Toronto and Montreal. We of the maritime provinces are an independent people, and we want within our borders the facilities that are to be found in any other section of the Dominion of Canada, particularly when it is in the interest of that great body of our citizenship known as the agricultural class. I have only this to say in conclusion, that I reiterate every word that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton has said, and I humbly beseech the Minister of Agriculture to lend a willing ear to our request and to respond to the Macedonian cry: "Come over and help us."

[Mr. Martell.]

Mr. LEWIS: I want to assure the minister in the beginning that I am not seeking any grant for exhibitions; I am simply standing on my feet in order to get certain information. A great deal has been said this afternoon and evening in regard to mixed farming. I happen to represent a part of southern Saskatchewan where we believe that mixed farming is going to be the salvation of that district. One hon. member said this afternoon that, if we were not able to grow wheat, we might as well shut up shop; but if we can only grow wheat in southern Saskatchewan, we might as well get out. We believe that, if we can enter into mixed farming, as has been advocated by the Minister of Agriculture, we can get a living off the soil; but there is one thing that is bothering us at the present time. We understand that the Minister of Agriculture is going to establish demonstration farms on a small scale in the dry area of southern Saskatchewan and to encourage growing sunflowers and corn and the building of silos for feed for stock. I also understand that the Dominion government is going to lend sires of pure breeds for dairying purposes, etc. At the same time, the difficulty that we see in the way is this. In every small community we have about five or six farmers who are engaged in mixed farming, and they are the ones who are making good; but, because of low prices of grain last year, many others went into mixed farming, saving all the cream that they could possibly save in order to get a little money, with the result that, instead of their getting the amount of money they expected for cream, butter and eggs, they got about fifteen to twenty cents per pound for butter and about the same per dozen for eggs. The question that we are concerned with is this. If all the people of southern Saskatchewan enter into mixed farming, as has been advocated by many agriculturists as the salvation of our western country, where are we going to find markets? Has the minister any scheme or has he thought of any outlet whereby we can get rid of our surplus stock over local needs? That is the pressing question for us at the present

time; and as I look over this estimate, I am not able to see where he has made any arrangement for getting larger markets for the product that will naturally result from people entering into this mixed farming which he advocates. If the minister can assure us that he has some scheme in view, or that the Government as a whole intends to open up larger markets that will give a fair return for the products that we expect to raise from mixed farming, then I believe that our people in southern Saskatchewan, as well as in other parts of the country, will take up mixed farming with a better heart and a greater will.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A number of questions have been asked me, some of which I failed to answer. The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) asked a question regarding the live stock policy of the Dominion, which in some cases overlaps the policy of the provincial government. A good many people think the two policies might be merged to advantage, and I am of the same opinion. Every new Minister of Agriclture believes that the overlapping can to a large extent be avoided, and something has been done in the past in that direction, although not as much as had been anticipated. Whenever a department takes up any new work the officials are loath to see it disorganized, and you have that spirit to contend with. There is a great difficulty in disestablishing things and starting over again, and the process always takes time. My two predecessors were not sufficiently long on the job to make any great change, and I was going to express the hope that I might hold office long enough to give some effect to the good intentions we have in this matter. However, I will not dwell on that suggestion. If I am so honoured I hope to be able to meet the hon. gentleman's representations and endeavour to abolish the overlapping as far as it is possible to do so. There is no doubt that there is overlapping; the only question is how to solve the difficulty. I met some gentlemen from Saskatchewan last week who were down in the province of Quebec buying a carload or two of dairy cattle which they secured through the instrumentality of the government of Saskatchewan alone. When they wanted to get the head of the herd, however, they were obliged to come to the federal Department of Agriculture, and while they were negotiating for this animal the carload of females were waiting. It did seem to be a badly organized affair. However, after some delay and confusion we were able to start these gentlemen off west rejoicing.

The member for Battleford (Mr. McConica), in his own amusing style, referred to the difficulty involved in the wool business. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is present or not, but I may be able to explain the question of sending the sheep after the wool to pay the deficit. Some members of the committee know that the British government, before the war was over, secured a large quantity of wool in anticipation of a protracted state of warfare. Among other countries, they bought wool very largely from Australia for several years, and they have been taking the wool off Australia's hands at the high price engaged for during the war, and feeding the market with it as slowly as possible, having regard to the fact that they had to get rid of it at some time. Nevertheless, in spite of the slowness with which they fed the market, they glutted it, with the result that wool is now a drug on the market. The large stocks accumulated in England in anticipation of a long drawn out war had to go on the market, and this created a congested condition from which we have not yet recovered. I may refer to a similar condition in regard to another industry, and it will be a solace to those who are going into mixed farming to find that there is a valid explanation for the extraordinary state of things with regard to butter. Great Britain's stocks of butter were so generous at the close of the war that she finally got rid of them only last July. They were procured at high prices and sold at low prices, and the last consignment went to Belgium, consisting of 1,000,000 boxes of 56 pounds each, or 56,000,000 pounds of butter for which Belgium has twenty years to pay. It is therefore obvious how long it has taken to adjust affairs after the great upheaval due to the war. Now that these stocks have been got rid of, new production will have a better chance of being disposed of in the future than during the last year or two. I am sure that these explanations will be accepted. They are facts, and they indicate, I think, a hopeful prospect, as well as the circumstances that we have reached the bottom in the matter of bad prices. This knowledge, of course, does not put any more money into your pocket just now; but if there is a bad condition of affairs and you can explain it and show that it is not likely to recur, it does hold out some hope for the future.

The member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) brought up the subject of cold storage in the maritime provinces. I was rather surprised myself to find, when making inquiry into a certain condition of affairs in connection with the live stock industry, that there was only one cold storage abattoir in the three maritime provinces, located at Charlottetown. There is a reason for that, but the fact remains that they have only one and want more. Now, apart from any provincial effort which those provinces may make, the only hope I can hold out to my hon. friends is that, in the not too distant future, we may be able to amend the present Cold Storage Act in such a way as to carry out the original intention of helping other co-operative plants than municipal plants, which are the only ones that are aided at the present time. Formerly the act applied to any cold storage plants put up either by individuals or by co-operative companies. Under the provisions of that act, any cold storage company, complying with the regulations, received from the federal government 30 per cent of the cost of erection as an encouragement in the establishing of such plants. About three or four years ago the act was changed to apply only to municipal plants, and scarcely a dollar has been spent since that amendment. When we have a little more money in the treasury upon which we can draw, we hope to revert to the original condition and permit the maritime provinces to avail themselves of the substantial subsidy which is allowed for erecting cold storage plants. In Saskatchewan a number of plants were erected under this system before the change, and it was a great stimulus to this enterprise. Just now, however the treasury would not appear to be sufficiently buoyant to warrant the expenditures that would be entailed in this direction.

My hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) asks a very natural question: What shall we do with all these mixed farming products? Some of my recent remarks will apply the answer so far as wool is concerned. As regards butter and dairy products generally, and also beef cattle—and that is the direction in which I expect the greatest development in southwest Saskatchewan in the future—I might inform my hon. friend that to-day we supply only 2½ per cent of the total imports of butter of Great Britain. There is therefore abundant room for us in that market; we ought to be able to get some share of the other 97½ per cent. True, there are a number of competitors like Denmark and little New Zealand. But it is for us, with improved methods and better cows, to meet that competition squarely and fairly. There is no doubt that while there is a limit to the market for milk, there is really none in sight in our time as regards butter, especially when we realize that we supply, as I have said, only 2½ per cent of Great Britain's total importations of this commodity. With regard to other products, pork, bacon, eggs, etc., we have really never been stuck for a market. It is true that the supply of eggs fluctuates with the season, but with cold storage to take care of them in the spring and ease up the natural glut on the market at that time, it seems to me there would always be a fair market.

With regard to bacon, that is an article of world-wide production, and the surplus goes on to the British market where we have exactly the same competitors as in butter. If we produce a second or third grade article the problem of market will always be present; but if we provide a gilt-edged article in competition with Denmark and New Zealand, then we shall be able to secure the market. But we are not doing it now, for the reason that our bacon is not going on to the market graded, nor is proper attention being paid to the grading of hogs, with the result that we are struggling to retain what share of the British market we already have. We must improve our methods of production and the quality of our goods if we are to secure a greater share of that market.

I do not think my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Lewis), was in the House this afternoon when the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) and others were discussing the embargo question. There are very good hopes within a reasonable time of that embargo being removed. Of course, we are going to get it removed, and we are getting nearer to that end all the time. I cannot speak positively, but the situation is hopeful; and, after all, in this world we have more or less to live on hope.

The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) and the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) spoke this afternoon about the ravages of timber wolves from the forest reserves in their constituencies. It is true that when the depredations are due to wolves which are supposed to come from the forest reserves of the Dominion, damage claims may be made against my col-

league, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), who has charge of those reserves; but as far as I am aware no bounties have been given in the past by the Dominion government for the killing of these timber wolves. It is a matter that has always been dealt with by the provincial authorities, and there is no reason why those hunting timber wolves may not go on the timber reserves in search of these animals. I know that in Saskatchewan and Alberta the provincial governments have for many years paid bounties on wolves, I think twenty dollars on each adult animal, and so much less on pups. I think we are too far away from the scene of depredations to engage in a dual system of wolf bounties. If my hon. friends have had anything to do with the administration of the Wolf Bounty Act, they would know that it is a very difficult piece of work. I know that half a dozen timber wolves will do an enormous amount of damage against stock in a very short time, but that is purely a matter for the provincial authorities to handle, even although the wolves are on Dominion land.

The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell) uttered what seemed to me to be very justifiable remarks about the smallness of some of the votes. I think most of us will agree that all of these votes are, if anything, too small. But last year, taking the Health of Animals branch there was an increase of some $300,000. Consequently that vote was put at a fairly high level, and it is not necessary to still further increase it this year. And, further, because of our intention to amend the act with respect to the valuation of the animals that are slaughtered, owing to the fact that the value of live stock has come down so substantially since the act was passed, to the extent of at least one-third, we are not justified in giving such a high valuation as obtained two years ago, and therefore we will be able with the same aggregate amount to cover a very much larger field of work. In other words, the vote as it stands to-day is equivalent to a very large increase when you consider the larger number of slaughtered animals it will cover by reason of the reduced indemnity.

My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good) states that we should go easy about handing out advice to farmers. I agree with him and accept that advice myself. I think I know enough about farming to be the last man to hand out advice too freely to a farmer, especially to one who has been on a particular farm nearly all his life and knows better than any other man just what that farm can produce. At the same time, there are many other activities in connection with research work, without being too personal or hurting the susceptibilities of anyone by handing out too much advice. When I used to regard those sitting in the seats of the responsible, I took the same attitude, and I think I was justified. We do not mind taking advice from those who know at least as much as ourselves, but there has been a disposition, especially in connection with prairie agriculture, by people who do not know the prairies and cannot understand why we are wedded to grain farming, to advise us to engage in mixed farming. If they were on the prairies they would know how difficult it is to get away from grain farming and to gradually go into live stock. Many have tried it and have been driven out from one cause and another. But every time we gain a step in that direction we are making so much headway, and it will be found that our exports of dairy butter are increasing year by year in spite of setbacks.

I think I have covered all the points raised, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STANSELL: Was not the increased vote for live stock last year due to the fact that this accredited herd system was then created? My point is that if you carry on the work you must provide the money to do it. At the present time I am told that applications from farmers to have their herds placed on the list are being refused, owing to lack of funds. Now if we adopt a certain system of work, we must either finance it or abandon it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I had forgotten that matter. The vote of half a million dollars yast year was exhausted before the end of the fiscal year, and we had to ease up on the work. This is only our second year in this work. My predecessor started it, and started it well, but the work has become so popular that neither have we sufficient staff nor sufficient money to handle it; but, as I explained, the result of the adjustment we propose to make will enable us to cover that work in another year. For another thing, a number of changes had to be made in the regulations. The inspection applies only to herds of a certain size. I can assure my hon. friend that we are not lying down on the job, but, of course, when the vote runs out we are

limited. Now that the new vote is becoming available, the work is being speeded up. I quite agree with my hon. friend that we must not lag behind in this work.

Mr. STANSELL: My point was this: if the appropriation last year did not carry on the service for more than six months, how are you going to carry it on this year without increasing the amount? Increases are being asked for other departments, so why not for this?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: By reducing the valuation basis we shall be able to cover three herds where formerly we covered one.

Mr. BRETHEN: Will the inspector value the animal at the decreased valuation? I have some knowledge of the way this service has worked out. I have seen herds that were not valued by inspectors at the proper figure. It is a very easy matter for an inspector who is not very well informed as to values to let the owner's valuation slip through rather than criticise it. He would do that to avoid showing his ignorance of values. There is just the possibility that the inspectors will not value the animals at the decreased valuation. Will the inspectors value the animals at the decreased valuation, as the minister thinks they will?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The maximum will be reduced to whatever the House deems advisable, and that sum will then be fixed. It will be the maximum, just as $250 is now, by law.

With respect to the judgment of the inspectors, human judgment, of course, always differs. It is quite natural that the owner of the animal should put a higher value on it than the inspector. That happens frequently, but the inspectors have been instructed to place a fair valuation on the animals, keeping the maximum in mind. If they do not do it, I do not know what we can do. I do not want unnecessarily to bring the Civil Service Commission into this discussion; we have had it bear a good many sins in the past, but as a matter of fact, I have very little to do with the selection of these inspectors. If I had more to do with their selection, I can assure my hon. friend that if there was any delinquency among the inspection staff, if any man was not doing his duty, it would very soon be rectified; but I cannot make any such promises now, as the matter is not in my hands.

Mr. BRETHEN: I have made some inquiries regarding this matter and I understand that the inspectors, as the minister has stated, have been instructed to place a fair valuation on the animals, but there is this proviso: if a man suffers a heavy loss the inspectors are instructed to be lenient with him. In the case of a herd where the value of the individual animal is below the valuation set by the department, it might be a good thing for an owner to lose all his herd. I believe there are cases of that kind.

There is another phase of the matter. An inspector informed me in conversation of an incident in his own experience where a herd of six or seven animals had to be destroyed, and they were so badly infected that none of the carcasses was fit for food, which was very unusual. All these animals went to grease. Now, in the owner's family there were two children suffering from bone tuberculosis, and the inspector made this statement: "Knowing all the circumstances, it was very difficult for me not to associate the condition of the children with the condition of the cattle." I mention that to show that it is one of the most important things this department has to deal with. It is a matter affecting not only the health of animals but the health of the family. I know there are a great many breeders today who are very anxious to get into the accredited herd system because of this danger to their families. I had a man in my room the other day who is very anxious to get his herd under this system, but because it was under the minimum of twelve animals he was unable to come in. I think there should not be that discrimination. Why should a man with only six or eight or nine cows be refused this service? The inspection of a small herd would cost the Government very little in comparison with a large herd of sixty or seventy cattle. Why should the smaller owner be refused this service that is paid for out of public moneys? He is refused, I understand, because of lack of funds and a shortage of inspectors. If that is the case, is this vote high enough? I understand that it was necessary to bring down a vote of $300,000 in the Supplementary Estimates last year for this service. With 250 herds now on the waiting list, how are you going to provide the service this year? Is not the service of sufficient importance that provision should be made for it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is quite true that this service is available to the man with a large herd, but not to a herd of less than twelve. That is not an arbitrary

number, but we have to fix a limit somewhere, or else you would have the inspectors travelling all over the country to inspect a herd of two or three, or even only one animal. Suppose a man in a remote district had the inspector travel out there, a long way from the railway, at great expense, to inspect only one animal. It might be tubercular, it is true, and might be endangering the health of his family, but you cannot get value for the money expended on travelling unless you fix a minimum for the size of the herd. A man can inspect a herd of forty or fifty at a much less expense proportionately than a smaller herd. Since I have had the honour of taking charge of this department I have had this matter up with the members of my staff, and I have taken the ground that twelve was too high a minimum, but it was pointed out to me that no matter where you draw the line the man just below that number would seem to have a grievance. If you make the minimum six, the man with five cattle will think he has a grievance. There is no way of avoiding that except by setting the minimum at one animal, because you cannot go below that. You have to stop somewhere. I would not like to say that twelve should be the proper number; in fact, my own opinion is that it should be less. I am informed that wherever there are two herds of a smaller number than twelve adjacent to each other we do make the test. I think possibly we might be able to apply the system to three and take care of almost the whole of the herds by this means wherever conditions lend themselves to its being done. I have to thank my hon. friend for bringing my attention to that point because it is a very important one and one by means of which, if properly worked out, we may be able to take care of the situation almost completely.

Mr. JELLIFF: I am not at all satisfied with the minister's attitude on the timber wolf situation. He has spoken very strongly to-day in favour of mixed farming and has referred to stock raising as being the very foundation of our whole farming system. He was very fair in what he said as regards those matters and I approve of it most heartily; but I cannot see the consistency in voting money for the stamping out of tuberculosis and other diseases which afflict our cattle and saying that little or no allowance can be made with respect to the destruction of cattle and especially young cattle, on our far distant ranches by timber wolves. It seems to me that there is a remarkable inconsistency in such a policy as that. I think that all these young animals that are being born out in that northwest country—in the territory immediately adjacent to our own Dominion parks and forest reserves—should have our consideration, and it should be as important to us to save the lives of these animals and protect them from destruction from that cause as from any other cause.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does not the provincial government give a bounty of $20 for the destruction of timber wolves?

Mr. JELLIFF: I cannot speak authoritatively as to that, but even if such is the case it seems to me to be absolutely insufficient to meet the need. I believe that wherever such aid is granted by the provincial government it might well be supplemented by assistance from the federal government to put an end to the destruction that is now going on and to encourage the very thing which the minister lays down as a desirable policy—the growth of live stock as the basis of successful farming in this country. I am going to call the minister's attention to the facts once more, and again implore him to make some provision to assist us in stamping out this public nuisance which has its origin in the public parks and grounds of the Dominion.

Mr. GARDINER: No one is allowed to enter the public parks of the Dominion carrying fire arms and consequently it is not possible by that means to get rid of the wolves which breed in those particular places. If the minister would take that fact into consideration I believe it would be helpful to some extent in the solution of this question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to that portion of the vote to be paid out in connection with the accredited herd system and for the eradication of the disease of tuberculosis in herds supplying milk to cities and towns and villages, could the minister state the amount paid out for that purpose, and also the amount paid out for eradication of disease in pure bred herds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If any other hon. member wishes to speak he is at liberty to do so, because it will take a little time to obtain the information for which the hon. member for South Oxford has asked.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: While the minister is looking up that matter I would also inquire—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand a return which has been prepared and will be laid on the table to-morrow contains the information which my hon. friend has asked. Will that satisfy my hon. friend?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the item is allowed to pass now we shall be debarred from discussing it later on. Perhaps the minister would allow this item to stand until the information is brought down.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There are some other questions I would like to ask. I was very glad to hear the minister state that the date for the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle is a little nearer than it was. I am sure that will be very encouraging to a great many people. I remember that about a year ago there was a very interesting discussion in this Chamber on the subject and judging from statements that were made at that time, both in this Chamber and outside of it, one would almost have expected to have seen the embargo removed some time ago. I have here the report of a speech made by the provincial treasurer of Ontario at St. Mary's in February last wherein he also referred to this matter of tuberculosis in cattle. When the minister was pointing out that herds of less than twelve were not included in the plan, I notice the provincial treasurer stated that "it has been necessary to kill eighty-four out of eighty-five head at Monteith," so that apparently the large herds have the preference over the small herds. That is the reason I put the question I did to the minister. Because to me it seems a most remarkable state of affairs that herds supplying milk for human consumption in towns and cities are apparently not receiving the same attention that is accorded the pure bred herds which are not supplying any milk for public consumption. In the same speech Mr. Smith stated:

> To Hon. Manning Doherty will go the whole credit if the embargo on cattle is lifted by Great Britain, which is likely to be the case.

The provincial ministers were evidently anticipating at that time the early removal of the embargo and were going to appropriate the whole credit for that removal. Now I am sure it will be pleasant to those who are interested to know that we are a little nearer the date of the removal of the embargo than we were a year ago. I also noticed in a newspaper article references to another man who occupied a prominent place in one of the provincial governments at that time. That man is now, I believe, in the employ of the Government of Canada and is, I understand from the minister, to be employed in developing our live stock trade with Patagonia. The same man is now, or recently has been, in Florida. I refer to the Hon. Duncan Marshall. He has also been paying considerable attention to the removal of the cattle embargo, and probably the minister could inform us as to whether part of his work during the time he is in the employ of the Government will be devoted to having that embargo removed, because I understand he is engaged simply for six months. I was also in a quandary to understand what the minister meant when he stated they were going to have the valuation of these animals for which compensation is being received under the accredited herd system reduced. Where there has been a maximum figure of $250 fixed, that surely does not mean that the same valuation is being placed on the animals after the value of the animals has decreased by one-half. Surely some judgment is being exercised by those in the department. The minister has stated that he has very little control over the matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that. I said I had nothing to do with the selecting of those inspectors.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I misunderstood the minister, and I am glad that he has some control, because we should hold the minister and the Government responsible for the decrease. Under the new Animal Contagious Diseases Act, a good deal of latitude is given the department in the regulations which govern the payment of compensation. The compensation that has been paid in many instances is not anything like compensation for the loss sustained when animals are destroyed, but it goes a long way towards eradicating diseases in herds. I had occasion a year ago to bring this matter before the House in connection with a party who resides in the constituency I represent. Inspectors of the department went on his premises, destroyed 245 animals, and refused to give him any compensation at all. I took the matter up with the minister this session. I realize that he has been kept very busy familiarizing himself with his department, and that it would be practically impossible for him to give the matter the considera-

tion which I think this party is entitled to. A year ago I moved for a return of all papers and correspondence in connection with it. When the return was brought down I had to call attention of the House to the fact that it was not complete. A further return was brought down, and it was not even then complete. I made the statement on the floor of the House, and I want to repeat the statement, that the head of the branch, who is the man, above all others, who is responsible to the minister, who has control over this matter, was not only incompetent and unfair, but was dishonest in the administration of the act. Hon. members will find, on looking up Hansard, that these words are on record last year, and I want to emphasize them and place them on record again this session. Too much money and too many people are affected by the operations of the Health of Animals Branch to allow a statement of that kind to go unchallenged and not to have it investigated. Although this man has suffered a loss for upwards of two years, I was told a year ago by the minister on the floor of this House that he would have to accept the word of his inspector in preference to that of the man who suffered the loss. This man has no other recourse. The matter has already been submitted to the new Government, and they do not see fit to give it any further consideration. The man is absolutely ruined by the loss which he has sustained, and he submits the evidence, but the evidence of the inspector is to be taken in preference to that of this man. It is a nice state of affairs if Parliament is going to delegate to the minister, and the minister delegates to somebody else, the authority in connection with this matter. We are a little too much inclined to throw the responsibility on somebody else, on the Civil Service Commission or something of that kind. Too much of that has been done already during the present session. That commission is responsible up to a certain point. After that the ministers are responsible. In view of the statements I made a year ago, which I repeat again to-day, I say it is up to the Government and to the Minister of Agriculture to see that this matter is properly investigated and investigated to the full. The evidence is in the further return which was brought down last year and will substantiate every word I have stated, that this man was dishonest in the administration of the act. It was quite apparent to any one that the return was not full, in the first instance, in order to conceal a matter in which this officer had failed to do his duty by the party who had been aggrieved. But he says, "It is the duty of the department to save money; we must not pay out money in cases of that kind." I am placing this matter before the minister to-night, because when we pass this item we will not have a further opportunity to deal with it.

There is another matter I desire to touch upon, because I was not here this afternoon, and it possibly may have been referred to already, in connection with the vote of one million dollars for live stock, which I believe is the vote that is now before the committee, although the minister has been discussing the other matter to which I have referred. I would like to know how much of this amount has been paid out for feed for live stock in certain districts, and how much has been paid out for carload lots and how much has ben paid out for male animals that have been distributed by the Government through the country. If these questions have been answered, of course I do not want a further answer, but I would like an answer to the other question with regard to the proportion paid out for the eradication of tuberculosis in herds that are supplying milk for human consumption, and that paid out for pure bred herds.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The amount paid out last year under the accredited herd system was $467,437. Under the municipal system $98,080.33 was paid out. I think those are the figures, although they are blurred in this copy.

My hon. friend, by referring to his speech last year, saved me the necessity of referring to Hansard which I have before me with the speech of the hon. gentleman. He made some very strong statements regarding the Veterinary Director General, who, of course, I am responsible for, and I take the responsibility for what it amounts to inasmuch as I have had to review the work that he did before I came in. Therefore, I am, in a sense, responsible for what he did a year ago, and I accept that responsibility. I do not want my hon. friend to put in my mouth that I am disclaiming responsibility. I go the limit of responsibility. All I ask him to do is to assist me to get the power to do the thing which should go with the responsibility, the power to man my own ship. That is what I have not got, but I am not trying to shirk responsibility.

With respect to the maximum valuation of pure breds, it can be left exactly just where it is, and the inspectors can be instructed to make the valuation based upon the present value of animals, as compared with two years ago. But it would be giving them only that much more latitude. In the first instance, a maximum was wisely put, which he could go below as much as he liked, but which he could not go beyond, and that maximum should be reduced proportionately with the decreased value of animals, so that the inspector can be prevented from putting on too high a valuation at all events. I think it is wise to reduce the valuation proportionately with the decreased value of animals on the market. If I understood my hon. friend aright, I think he made remarks about somebody on this side wanting to claim the credit in connection with removing the embargo. I had not any such thing in mind. If I am fortunate enough to be in my present position when the embargo is removed, I shall reap what others have sowed. My predecessor worked hard in connection with this matter, and if it is my fortune to reap what others have sown, I shall be ready to distribute the credit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It was the Hon. Manning Doherty who was to receive the full credit.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have to plead ignorance regarding the incident in connection with that hon. gentleman. I have to take him as I find him. I was very busy at the time that incident occurred, and I was not as close a reader of the newspapers as I am now, so that the incident escaped my attention. I was not reading many eastern newspapers at that time, and I do not think it appeared in the western newspapers.

As regards the bunch of hogs to which my hon. friend refers, an injustice may have been done. Sometimes justice falls short; we have known innocent men to be hanged, and we may expect a similar fatality to be meted out sometimes to a hog, to the detriment of the owner. All I say is that the evidence is against my hon. friend and his friend. That is, I think, what my predecessor claims, and he, last year, took the ground that, in the absence of contrary evidence, he had to stand by his officials. If, at the instance of every hon. member who chose to stand up loyally for his constituents, as he should do, we threw down our inspectors, we would soon have no inspectors at all. I do not mean to say that, if the weight of evidence warrants our doing so, we should not dismiss an inspector and get another one and make proper restitution to the man who is wronged. Since, however, I have taken charge of this department, I have had an amazingly large number of these old, laid-on-the-shelf claims tried out on the new minister to see if he is easy enough to come across. I was not very long in this position until I had all kinds of representations how to do things and how to save the nation generally, amongst others, these old claims that had been threshed over, some of them repeatedly, in this House. While I admit that, in some cases, an injustice may have been done, I cannot find any injustice in this case, and with the absence of any weight of evidence to the contrary, I must stand by the decision of my officials and my predecessor. Nothing would give me more pleasure than to correct a wrong; and if this man had been unjustly dealt with, it would be a great pleasure to right the wrong, apart from the fact that that would be the ordinary work of my department. I have not, however, found that any injustice has been done. Another gentleman—I will not mention the name—wrote me the nicest letter comprising three or four pages, and it almost persuaded me that he had a case. I never received a finer letter, and I went to my deputy and the Veterinary Director General and I said: "Here is a man who has been grievously wronged." He was the worst humbug of the whole of them; but he nearly put it over me, and I felt I was badly fooled. You cannot go by appearances, nor by the skill with which people present their case, because sometimes the presentation is done rather decently and gentlemanly. My staff protected me on that occasion, and I did not come across because this man was the worst of the lot.

This is the contract that must be signed by all men who claim they are eligible to be recompensed for hogs slaughtered on account of cholera, and this was signed by Mr. Alderson:

> In consideration of the granting of a license to me, I hereby agree:
>
> 1. To maintain my hogs in a clean, sanitary condition.
>
> 2. To sell no hogs except for immediate slaughter.
>
> 3. To notify the veterinary inspector if sickness appears among my hogs.

The fourth is the crux of the whole matter.

4. To forfeit all claim for compensation in case it is necessary to destroy any of my hogs as a result of hog cholera unless it can be shown that the infection came from some other source than from feeding garbage.

In the absence of any proof that this hog cholera came from any other source, and in the fact of the presence of garbage uncooked being discovered in the troughs, what was I to do but ask that this bargain be abided by? I sometimes wonder if we can get away from this proposition of cooking garbage. Those who do not believe in cooking garbage, who do so only under compulsion, who think it only a fake to have to cook garbage and that the Government is simply putting them to a lot of expense in buying a boiler and burning fuel, will, if you let them, cook the garbage in a slovenly manner. They will simply warm it up. This man may have simply warmed up the garbage because the disease germs were not killed. There was no evidence of the disease occurring in any other way, and, therefore, it must have come from the garbage. In the United States, the cooking of garbage is dispensed with. Hog cholera is so prevalent there that some sort of antitoxin is used, with which the animals are inoculated when young, the necessity of cooking garbage being thus avoided, as the antitoxin renders the hogs comparatively immune. Hog cholera is not sufficiently bad in this country to make it necessary for us to go to that expense. The next best thing is to take care of 90 per cent of the source of contagion which is known from actual experiment, to be from this uncooked garbage from hotels and such places. I hope the time will not come when we have to dispense with this matter of cooking garbage, because the whole country would be filled with cholera. I have looked carefully into the correspondence in this case, and I can read some of it; but in the absence of evidence to the contrary, there was nothing for me to do but to abide by the decision of my officials. As regards the charge against the Veterinary Director General that he is dishonest, I am not going to enter an action against my hon. friend. I have not found that to be the case at all. The Veterinary Director General may have his short-comings, as we all have, but I do not believe that dishonesty is one of them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am a little surprised to hear the minister dispose of this matter with so much assurance. I would imagine that, before expressing so decided an opinion, he would have taken the trouble to read the return through in full. If he had done so, he would have found that compensation was not withheld because the hogs were fed garbage. The officials departed from that contention, and they finally withheld compensation because the department had not been notified that cholera or sickness existed in the herd. The minister will find that there are affidavits furnished by the man who suffered the loss, by his son and by his general manager, that they were not aware of any sickness in the herd; and if so, it would be absolutely impossible for them to notify the department of sickness. More than that, I should like to ask: Is it reasonable to suppose that, with hogs that were valued in the neighbourhood of some $10,000, anyone who had been engaged in this business for many years would be so reckless as to take chances of having cholera develop in his herd? Who had a greater interest in maintaining the health of the herd, the owner or the inspectors of the department? The owner had everything at stake. He was anxious to continue in business and see that disease did not develop in his herd. He had one of the most up-to-date appliances for cooking the food that was to be found anywhere in the country, and if you look through the return you will find that he was finally notified that he could not receive compensation because he had not notified the department that disease existed in his herd. Why did not the inspector, when he notified his officials at Toronto, request them to inspect the premises that were complained of instead of giving the name of another person? And why did he withhold this from the first return brought down? It was not until he was ordered to bring it down in a further return that the information was tabled. Should the minister get up and attempt to ridicule anyone who stands for the rights of the people of this country? There is a court of appeal to which litigants may have resort, but in this case the Veterinary Director General appears to be the final judge, and the minister quietly accepts any statement he makes, so that the party who is aggrieved, it does not matter who he may be, has no further recourse. Is not that a strange condition of affairs in a country like this, when a citizen can have his rights brushed aside in that manner in the face of sworn evidence that substantiates his claim? All that the man asked for was a board of arbitrators who should go into the matter,

and if they decided against him he was prepared to accept their decision. But he did not wish to be shut out on the word of an inspector. What sort of tribunal is there in the Department of Agriculture, in connection with the Health of Animals branch, if people are to receive such treatment and there is no appeal from the decision of the Veterinary Director General? This is too serious a matter to be allowed to pass unheeded, because we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in this business.

I would ask the minister another question. Does he approve of spending $467,535 for the eradication of tubercular disease in pure bred herds, and only $98,000 in herds supplying milk to the people of the towns and cities? In connection with milk that is supplied to the municipalities only $98,000 is spent for the purpose of eradicating disease, although to-day so much attention is being paid to the children in the schools, who are being advised to drink more milk in order to build up their physique. In view of that fact, is it right or fair that the herds that supply the city people with milk should be discriminated against as has been done in the past? If the minister is anxious to preserve the health of the people, this item should be increased considerably. I am not finding fault with paying out this amount of money for the eradication of disease in pure bred herds, but I say that it is unfair that the herds supplying milk for home consumption should receive such a small amount for this purpose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It depends on the people themselves. This law was in force for years before any city took advantage of it at all, and I am not aware that there is any city to-day that has made application, which was denied, for the appropriation that is set apart for the inspection of herds supplying milk to municipalities. It rests with the cities and towns themselves to make application for an appropriation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not provided that only herds of a certain size shall be inspected? I think the number of animals is twelve.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no limit, in the case of herds supplying milk to the cities, as there is in connection with the accredited herd system. It does not matter how small a herd may be that supplies milk to the cities, it is inspected. With the accredited herd system, however, the maximum is twelve.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. BOIVIN: What conditions must be complied with by a city wishing to take advantage of this provision?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I could read the regulations as quickly as I could explain the matter. An Order in Council dated April 16, 1917, provides assistance to dairies under municipal control:

1. The aid of the Department of Agriculture will be given to such cities or towns as are in a position to fulfil their part in the following regulations and shall have secured the necessary provisions under provincial legislative authority for the purpose of agreeing to the present regulations:

2. The Government of Canada will assist any city or town which shall have signified in writing to the Veterinary Director-General its desire to have the aid of the Department of Agriculture in controlling bovine tuberculosis in the cows supplying milk and cream to the said city or town, provided, the said city or town shall have stated in its application for the aid of the Department of Agriculture, as aforesaid that being thereunto duly empowered by law, it will undertake and provide that:

(a) Dairies in which milk or cream is produced for sale therein shall be licensed.

(b) No license shall be issued unless the dairy conforms to the standard.

(c) The standard shall require that the stable shall have ample amount of air space, and at least two square feet of window glass for each cow, and shall be well ventilated, drained, and kept clean and sanitary.

(d) Two years from the date of the first test of the cattle of a dairy the sale within the said city or town of unpasteurized milk or cream from the said dairy shall be prohibited, unless the veterinary inspector can certify that the said herd contains no reactors and in his opinion is free from tuberculosis.

(e) An inspector or inspectors shall be appointed and paid by the said city or town, whose duty it shall be to see that the undertakings and provisions as aforesaid are carried out, and that the cows are kept clean and properly fed and cared for.

3. The Veterinary Director General on receiving notice in writing from any such municipality of its desire to have the assistance of the Department of Agriculture, as aforesaid, shall forthwith make inquiry, and if satisfied that the foregoing requirements are being carried out, shall send veterinary inspectors from the Department of Agriculture to inspect the said cows.

So far as Lethbridge is concerned, we have no inspector. There does not seem to be sufficient reason for his going there, and he was busy elsewhere.

4. The veterinary inspectors shall use the tuberculin test (except as provided for in section 13), and also make a careful physical examination of the cows in order to determine whether they are healthy or not. Dairy bulls shall also be examined and subsequently treated in the same way as cows.

5. Following the examination and test, the diseased cows and reactors shall be dealt with as follows:—

I think that covers the question. There is co-operation between the city and the department. After the city has complied with the conditions and regulations, the department performs its duty.

Mr. BOIVIN: Does this Order in Council apply only to dairy herds that are kept within the city, or to all dairy herds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It applies to all cows supplying milk; there is no limit as to locality.

Mr. BOIVIN: Is the compensation, for animals owned on farms throughout the country, limited to pure bred stock, or does it apply to other cattle as well?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is paid to grade animals on a smaller valuation, $80 being the maximum.

Mr. BOIVIN: I gather from the remarks of the hon. minister that at the present time the serum treatment of hogs fed on garbage is being attended with considerable success. I also gather that the cooking of garbage in places adjacent to cities does not eliminate the hog cholera germ, because the cooking is not carried on according to plan.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. HARRIS: He admits that perhaps in the United States the treatment is a success, but that his department purpose to enforce the act by insisting that those engaged in feeding hogs on garbage shall put in more or less expensive cooking equipment. At the same time his department, I understand, is not going to try to discover a suitable serum which would render such equipment unnecessary. I have had considerable experience in the feeding of hogs, having fed about one thousand in York county in the vicinity of Toronto, and having had a rather unfortunate experience with the department in the serum treatment. Officials of the department treated three hundred of my hogs, and practically ruined them, and I was unable to get any assurance from the department as to whether or not it had a serum treatment which would eliminate the necessity of cooking garbage to kill the hog cholera germ. What is the intention of the department in regard to investigating this serum treatment with a view to making it thoroughly effective?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a very proper criticism. I was confronted with that alternative myself, until I found that the inoculated animals are still capable of transmitting the disease, although the animal itself is saved so far as its flesh is rendered fit for human consumption. It occurred to me, why not inoculate all hogs and thus cut out this garbage cooking and do away with the difficulties that my hon. friend from South Oxford and others complain of. It has been a source of a good deal of worry to me, for fear I was doing injustice by not taking such a course. But to inoculate all hogs would be an exceedingly expensive proceeding, besides, there is not a sufficient amount of the disease in Canada to warrant such extensive measures, and, as I have said, after all the disease would still be transmissible. Where the garbage is properly cooked, ninety per cent of the infection from the garbage is eliminated.

Mr. HARRIS: I cannot accept the statement of the hon. minister that the Dominion is free from hog cholera—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say that.

Mr. HARRIS:—in any greater measure than is the United States. I submit that there is as much hog cholera in Canada as in the United States, and in my view his department should take as deep an interest in its elimination as is being taken by the department of agriculture across the line.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much has been paid out during the past year on freight on carload lots of stock shipped out from the various stockyards?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend has already asked for that information in the return I have referred to. We have not got the particulars here. If the information is not in the returns to-morrow, then another order will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will we have an opportunity of discussing the matter after this vote is passed? As a matter of fact, I am informed that there has been considerable discrimination in the matter. Can the minister also give any information as to the amount paid out for hay for shipment to certain districts where feed was scarce?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not that information here. I think I can give it to my hon. friend, although it does not come under this vote, but under another vote that has been passed. I think my hon. friend refers to what we call the free freight for feed in the western provinces,

that is, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and a small part of Manitoba. A certain amount has been set aside in order to move feed or animals back and forth, the stockyards bearing one-third of the expense, the provincial government another third, and the federal government the balance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am referring to stock shipped out from the various stockyards back to the farms.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Do you mean provision for buying stock at the central markets and shipping it back to the farms?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, there is a very generous provision for that in the payment of caretakers, low freight rates, and so on. We will have the information in a moment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What was the amount paid out in that way in each of the provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The shipment for the twelve months ending October 31, 1921, was 8,224 heifers and 7,724 ewes. We have not the figures here by provinces, but I suppose we could get them if for any particular reason my hon. friend would like them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: To my knowledge there has not been anything paid out in the province of Ontario. A great many animals have been shipped from western Canada to the stock-yards here, and then shipped back again.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It depends, of course, whether a man desires to make application for this service. In the West there was a good deal of that done, especially during the latter days of the war. The animals would go to Winnipeg and then be shipped back to be fed on Indian reserves, forest reserves, or grazing land, but application had to be made, and I have no doubt that if similar application had been made in this province the same thing would have been done. Probably they were feeding their own stockers or they may not have been short of feed, or perhaps they were not concerned in this policy; there are a dozen other reasons that might account for it. It is entirely within the option of the individual whether he takes advantage of it or not.

Mr. HARRIS: I do not feel quite satisfied with the answer the minister has given to my question whether it is the intention of the department to continue the work that has been under way for some years with regard to the serum treatment of hogs, and the consequent non-necessity of cooking the garbage for feed. I gather that it is the minister's intention to have all garbage cooked before feeding rather than to adopt the alternative of serum treatment. I would ask the minister whether the work which has been going on for the last ten years in regard to serum treatment is not going to be continued, or is the department going to drop the whole of this investigation and burden the country with an army of inspectors to see that the small hog feeders cook the garbage before feeding it to their hogs?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have no way of disproving my hon. friend's statement as to the amount of hog cholera in this country as compared with the United States, but as we all know, hog cholera was prevalent in the United States for many years before we had it in Canada to any appreciable extent. I am more familiar with conditions in the West. While we had hog cholera in the West to a considerable extent about ten years ago, there is none of it now. I am not so familiar with conditions here, but I have not run across very much hog cholera so far. The fact that only $3,055.06 was paid out last year would indicate that we do not locate very much of it. I would not like to think that my hon. friend's statement was correct, because it would indicate that the situation is very much worse in Canada than I think it is, but the solution would be very much more simple if the facts were as he states. If we could get rid of this cooking of garbage, which is done very perfunctorily, I think, in very many cases I would be delighted, but the alternative is to adopt the serum treatment, which has been recognized as curative to a certain extent, though still leaving the animal capable of transmitting the disease. In my opinion the cases are not sufficiently numerous to justify us in adotping that alternative, and we shall therefore continue for the time being to have the garbage cooked, believing that that is the source of contagion in at least ninety per cent of the cases.

Mr. HARRIS: That figure of $3,055.06, to my mind, is not a fair index of the amount of hog cholera prevalent around large cities. It rather goes to prove that the department has not seen fit in a large number of instances to give the benefit of

the doubt to the hog feeder. The regulations provide, as the minister has pointed out, that if the hog feeder does not live up to the strict letter of the law the hogs will be destroyed without any compensation. The figures given by the minister simply bear out my statement that the inspector's word is taken rather than the word of the small hog feeder who perhaps has suffered the loss of all his hogs. It might be better for the industry if the benefit of the doubt were given to the man who is raising the hogs. I know of one area where upwards of 10,000 hogs are being fed on garbage, and it seems to me that the Government would be well advised not to pay so much attention to the army of spies—I hesitate to use the word, but these men are more or less inclined that way, going around the outskirts of the city spying on one man here and another man there—but rather employ one or two experts to follow through this serum treatment so that if possible all this unnecessary expense could be done away with. I am sorry that the minister is taking the view he has intimated. I think he should take as an index, not the amount of money that has actually been paid out by the department in compensation, but the number of cases where the department has found indications of cholera and perhaps destroyed the hogs without any compensation at all.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would like to ask the minister if the act applies to villages, or only to cities and towns? Why should the villages be discriminated against? The milk is supplied in villages in exactly the same manner as in towns and cities, and if they do not come under the act I should like to see the act amended so as to bring them in.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The act when it was passed about five years ago applied only to cities with a population of 5,000 or more, but the provisions have been growing wider ever since and taking in smaller towns. It is a matter for consideration whether we ought to apply the act to still smaller units, but I rather think there is not much dairying done in a small village of from 100 to 150 people. The milk would be supplied by people quite close to the town; it would be just a question of expense.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Referring to hog cholera, I should like to know in how many instances compensation has been withheld during the past year? Is it the intention of the department to discontinue the licensing of garbage feeders? If the department concludes that this is a menace to the industry because of the danger of spreading disease possibly there may be justification for doing that. I would like to know in how many instances compensation has been withheld during the past year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand from my deputy that he has not got that information here. Not more than four, and I think only three, persons wrote to me regarding claims they had before my predecessor and all for the same reason. I could not see my way clear to reversing the decision of my predecessor or the inspectors in any one of the cases. I suppose we could find out just how many claims have been refused. Doubtless wherever the conditions were not observed that course was pursued. There is no use in having conditions unless they are lived up to. The suggestion that we should take the word of somebody else—presumably the owner, or the member, or some other person—rather than the word of the regularly appointed inspector is a novel one to me. If some way of arbitrating the matter was found later on I presume there would be some redress for my hon. friend who thinks the inspectors have been unjust. There is, of course, that procedure but if that were done, I suppose it should only be as a last resort. I have made it as plain as I could that I have no money to hand out to people to satisfy a complaint unless that complaint is well founded. We certainly must observe the regulations. There is no doubt that other persons than those referred to have been refused compensation, but I certainly would not be justified in handing out public money in defiance of the existing regulations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am a little surprised to hear the minister refer to this matter in the way he has done—at the allusion he has made to the word of a member of Parliament and his statement in that connection that he cannot hand out money. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that nobody is asking him to hand out money when there is no justification for paying it out. As regards the particular case to which I refer I did not know anything about it until almost a year after it had happened. Having made inquiry I think the minister, if he takes the trouble to read the report very carefully, will have good reason to change his views in regard to his inspector. The complainant in this case is a citizen of

Canada who has observed the laws of the country fairly well for upwards of seventy years, and I think that having sustained a loss of between seven and ten thousand dollars, something more than the word of the veterinary inspector should be the deciding factor in the matter. I am not going to remain silent and permit the minister to indulge in insinuations with respect to statements made by members of Parliament. The minister may come here with quite a reputation. He will find, however, that members of Parliament have also reputations to sustain, and when they make a statement on the floor of this House charging an inspector in a public department with dishonesty it is time for the minister of that department to cause an investigation to be made into the facts instead of indulging in slurs on the representatives of the people. Let me tell the minister that some of them have just as good a reputation as he himself can boast of.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the item is carried I would like to have some information with regard to the question I submitted a moment ago as to the amount which has been paid out in each province for car-load lots. My attention was drawn to the question in connection with a load of cattle shipped from the vicinity of Battleford to Toronto and again shipped out from the latter city. Now the minister does not need to get up here and suppose certain things—that people do not make application in certain provinces because they have been distinctly told that these special rates were not available in certain places, whereas they do make application in other cases. I would like to know before this vote passes what amount has been paid out in the several provinces for this purpose, and whether in this respect the people in all the provinces have been treated alike.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I gave the hon. member the aggregate number of animals referred to and I would be delighted to give him the details as to every province, and even more minute information if it was available, but I do not have it here to-night. I would be pleased to give the information in the form of a return, if that would be satisfactory; I want to do anything at all that is reasonable. But my hon. friend has asked questions that would keep a whole set of accountants going one-half of their time if they were insisted on. Some questions have been asked, the answering of which would involve a report so minute and classified in its form as to demand the services of a tremendous staff. We have been criticized for having too many statisticians, too many clerks, too many officers doing clerical work. Well, we would require a good many more such officers if we had to furnish such minute details and classify them according to provinces. I think the information can be got, but it would keep the committee too late if it were insisted upon to-night. However the information is available and if my hon. friend insists the vote can stand until it is brought down; I have no objection to that course being taken. I do not want to restrict questions or debar any hon. member from obtaining information which he deems to be necessary in the public interest.

Mr. HARRIS: May I be permitted to ask one question along the same line? Will the minister tell the committee how many cases of hog cholera were reported throughout the Dominion last year by his inspectors?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not that information here.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I understand the minister is willing to let the item stand until further information in connection with it is brought down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Put the question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I shall not have a further opportunity of discussing this matter if the item is passed. I understand the minister stated a few minutes ago that he had no objection to the item standing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HARRIS: This is a very important matter which affects some 30,000 hogs in the Dominion. If these questions cannot be answered now and the passing of the vote will mean we shall be debarred from asking them again later on, I submit the suggestion of the minister should be adopted and the item should stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Seed, Feed and Fertilizer Control, $275,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the Seed Grain Commission come under this vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it the intention of the department to keep the Seed Grain Purchasing Commission in existence any longer?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think so. I think the institution is a good one. We have such variations of season in Canada and such a dearth of seed some years in some parts of the country that I do not know exactly how we would get along without it. Some objection was taken to the commission when it was first inaugurated some years ago, but the people have become familiarized with its work. There is no seed merchant that I know that would be able to take care of the enormous requirements of seed that have to be met from time to time, and which can only be met by this commission.

Mr. GARDINER: I am very glad indeed to hear the minister state that he is going to keep the commission in operation for a longer period. Many dealers in western Canada have endeavoured to get the Seed Commission done away with because it interfered with the profits of the seed houses, but I am glad indeed that the minister is going to continue the organization for a further period.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I might tell my hon. friend that, in consequence of the storage in an interior elevator in the West of a larger quantity of seed oats than was required last year, the Seed Grain Commission was able to supply over 300,000 bushels of seed oats for the maritime provinces and places east of here this year. I do not know where they would have got them if it had not been for that source of supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad to hear the minister give utterance to his intention to continue this scheme, and to see that it is receiving the support of hon. gentlemen to my left. Although I never undertook to advise in farming matters, I sometimes had to do with forming the policy, and it so happens that, five years ago, when acting Minister of Agriculture, upon the advice of an official of the department—I claim no originality in the matter—I was successful in establishing the commission. I know that the opposition to the Seed Purchasing Commission was not altogether a disinterested and unselfish opposition, but an opposition, nevertheless, sometimes hard to overcome. There is no doubt that it has rendered great service, principally in putting at the disposal of municipalities, and through municipalities of agriculturalists, dependable seed, and all the more so during years when the getting of that seed was a matter of more than ordinary importance to the country generally. Consequently while not seeking to bring credit to myself, I would like to emphasize the fact that there were some things done under the late administration, with which, it is true, I had specially to do, that turned out to be a lot more popular when there appeared to be danger of their abolition than they were at the time of their establishment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What does the feed control include?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is an act called the Feed Control Act that has to do with the controlling and inspecting of feeds. For instance, take mill feed; there were many complaints some years ago about its character, such as that it was adulterated with seeds.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Have there been many complaints received with reference to the manner in which the act has been enforced during the past winter and fall of 1921? Has the department had many complaints in regard to mill feeds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, very few complaints. Do you mean complaints from the consumer?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My deputy tells me there has been a number during the past season.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What were the chief complaints with regard to feed stuffs and mill feeds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Just the one I have already mentioned. There were complaints a number of years ago, and they apparently subsided, but they have broken out again. That is in regard to adulteration of bran and shorts with weed seeds, sometimes not very well screened either.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is evidently worse than it was some time ago. I took some little interest in this matter when the act was put through, but still I do not claim any credit for it. Yet I was satisfied in my own mind that the effect

would be,—and I pointed it out to the committee—that it would be absolutely impossible to purchase pure mill feeds. To-day, as is well known to all the live stock dealers or feeders, it is absolutely impossible, in the part of the country from which I come, at least, to purchase pure mill feed. They are all adulterated badly—much worse, as has been pointed out, than they were sometime ago. This is too serious a matter to be permitted to continue. There was a distinction made in the act between commercial feeding stuffs and feed stuffs. Feed stuffs were supposed to be pure bran, shorts and other grains. The Grain Standards Act was changed sometime ago, and it was made permissible to mix in this way, but, under the act as it stands at the present time, I think all the millers are practicing the policy that is now in effect, because the containers do not indicate what is in them, more than that the words "screenings not exceeding mill run" are printed on the sack. I think the inspectors are somewhat lax in their duties in not enforcing the act. I would point out to the minister the advisability of having the act changed, so that it would be impossible for the millers to adulterate mill feeds, as has been the practice during the past year or two, because there is no justification for it. These mill feeds are absolutely free from this adulterated article when it is milled, and it only goes in there through an arrangement which they have for piping this stuff back into mill feed and disposing of it in that way. This is a common practice of the millers throughout the country under the act as it stands at the present time, and I have no doubt there will be many more complaints received in the future than during the past year, if this is allowed to continue. For a time they disregarded the law. A law was placed on the statute book in 1920, which prohibited anything of that kind. That was amended and the present act took its place. This act permits the practice, which is now followed, but even under present conditions I do not think the inspectors are carefully observing their duties and enforcing the law, or this policy would not be permitted, because you can go into any feed store in the country and find the containers all have printed on the bottom "screenings not exceeding mill run". That never was the intention of Parliament when the act was put through, although it was pointed out that this was likely to happen under the act. This is happening and the result is that the farmers of this country, whom the minister is so much concerned about, are suffering a great injustice in having to pay a high price for this stuff, instead of getting the pure feed stuffs.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will look into the matter. I can quite understand, if that proviso is incorporated in the act in any way, or in any regulation connected with the act, that during any time like the present, when bran and shorts are needed, there will be a tendency to label the sacks in that way, but there must be some proviso authorizing it. They must have authority for doing it. I am not familiar with that act, but I will certainly familiarize myself with it. At present, I can see no justification for it in the act. But as my hon. friend says, these articles should be pure and free from weed seeds, unless the adulteration is deliberately done.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As I pointed out, I believe that the inspectors are somewhat to blame for laxity in enforcing the act as it exists at present. There is a distinction between feed stuffs and commercial feed stuffs. It is quite permissible to incorporate this other stuff with commercial feed stuffs and to sell the mixture as commercial feed stuffs. But dealers are putting in orders, it may be for bran and shorts, and they are getting this stuff back with the words printed "screenings not exceeding mill run." They are not getting what they order, and, consequently, it is the duty of the inspector to make inquiries from the millers to find out whether they are receiving these or not. Complaints which have been received indicate that there is, at the present time, a considerable amount of crookedness in connection with the matter. While I do not like to use that word, I again state most emphatically that it is impossible, in many parts of the country to-day, to purchase the pure article; you have to take the adulterated article.

Item agreed to.

Administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act, $20,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In connection with this item, I noticed a statement in the press—I am not sure whether it was by the minister or not—that one of the reasons why the Hon. Duncan Marshall had been engaged by the Government was to find out whether some provinces had been receiving, under the Agricultural Instruction Act, more than they were entitled to receive; that the amount in the past had been paid out in proportion to the population of the

various provinces; that he considered that was an injustice, and that he was inquiring into the matter. Was it in connection with this matter that the hon. gentleman made his trip to Florida a short time ago?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I do not think he would go down there for that purpose. While my civil government estimates were under discussion, I stated quite plainly the primary reason for Mr. Marshall's appointment, and I read the Order in Council to the House. I pointed out that we were having an investigation into the working of the Agricultural Instruction Act with a view to its possible continuance, discontinuance or amendment. Some phases of the act were under discussion when it was first launched, one of them being the basis of allocation, and I think that is a proper subject for reconsideration and further discussion. The present basis may be the best obtainable; but there is no harm in inquiring into the matter in order to see if there is a more equitable basis and also to find out first hand from the various provincial ministers of agriculture just what suggestions or amendments, if any, they would wish to make to the act. I am sorry to report that Mr. Marshall has been ill for the last three or four weeks and has not been able to continue his work. In the course of his work, he had a very bad attack of "flu" and has been in bed for nearly a month, so that we have not received that report yet. In view of the prospects of an early session next year, it may not be necessary to take action this session but we would like to have the act re-enacted this session with such amendments as may be found necessary, so that the provinces will know authoritatively that they can plan their work on the assumption that this work is going to be continued. I hope to be able to have the act re-enacted this session, and it may be found possible to incorporate some of the suggestions made by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) with regard to removing the overlapping of provincial and Dominion activities. In this way some activities which are now carried on by the Dominion might be set apart for the provinces with Dominion oversight. These are all tentative propositions that could be decided upon only after careful examination into the work in the various provinces, and that work has already been begun.

As regards Mr. Marshall's trip to Florida, since that matter has been brought up so many times, I have no objection to going into it. I do not know why any hon. gentleman should think that I was sending Mr. Marshall or anybody else to Florida for a joy ride or jaunt, for no particular purpose. I have been making inquiries into the matter, and find that the exhibition there has been running for a considerable number of years, I do not know how many. It is, therefore, not an exhibition that has been suddenly organized by the Minister of the Interior for the purpose of permitting one of the staff to go on a joy ride or anything of that nature. I am not sure whether it was organized under the late government; it may have been tried out by my predecessor. In any event, I have a report from an officer in the Interior Department giving some of the results of Mr. Marshall's trip, stating that he addressed a large assemblage there of some 8,000 people and received a large quantity of front-page advertising by way of reports in many newspapers, advertising that would cost $15,000 or $20,000 at ordinary advertising rates. Notwithstanding the doubt that was thrown on the likelihood of receiving any immigrants from that part of the world, I have a number of clippings intimating that many people at that exhibition were farmers, and already, as a direct result of that exhibition and of the address given by Mr. Marshall, some immigrants have arrived in Canada. Therefore, this trip was not entirely fruitless. Two other officials were there in charge of the exhibits, and this was a regular annual event organized years ago and held in the same place as formerly for the same purpose of reaching possible immigrants, many of whom were at the exhibition. My information goes to indicate that, in the immediate neighbourhood, there are about 6,000 Canadians, many of whom, it is felt, would be desirous, if they knew the facts, of returning to Canada, and I think this is a most fruitful ground for doing immigration work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have no doubt that many Canadians are to be found in Florida; in fact, many go, during the the winter, to that very delightful spot. In submitting my question to the minister when this appropriation was taken up, I pointed out the minister's evident intention of departing from the old system of allocating the appropriation under the Agricultural Instruction Act in proportion to population and of obtaining some other means of allocating it. This appropriation, which was for a ten-year period as first adopted, will possibly soon be used

up. My desire to get some information with regard to this matter has been prompted by the evident disposition on the part of some people to see that the province of Ontario contributes its fair proportion of the expenditure of this country and yet is denied advantages which other provinces are receiving at the hands of the Government. The questions which I submitted to the minister with reference to the item which was allowed to stand over, were prompted by a desire to obtain this information, and the same is true with regard to experimental farms. The other night when I asked for information, we were simply told that Ontario was an old province and that we did not require anything of this kind. Now that we are discussing another vote we are told by the minister that Mr. Duncan Marshall has been employed trying to devise a better system by which larger grants will be given to some provinces than they are receiving at present.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I never made the statement my hon. friend attributes to me. Surely he misunderstood me. As a matter of fact, the question of allocation came up when the act was first introduced, or at least the year after. The question as to whether the allocation should be based on straight population or on rural population is one of the debatable things that may come up, as it has come up before. It is not a new question, and personally I have no strong views upon it; but I take the ground that in some cases the grant might reasonably be smaller than in others. We have nine provinces. Suppose one province had no agriculture at all. That is an extreme view, but it is not an impossible one, because a province might be wholly engaged in manufacturing, mining, or lumbering. In such a case, should we be justified in making an allocation for agriculture where no agriculture existed? As I say, that is taking an extreme view; but just in proportion to the extent to which agriculture is pursued should the allocation be made. Whether a province is very largely engaged in agriculture, or is engaged in the industry only to a small extent, is a consideration that should surely have a bearing on the allocation when it is primarily for agriculture. That is a debatable question and it will be discussed when the matter is under consideration. However, it is not the subject for present investigation at all. The subject for discussion is the probable extension of agriculture, along the lines I have intimated, where we might avoid overlapping.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister practically denied what I stated, but he concluded by arguing rather in support of the view I have formed of his position. I have been charging the department with a desire to discriminate against provinces on the basis of population, and now he says that a province that is largely engaged in manufacturing should not receive the same consideration as a province almost entirely engaged in agriculture. Well, I presume that, so far as his remarks in regard to manufacturing provinces is concerned, the province of Ontario stands out, if anything, a little in advance of any other province. I do not know whether Ontario is the one the minister has in mind, but you can easily realise where his argument would lead to. If you say that a province that will not derive any benefit from the grant shall not be required to contribute to the payment of it, that is a different matter. But if some provinces are asked to contribute practically one-half of the revenues of the country and are to be denied all the advantages that other provinces receive, then I say that this discrimination is going too far. And that is practically what we were told the other night by the minister with regard to experimental farms. He said that an old province like Ontario can derive no great benefit from these farms. I contend, on the contrary, that there are great benefits which we can get from a proper expenditure. I am not criticising the amount spent, but I should like to know whether we shall have an opportunity of further discussing this matter when Mr. Duncan Marshall's report is submitted to the House, as I presume it will be.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the experimental farms were under discussion I did make some of the remarks my hon. friend attributes to me, but I pointed out further that, so far as Ontario is concerned, in the one experimental farm at Ottawa there was more money spent, and there were more activities engaged in, than was the case in any other province in the Dominion. What more does Ontario want?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The experimental farm at Ottawa is not intended to serve Ontario alone. The minister's remark in this regard might apply with equal force to the expenditures in conection with the

administration of the Government of Canada which is located in Ottawa.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would ask my hon. friend what the large representation from Ontario in the late House were doing when they let the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) neglect that province?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister stated the other night that 75 per cent of the value of experimental farms disappeared after they had been in operation twenty-five years. I think those were the words he used. I do not agree with that statements at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know whether there is any use in correcting my hon. friend. He gets certain notions into his head and apparently a sledge hammer will not knock them out. This is what I said: In due time another era will dawn when experimental farms will be just as necessary as to-day, when the question of soil fertility will render further experimental work imperative. I hope my hon. friend recognises the distinction. I did not stop at the statement that in the first twenty-five years the experimental farms had rendered 75 per cent of their usefulness. I supplemented that by saying that as time went on a new era would dawn that would require a different line of work altogether, and that probably the farms would be just as useful then as in the first twenty-five years. I distinctly made that addition. I do not want to charge my hon. friend with misrepresenting me, but he is doing so, inadvertently, as I hope.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If Hansard contains the words I have quoted, I suppose the minister will reconsider the statement he has just made. I think he said that 75 per cent of the value of the experimental farm disappeared twenty-five years after it had been established.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I said that and much more.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We shall continue in Supply with Agriculture and follow with the estimates of the Department of Interior.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1922

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=first, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negative. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See also* Cold Storage; Health of Animals; Meat and Canned Foods
Maritime provinces in, M. 992, 1023

Accountants. *See* House of Commons; Senate

Accounts. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act; Finance; Public Accounts

Accredited Herds. *See* Health of Animals

Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Escheats Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* Militia; National Defence

Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 10, 15, 50, 98, 122, 173, 211, 260, 303, 326
Mover (Mr. McMurray) 10; Seconder (Mr. Mercier) 15
Speakers, Messrs: Baldwin, 60; Baxter, 98; Beaubien, 280; Brown, 332; Campbell, 356; Carmichael, 155; Church, 116; Crerar, 50; d'Anjou, 306; Denis (St. Denis), 348; Dickie, 341; Drayton, 195; Evans, 300; Forke, 76; Gouin, 140; Harris, 307; Hughes, 224; Irvine, 211; Johnson (Moosejaw), 112; Kennedy (Edmonton), 142; King (Mackenzie), 38; Ladner, 321, 326; Lewis, 149; Logan, 105; Macdonald (Pictou), 186; MacKelvie, 159; MacLaren, 353; MacLean (Prince), 335; Maclean (York), 63; McBride, 316; Manion, 263; Marler, 243; Meighen, 19; Neill, 169; Pritchard, 250; Putnam, 309; Raymond, 253; Robitaille, 320; Ross, 95; Ryckman, 284; St. Père, 281; Sexsmith, 293; Sheard, 294; Speakman, 80; Stansell, 359; Stevens, 230; Stork, 330; Turgeon; 273; Warner, 349; Woods, 92; Woodsworth, 84
Motion agreed to, 362; acknowledgment of address by Governor General, 746-7

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Administration of Oaths of Office bill, 1r., 6

Admiralty Act Amdt. bill (Deputy Registrar and Deputy Judge) 1r., 245-6; 2r., com., 2822; 3r., 2823

Admiralty Court vacancy at Quebec, 1275

Adulteration of Food. *See* Food; Health

Advertising. *See* American Magazines

Aerial Patrol. *See* Air Service

Aeronautics, control of. *See* Air Board Act

Aeroplanes. *See* Air Service

Age of consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agents Provacateur. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Ages, Population by. *See* Population

Agricultural bloc in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Budget; Customs; United States

Agricultural Commodities. *See* Farm Products

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Fertilizers. *See also* Fertilizers
Inquiry as to legislation, 3041
Speaker's ruling, 1282

Agricultural Fertilizers, Regulation and Sale of, bill. Res. 3043; 1r., 3044; 2r., 3044; ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 3044; com., 3194; 3r., 3195. Senate amdts., 3607

Agricultural Implements, 2185, 2217, 2360, 2464, 2564, 2620
Brantford factories, closing of, 2375
Duties on, reduction, 2115, 2175, 2206, 2217, 2230, 2360, 2375, 2381, 2484, 2534, 2592, 2731, 3118-3120, 3141. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Drawbacks and refunds, 2175, 3122
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston — Last Mountain) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Imported from United States, 2413-14, 2486
By United Grain Growers, 3118-19
International Harvester Company, 2382
Massey-Harris Company, 2175
Price of, 1476, 2188. *See also* Address; Budget
At home and abroad, 2452, 2620
Protection, 2697
Manufacturers, and, 2575
Raw Materials for, 302, 309, 766. *See also* Customs Tariff
Raymond, Mr., and, 254, 255, 2705. *See also* speeches on Budget
Repair parts, 1901
Standardization of parts, 2406
Tariff, and, *See* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff

Agricultural Institute, 657, 969

Agricultural Instruction Act, 651-2, 994, 1012
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Accredited herds, 995, 2556, 2734-43
Diseases, 968. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Valuation, 1000
Animal diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Bounty to, 1698
Bovine Tuberculosis. *See under this title.* Health of Animals
Butter. *See also* Oleomargarine
Accumulation in England, 997
Colouring of, 1778
Imported, qu. 613, 803
New Zealand, from, qu. 614
Protection against oleomargarine, 177. *See also* Oleomargarine
Vitamines in, 1781

Agriculture — *Con.*
Cattle. *See also* Live Stock
Embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 992, 998, 2557
Abattoirs, maritime provinces, 992-3, 1023
Quebec, 1471
Warehouses, 3521
Commissioner of, qu. 609, 645, 3501. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See* Agriculture and Colonization
Competition, 2698
Conditions and prospects, 16, 53, 78, 81, 85, 113, 150, 231, 252, 300, 2147, 2149, 2153, 2156, 2163, 2216, 2403, 2885. *See also* speeches on Address; Agriculture Estimates; Budget
Statement by Manitoba Agricultural College, 2332
Contributions to railway tonnage, 1927. *See also* Freight Rates; Wheat Board
Dairying. *See that title*
Depression in, 1475, 2147. *See also* Address; Budget
Department
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Comparison of average salaries, 750
Dominion Apiarist, 592
Estimates, 1018, 1718, 3520
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment of, 3501. *See also that title*
Salaries and contingencies, 588, 644, 3504
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 590, 3520. *See also under this title,* Entomology
Diseases of Animals. *See under this title,* Accredited Herds; Health of Animals
Entomology, 813
Exhibitions, 993, 1026, 3521. *See also that title*
Experimental and illustration Farms, 795, 2557, 3521
Buildings, expenditure on, 1264
M. (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item, 812
Mont Laurier, 994
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Export figures, 2446, 2638
Farm labourers, 79, 87, 251, 1153
Harvest excursions to West, 337
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Unemployment. *See* Unemployment
Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers; Fertilizers
Fruit Industry. *See that title*
Importance of, 2386. *See* Address; Budget
International Institute of, 657, 969

Agriculture — *Con.*
Health of Animals, 967. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Bovine tuberculosis, 2556
Hog cholera, 1007, 1028
Alderson claim, 1004
Tuberculosis, 3521. *See also* Animal contagious Diseases
Japanese engaged in, 345-6. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Lecturers, 1023
Live Stock. *See that title*
Manitoba Agricultural College, statements on, 2332
Markets, 251, 2149. *See also* Address; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Wheat Board
Military and agricultural expenditures, comparison, 1137
Mixed farming, 2592
Potatoes. *See that title*
Root Vegetables. *See that title*
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Seed, Feed, and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Seed Grain, 3522
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718. *See also* Live Stock.
Unemployment, and, 2158, 2331. *See also* Labour; Unemployment
Wheat Board. *See that title*

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Canadian Council of Agriculture Memorandum ref. to, 377
Constitutionality of Wheat Board, Law Officers' opinion, 940
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900, 2406
Reports
Inquiry as to, 1929
Second and third, 657
M. to concur in, 703, 726, 776
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to refer back, 779
M. as amended, agreed to, 786
Third, concurred in, 786
Fourth, concurred in, 865
Fifth, M. to concur in, 2915
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland), 2951; neg. 2969
See Wheat Board, for further proceedings
Standardization of parts of agricultural machinery, 2406

Air Board, qu. 366. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Air Board — *Con.*
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Civil aviation, 1722. *See also* Air Force
Estimates, salaries, etc., 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1728

Air Board Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Compensation for death or injury)
Res. 2357, 2820; 1r., 2821, 2r., com., 3r., 2826

Aircraft Limitation. *See* Limitation of Armmaments

Air Force. *See also* Air Board; Militia, National Defence
Aeroplanes, danger of attack from, 2085-98
Civil Aviation, and, 1047, 1722
Aerial patrol, High River, Alta., 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Camp Borden, 1728
Co-operation with provinces, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, B.C., 1730
Forest patrol, 1047
High River station, 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Railway Belt, B.C., 1730
Gasoline for aeroplanes. *See* Gasoline
Pensions, Widowed mothers, 1305

Air Service. *See* Air Force

Aird, Sir John, 1128

Alberta
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian schools. *See* Indians
Meeting of defeated candidates, 2858
Public buildings, 1254
Second homesteads, 1042
Soldier's Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Alcohol. *See also* Customs Tariff; Opium and Narcotic Drugs; Prohibition; Special War Revenue Act
Country doctors and, 2177
Retail druggists, for, ques. 1213, 1400; 2114, 2176-7, 2191

Alderson Claim. *See* Agriculture, Health of Animals

Aldred, Mr. J. E., 1128

Ale. *See* Liquor; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Algoma Steel Corporation, rails, 1689

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Deportation of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Enemy property, custodians of 1672, qu. 1904
C.P.R. shares held by, 1672
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu. 3363
Prince Rupert, 3606, 3601
Fisher & Oughton, qu. 1773, 3601, 3606
Thorsch, Mr., qu. 1772
Williams & Manson, qu. 1772, 3601, 3606
Lord Kitchener, news of his death, and, 2155
Oriental Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens
Taxation of, 2155
Women of Alien Birth. *See* Dominion Franchise Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Allan, Sir Montagu, 872. *See also* Banks, Merchants Bank

Alliances, Political, 2095, 2097. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party
"Morganatic alliance", 2095, 2344

Alpine Club, grant to, 1053, 1387

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminum Company of America, 71, qu. 728
Cedar Rapids power, qu. 1375

Amalgamation of Departments. *See* National Defence Bill

Ambassador, Canadian, at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

American Bankers' Association, 2189

American Magazines, importation and competition, 3109

Amherst, N.S.
Car repair contracts, 1702
Drill hall, 1238

Ammunition. *See* Militia and Defence

Anaesthetics, use of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Budget, 2364. Tribute to Finance Minister; taxation and the cost of living, 2364; tariff; import and excise duties; free trade; origin of protective policy in United States; population, increase

Anderson, Mr. R. K. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of; tariff reductions; a two and a half per cent budget; sales tax increase, 2365; party without definite fiscal policy; 2366; revenue and protective tariffs in England and United States; Fordney tariff, 2367; reciprocity with United States; British and American investment in Canadian industries, 2368; home manufacture; trade with Great Britain and United States, 2369; home market; difficulties due to war; debt and deficits, 2370; economy and expenditure; civil service; militia and naval service, 2371; taxation; railways; emigration; dumping clause, 2372; beet sugar; the amendment, 2373
Burlington channel bridge, 2007
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 954
Halifax and St. John quarantine stations, 1241
Halton county
Highways — Dundas Street, qu. 1065
Post offices, 1247
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021-2
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, 3014
Orders in Council, qu. 935
Overseas service — categories, 3317
Penitentiary Act Amdt, 790
Pensions, commutation of, 1281
Public buildings
Rentals, 1259
Water, 1266
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, care and medical examination of patients, 1281
Steel rods, refund of duties, 1774

Andrews, Mr. A. J., K.C.
Winnipeg Strike correspondence, 2042

Anglo-French Relations. *See* Genoa Conference; Limitation of Armaments

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168. *See also* Japan; Limitation of Armaments

Animal Contagious Diseases Act
Administration, 967, qu. 3362

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill
(Compensation for slaughtered animals), 1r., 1283; 2r., com., 2102; com., 2734; 3r., 2806

Animals, Cruelty to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Annexation, 2550
"Annexationists of the prairie provinces", 1020

Annual Drill. *See* Militia

Annuities Branch, Salaries, etc., 776

Anti-Conscription, 22. *See also* Military Service Act Amdt.

Anti-Dumping. *See* Budget; Customs; Fruit; Trade

Appeal Cases. *See* Judges' Act Amdt.

Appeal Judges, Saskatchewan. *See* Judges Act Amdt.

Appeals from Provincial Courts. *See* Supreme Court Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 26 (Interim Supply — for $53,-901,669.17 for 1922-23). Res., 362, 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599
2. Bill No. 85 (for 1921-22, for $9,623,-792.61 and 1922-23 for $88,517,204.53). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1842-3
3. Bill No. 202 (for 1922-23 for $175,766,-646.71). Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3607

Appropriations not required. *See* Estimates

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bankruptcy Act, trustees for Montreal district, 1183
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth). *See under this title,* Immigration-Criminal Code
Health Dept. correspondence relating to drugs, 1289, 1377
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Special Com. Reports, 1988, 2519, 3156, 3280
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Military Service Act Amdt., 642
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289
Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bill (Residence), 1062
Newspaper censors, 1069
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Point of order — relevancy, 1890
Pratt vs. Delphine, 302
Railway Commission, Chief Traffic Officer, ques., 1377, 2215, 2457

Archambault, Mr. Joseph — *Con.*
St. John harbour, qu., 1401
Trent canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376
Victoria bridge tolls, qu. 1377
War claims, details of estimates, qu. 1288
Welland canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376

Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Ocean, patrol. *See* Naval Service

Arctic Regions, Mounted Police in, 3497

Arichat, port physician, qu. 1773

Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Armorial Bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601

Armouries. *See also* Militia and Defence
Fittings and alterations, 1261, 1288
Quebec, in, qu. 1287

Army and Navy Veterans, Oriental immigration, 1514

Arsenals. *See* Militia

Arthur Young & Company, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Canadian Transit Company Bill, 1771
Cash Bonus to Soldiers, 403; M., 429
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Fishing schooner race, 3514
Geodetic survey, 1986
Labour Dept.
Nova Scotia strike, 584
Salaries, 575
Temporary clerks, 567
Naval Service, cruisers, qu. 2039
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3440-53
Postal receipts, qu. 938
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3959
Reading of documents, 560
Returned soldier hikers, qu. 3153
Rural mail routes, qu. 3152
Soldiers' settlement, building loans, 3475
Transcontinental railway, 919

Articles. *See* League of Nations

Artillery. *See* Militia; Royal Canadian Artillery

Artisans, Immigration of. *See* Immigration; Labour

Ascension Day Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada, Oriental Immigration, 1514

Asiatics. *See also* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
British Columbia in, 171, 183

Assiniboine River Floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Relief measures, inquiry, 3491

Assistant Chief Electoral Officer. *See* Chief Electoral Officer

Athletics. *See* Cadet Camps

Atlanta, Ga., Penitentiary, 1278

Atlantic-Pacific, Canadian ports. *See* British Preference; Steamship Services

Atlantic Sugar Refineries, drawback, 2850

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Supreme Court pre-audit, 1275

Audit Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt.

Auditor General
Contingencies, 3504
Salaries, 793

Auditor General's Report, 380, 424
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 1462

Aurora, warship. *See* Naval Service

Australia
Immigration policy, 1536
Preservation of Industries Act, 2411, 2648
Reciprocal trade with, 33, 174, 2110, 2802
Correspondence tabled, 9
Steamship services. *See* Steamship Services
Trade relations with, 2592

Automobiles. *See also* Taxation
Duty on, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2232, 2574
Drawbacks, refunds, 2850
Excise sales tax, 2116, 2177, 2186, 2206, 2230, 2260, 2346-7, 2388, 3272-3, 3276
Amended, 2857
Ford car, cost in Detroit and Canada, 2186
Ford Motor Company, 3273
Duty paid by, qu. 3599
Output, 3273
Protection and profits, 2232, 2696
Imports, qu. 1633

Automobiles — *Con.*
Industry, protection of, 2696, 2730, 3132
Number of, by provinces, 2566
Refund of taxes, 3600
Results of protection of industry, 2696
Theft, penalty, 2831
Value, $1,000, to be admitted free for settlers, 2116

Aviation. *See* Air Board; Air Force

Bachelor Tax. *See* Taxation

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See also* Lake of the Woods Repeal Bill
Lease of timber areas, 2805; qu. 2992

Bacon, production. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock
Conference on, 1025

Baddeck, N.S.
Public Buildings, 1238
Wharf, 1269, 1765

Baie des Chaleurs railway service. *See* Gaspé Railways

Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to, 1929
Appointment of Special Com., 2101
Second report, 3490

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply, 60; congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail, income tax collections, 60; attitude of leader of Opposition, 60-61; conscription, 61; leader of Opposition, 62
Armouries, 1288
Budget, 2250. Public debt; sugar control; railways; economy, 2250; naval service; development of natural resources, 2251; geographical difference; party promises; water power development; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2252; tariff; Progressive party; Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; Sir John Macdonald and protection, 2253; wartime wages and prices; immigration, national spirit; inequalities of taxation, 2255
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1832

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Loans; Roumania

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. *See* Banks; Ministers and Directorships

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Pensions for lightkeepers, 1496
Selkirk wharf, 2004

Banff, Windermere road, 1051, 1682

Banking and Commerce, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref to, 1210
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210

Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bills
1. Bill No. 45 (Mr. Jacobs — additional grounds for petition in bankruptcy) 1r., 821; ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1395
2. Bill No. 56 (Mr. Ethier — court to which petition shall be presented) 1r., 1132; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1662
3. Bill No. 107 (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 2035; 2r., com., 3025; 3r., 3026
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Avoidance of general assignment of book debts, 3025
Court of bankruptcy, 3026
Judges to be assigned by chief Justice, 3026
Senate amendments, concurrence in, 3611
Suspension of payment, notice of, 3025
Winding up Act, 3026

Banks and Banking. *See also* Finance; Loans; Taxation
American Bankers' Association, 2189
Bank Act, revision. *See* Address; Budget
Bank balances and real wealth, 2497
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2177, 2329, 2852, 2856, 3258
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Circulation, tax on, 2117, 2626
Commerce, 1085-7
Credit system, 1290. *See also* Financial Credits
Credits, 1071, 2729. *See also* Loans
Currency, issue of, 2501
Deposits, ratio to capital, 2728
Gold in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
Grain trade, financing of, 2246

Banks and Banking — *Con.*
Income tax payments by, qu. 1400
Interest, 1291, 3601
Alleged violation of Bank Act, 2627
Interlocking directorates, 2503
Loans to directors, 1093
Merchants', 1085, 1092, 1121, 3604
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Amalgamation, 2727
Ballantyne, Hon. C. C., 1085
Independent inquiry by Parliament, 2396
Macarow, Mr. D. C., case against, qu. 2305
Merger, 158, 237, qu. 367, 872, 1085, 2727
Montreal Bank and, 1085
Royal Trust Company, and, 1085
Montreal Bank, 1071-85, 1129
Canadian Pacific, and, 64-66
Unemployed and, 87
Montreal City & District Savings Bank, 1087
Municipalities, withholding credit from, 2627
Nationalization of, 2325-8
New banks, starting, 2501
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, property, qu. 1182
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill. *See that title*
Penny Banks, depositories for money received, 1132
Profits, circulation, interest, etc., qu. 3598
Refusal to advance money to school board, 2627
Royal Bank, 1087
Special War Revenue taxation. *See that title*
Note circulation, payments on, qu., 1400
System, revision of, 138, 158, 223, 237, 352, 2501, 2506. *See also* Budget; Irvine

Barclay, Mr. A. J., qu., 963-4

Barkhouse, Captain, 1748

Barnet, Major. *See* Soldier Settlement Board

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J., Forest Protection, 1049

Battlefields Commission, 119, 771. *See also* War Graves

Battlefields Memorials. *See also* War Memorials
Estimates, 2098, 2975

Baxter, Mr. Charles W., Appointment of successor, qu., 2457

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 98. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 98; Conservative party, campaign literature, 99; natural resources of western provinces, 100; maritime provinces, 101; tariff and reciprocity, 102; railway situation; Canadian ports, 104; economy in expenditure; industrial depression, 105
Audibility of debates, 708
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 712
Budget, 2340. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; per capita taxation; expenditure, 2341; Progressives and Government; duties on coal, boots and shoes; platform of 1919; failure of Government to implement pledges, 2343; reciprocity with United States; morganatic alliance, 2344; platform of Canadian Council of Agriculture; the amendment, 2345; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; redistribution; taxation of luxuries; automobile tax, 2346; tariff proposals as they affect farmer and labourer; trade with Germany, 2347
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 3007
Date of coming into force, 3008
Canadian National railways
Government ownership and operation, 1965
Immigration, and, 2165
Intercolonial, 1967
Menus, cost of printing, qu., 1931
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606
Civil Service — Mr. Martell, 3101
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Fines, payment to municipalities, 2832
Half-breed scrip, 3217, 3221
Pool-selling and book-making, point of order, 2973
Customs tariff operation, 769
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, Lunenburg, qu., 1902, 2458, 2584
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, 3468-74
Dredging, maritimes provinces, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born wives, M. (Mr. Euler) 492
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2826

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. — *Con.*
Fisheries
Deputy Minister of, 2166
Markets, 2166
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2817
Freight Rates
Special Com. on third report, 3577
Sub-amdt., 3586
Harbours and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
Immigration, maritime provinces and, 2165
Interior Dept., salaries, 454
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426, 546
Labour Dept., 494, 495
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu., 3598
Military expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Militia and Defence
Arsenal, Quebec, 2094
Expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) 1117
Monopolies and excess profits, 3276
Monuments, historic sites, qu., 469
National Defence bill, 2809
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Appeal, restriction of right, 3021
Deportation, 3024
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2016
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3441
Railway policy, 1965
Rideau Hall, coal supply, 1757
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. John, in, 736
St. John terminal facilities, 848-9
St. John Valley railway, 3039
Savoy, J. Clovis, qu., 3363
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — Insurance, 3253
Spruce bud worm, 815
Wharves in New Brunswick, transfer of, qu., 2305

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of C.P.R., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Address in reply, 280; congratulations to mover and seconder, aims of Progressive party, 280
Boy Scouts, 773

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — wrecks caused by defective cars from United States, 1708
Immigration — Ukrainians, 3061

Beck, Sir Adam, 63, 71, 92, 123, 124, 134, 633, 1327, 1937. *See also* Hydro Electric; Maclean, Mr., (York); St. Lawrence Waterway

Beef, Imports of, qu., 610

Beer. *See* Liquor; Taxation

Beet Sugar. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue

Behring Sea Patrol, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Béland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3479-84
Canadian Red Cross Society bill, 3151, 3386
Canteen funds, disposal, 3329, 3308
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 441
Chaudière Valley floods, 3492
Conservation Commission, 456-7
Election promises, 402
Health, department of
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Estimates, 2017
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
Salaries, 775
Venereal diseases, 2022
Insurance claim of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also under this title* Returned Soldiers Iusurance
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, M. (Mr. Archambault) 1289, 1377
Enforcement of Act, 2017
Prohibition and, 2018
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 775, 1841, 2823, 3013
Appeal, 3020
Deportation, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3439-64
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1339, 1349-50, 3336
Appeals, 3341
Charges against, 3041

Béland, Hon. H. S. — *Con.*
Pension Commissioners. — *Con.*
Discretion, 392
Memorandum of Chairman, 2994
Representation of Quebec, 1350
Pensions
Commutation, 392
European War and active militia, 1353, 1361
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3523
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1307
Pensions, Insurance, etc., Special Com.
Appointed, 496
Final report, 3355
Shaw, Mr., 3326
Returned Soldiers, alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2639
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3358, 3388, 3398, 3437
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1341
Employers' Liability compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Hospitals, 1348
Nurses' salaries, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pensions, 1349, 1353, 1361. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Royal Commission on Pensions, 388. *See also under this title,* Pension Commissioners
Staff, 405, 1343
Reduction of, 3602
Salary increases, 385, 388, 401, 405, 551
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281
War service gratuity, interest on, 1347
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept. bill, 3597, 3609
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528

Belgium, free trade and, 2525

Bell Telephone Company, rates increase, 132

Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504

Belley, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Benefit Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt. bill

Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Beverages, Tax on, 2594, 2857. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Bienfait, Briquetting plant at, qu. 6$4, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Expenditure and results, 2712-15

Big Bay Point, Lake Simcoe, removal of sunken vessel, 2005

Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765

Big Interests and Liberal party, 242, 2431, 2678, 2682. *See also* speeches on Budget

Biggar, Colonel O. M.
Resignation from Air Board, 1726. *See also* Chief Electoral Officer

Biggar, Mr., W. H., K.C., qu. 728

Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills *See* their individual titles;
For private Bills, *See* Private Bills Discussed

Binder Twine, 257, 265, 2405 2575
Brantford factory, 2375. *See also* Budget

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
L'Orignal wharf, qu. 1212
Quebec riots, compensation for damage, qu. 1508
St. Lawrence river waterway, communication with Imperial Govt., qu. 1508

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Budget, 2704. Political expediency; difficult to modify protective system, 2704; divergence of views of Mr. McMaster and Mr. Raymond; historic Liberalism represented by Progressive party, 2705; revival of Liberal spirit; attitude of Opposition towards Progressives; alleged inaccuracies, 2706; statement as to direct and indirect taxation; tariff a secondary revenue producer; sales tax; free trade and revenue, 2707; inheritance tax; protection and farmers, 2708; labouring man; competition under free trade;

Bird, Mr. T. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian wheat in England; workingman and protection, 2709; small industries and trusts, 2710; Wheat Board; protection and flagwaving; obstacles to united nationhood, 2711
Civil Service salaries, 554
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2786
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 526
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838

Birnie, Mr. Alexander, and others, petition of, 1929

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Alien enemy property, qu. 1904
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3483
Civil Service list, qu. 727
House of Commons
Law Branch, qu. 2304
Senate, and,
Chief Accountants, qu. 2583, 2803
Expenditure, qu. 2583
McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation, qu. 2805
Migratory Birds, 1686
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1520
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Committee, final report, 3334
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838
Senate and House of Commons
Chief Accountants' salaries, ques. 2583, 2803
Yukon Territory
Administration of justice, 1275
Suggested union with British Columbia, 1275
Mining and mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radio-telegraph service, 1749
Silver discovery, 1276

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Budget, 2448. Disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister; the tariff; jokers in budget; protection with an excise tax; boots and shoes; building materials and agricultural implements; exorbitant prices charged; manufacturers' rebate on raw materials; loss of population, 2449; immigration; railway situation; national railways; change of management necessary; merchant marine; civil service; mem-

Black, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
bers taking up too much time with speeches; trade relations with United States; export of cattle, 2450; immigration, 2450
Goderich harbour improvements, 2000
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2000

Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration
Appointment of, 3500. *See also* Immigration

Blackfoot Reserve. *See* Indians

Blake, Late Hon. Edward
Letter to West Durham electors, 2677
Malvern speech, 2655, 2677
Withdrawal from leadership of Liberal party, 2655, 2657, 2677

Bland, Mr. C. H., Civil Service Commission, qu. 1773

Blankets. *See* Customs Tariff

Blind
Canadian National Institute for, grant, 3540
Soldiers. *See* Pensions Committee

Blood Indian Reserve. *See* Indians

Board of Commerce, 1118
Constitutionality of. *See* Wheat Board
Cost, report, qu. 2583
Salary of secretary, 1715

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pension Commissioners

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Business of the House
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 1698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
St. Malo shops, 1699
Cheque tax, 3261
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Debates Committee, first report concurred in, 1258
Debates, Official, Unrevised Index, 3359
Health of Animals
Hog cholera, 1007
Inspection of dairy herds, 1007
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Unemployment, rail and car repair contracts, 1699

Bolshevism, 1290. *See also* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Bona fide Contractors. *See* Wheat Board bill

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans
Five year maturities, qu. 2993
Non-taxable Victory bonds, qu. 2971
Sale by public tender, 1468
Tax-exempt, 2567, 2725

Bonus. *See* Civil Service; Soldiers

Bookmaking. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Bootlegging. *See* Liquor

Boots and Shoes, 3238. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Price and labour costs, 2350
Protection of industry, 207-208
Tariff on, 102-103, 152-3, 159, 2341-2, 2465, 2488-9, 2632, 2685, 3236, 3237
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce duty, neg. 3238

Borden, Camp
Air force and civil aviation, 1728

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Appointment to Limitation of Armaments Conference
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
Imperial Conference of 1918, 1864
Naval defence, on, 1864, 1876
Quebec Harbour, 1475
Report on reduction of naval armaments, 9, 42, 1737, 1743
Withdrawal from directorships, 1089

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Introduction, 1929

Boucher, Mr. Aimé (Yamaska)
Naval policy, 2078
Sorel shipyard, men employed May 1921, qu. 1062

Bounties
Linen yarn, 3128
Steel, 304-5, qu. 3360
Sugar beet industry. *See* Inland Revenue

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis lightkeepers, qu. 2583

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu. 937

Boy Scouts Association, 772

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Big Bay point, Lake Simcoe, wreck, 2005
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Canada Gazette, expenditure Public Works, 1268
Coal, importation for public buildings, 1763
Dredging, 2005
External Affairs, salaries, 412
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Militia-Naval Service, officers, 421
National Defence bill, Air Force, 677
Naval Service
Militia, and, deputy ministers, 421
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Patronage — rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions Board, appeal, 390
Pensions, disability cases, 389
Public Buildings
Coal importations for, 1763
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1267
Expenditure on, 1268
Public works
Appropriations and expenditures, 2002
Estimates, 695, 698
M. to reduce, 695
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1268, 1271
Riley's army, qu. 3364
Soldiers' land settlement, 2132

Brantford
Agricultural implement industries, 255, 2375. *See also* Budget; Raymond
Meighen, Hon. Mr., speech at, 256

Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner of taxation, salary, 2024

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herds, 1000
Agriculture — Deputy Minister, 653
Automobile tax, 3276-7
Budget, 2693. United Grain Growers and agricultural implement business; income tax — who pays? 2693; economy; reduction in cost of government; national debt; domestic loans; reciprocity, 2694; sales tax; excess profits, 2695; luxury tax; unimproved land values; automobile tax; protective tariff and automobile industry, 2696; Ford car; protection of agricultural implements, 2697; home market; prices

Brethen, Mr. G. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
fixed in markets of world; ability of agriculture and live stock industries to meet world competition, 2698
Customs Dept., estimates, 763
Grants to live stock associations, 1027
Live stock trade with South America, 647
Manufacturers, protection of, 2696, 3232
Oleomargarine, 3430
Woollen clothing and blankets, 3135

Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Burlington Channel, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Edmundston, 1239-53
False Creek, 3516
Grand river, York, Ont., qu. 1287
Isle Perrot, federal contribution, qu. 1377
Ottawa, lighting, 1267
Quebec, 1068
Red Deer river, 1964
Victoria, tolls, qu. 1377

Bridgetown, post office accommodation, 1245

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait; Lignite

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Budget, 2407. Congratulation to Finance Minister; nothing for trade or agriculture, a "stand pat" budget; protection against competitors; wages and production costs in Germany, 2407; German exports to Canada, 2408; protection of industries in Great Britain; Safeguarding of Industries Act; United States tariff, 2409; protection against German competition; equalization of conditions; duty valuation based on Canadian selling price; safeguarding of French industries, 2410; Australian Industries Preservation Act; Tom Moore on German labour conditions; protection of Canadian industries, 2411; industrial development and tariff legislation in United States; iron and steel, comparison of English and American prices; steel rails; Germany underselling United States; nails; protection of Nova Scotia coal and steel industry, 2412; tariff revision long overdue, 2413; western farmer and tariff and freight rates; United States farmer opposed to free trade; tariff against Canadian agricultural products; protection against United States commodities;

Bristol, Hon. Edmund — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
free trade; agricultural implements, importation from United States; effect of tariff reduction on implement factories; American factories in Canada; trusts and combines; woolens, 2415; free trade means destruction of Canadian industries and home markets; harmony between eastern and western Canada, 2416; deflation; building costs, coal; railway wages and freights; the amendment, 2417
Canadian ships damaged during war, 1183
Welland canal, 2748
Co-operation with the United States, 2751
Grain transportation, 2750

British Admiralty, war claims, 1752

British Board of Trade, relief of distressed seamen, 1676

British-Born
Disabilities under Immigration and Naturalization Acts, 1389-91

British Columbia
Aerial patrol of forests, 1724, 1730
Asiatics in. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Banff-Windermere road, 1051, 1682
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Canada Temperance Act, 1017
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733, 2997. *See also that title*
Canadian National branch lines, 331
Coal mines in, 178
Coastal services, qu. 3152
Dairymen's Association, 1794
D'Arcy Island, lazaretto, 2021
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1156-63, 1353
United Farmers, and, 1354
Fisheries. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Cost and revenue, 2306
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Transfer to, 2042
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Fruit industry, 162, 225, 3417-3424
Tariff and. *See* Budget; Customs
Fuel Oil, 178, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Liquor traffic, 2018. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act

British Columbia — *Con.*
Natural resources, 328. *See also* Natural Resources
Old age and mothers' pensions, 1375
Oliver, Hon. John, 322
Criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2236-7
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Oriental Aliens. *See also that title*
Competition with, 171, 173, 183, 316-19, 332, 344
Immigration, 167, 872, 967, 2310, 3104
Res. by Legislature, 1511, 1513
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1509
Population, 1512
Voting, 172
Post offices, revenue from, qu. 824
Potlach Indian Institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Public buildings, improvements, etc., 1255
Railway Belt
Forestry, 1046
Survey, 1043
Railway mail service, 2797
Union for judicial purposes with Yukon, 1275

British Columbia House, London, purchase of, 3537

British Empire Steel Corporation, 200, 1106, 1130. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Business profits tax, qu. 1067
Compensation for loss, 1082

British Goods, Importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty *See* Limitation of Armaments

British Market. *See* British Preference; Cattle Embargo; Trade

British Ministry of Shipping
Account, 2975
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976

British North America Act, powers under *See* Quebec Fisheries

British Preference, 2111, 2201, 2529, 2624-5. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Canadian Seaports, and, 2688
M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 707
Amdt. (Mr. Lewis) 772; withdrawn, 726
Further reduction of duties, 2113
Goods imported via United States, qu. 375
Sugar, 2116

British Shipping Board, credit, 2975

British Subjects, Wives of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

British Valuation. *See* Customs, Valuation

Brockville and Westport Railway. qu. 704

Brown, Hon. George, on political pledges, 2482

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 332; reciprocity, live stock industry, 333; cattle embargo, 334
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. 2735
Automobiles, refund of taxes, 3600
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canals, traffic through, qu. 705
Canned foods, marking, 3050
Civil Service, economy in, 423
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Experimental farms, 808
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Inaudibility of debates, 1751
Labour Dept. — economy, 568
Militia and Defence
Estimates, 587
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Naval policy, 2069
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1674
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1803
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018
Pensions Committee — final report, 3342
Political alliances, 2095
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Co., claim, 3516
Public Works estimates, 696
Rideau canal, 2765, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1207
St. Peter's Indian reserve, qu. 472
Soldier land settlement, 2134
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 449
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1345
Statistics, accumulation of, 580
Wheat Board bill, 3180
Wheat Board — point of order, 2949
Woollen goods, duty on, 3232

Brussels Financial Conference, 1138, 1292

Bryce, Dr. Peter, H., pamphlet, 1224

Bud Moth. *See* Forestry

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Date of
Announcement, 1721
Inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Debate, on, 2104, 2171, 2216, 2256, 2307, 2358, 2407, 2459, 2519, 2523, 2585, 2640, 2692, 2842, 2859
Amendments
Crerar, Mr., 2473-4; Speaker's ruling 2520-23
Drayton, Sir Henry, 2179, neg. 2912
Divisions
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) neg. 2912
Corrected division list, 2972
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com., 2104; agreed to, 2913
Ruling of Mr. Speaker on Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2520-23
Probable time for conclusion of, 2639
Speeches of Finance Minister, 2104, 2842
Speakers, Messrs: Anderson, 2364, Baldwin, 2250; Baxter, 2340; Bird, 2704; Black (Huron) 2448; Brethen, 2693; Bristol, 2407; Caldwell, 2660; Campbell, 2729; Cannon, 2909; Chaplin, 2616; Charters, 2561; Church, 2392; Coote, 2724; Crerar, 2459; 2522; Denis (Joliette) 2887; Drayton, 2127; Drummond, 2272; Elliott (Waterloo) 2348; Fansher, 2229; Fielding, 2104, 2842; Findlay, 2893; Fortier, 2274; Gardiner, 2624; Garland (Carleton) 2300; Good, 2429; Gouin, 2654; Gould, 2711; Guthrie, 2874; Hocken, 2675; Hoey, 2331; Hughes, 2225; Irvine, 2495; Jacobs, 2513; Johnston (Last Mountain) 2220; Kellner, 2280; King (Huron) 2301; King (Mackenzie) 2537; Kyte, 2358; Ladner, 2276; Laflamme, 2895; Lanctôt, 2567; Lapierre, 2628; Lapointe, 2585; Lavigueur, 2398; Leader, 2510; Lewis, 2256; Logan, 2684; Lovett, 2270; Lovie, 2451; Low, 2445; MacKelvie, 2196; Maclean (Halifax) 2859; Maclean (York) 2321; Macphail, Miss, 2384; McBride, 2635; McConica, 2898; McCrea, 2314; McKenzie, 2604; McMaster, 2417; McMurray, 2474; McQuarrie, 2233; McTaggart, 2545; Malcolm, 2387; Manion, 2261; Marcil, 2905; Meighen, 2523; Millar, 2294; Milne, 2239; Morrison, 2699; Motherwell, 2548; Neill, 2307; Prevost, 2577; Putnam, 2282; Raymond, 2373; Robb, 2179; Sales, 2574; Speakman, 2881; Spencer, 2629; Stansell, 2290; Steedsman, 2721; Stevens, 2646; Stewart (Argenteuil) 2216; Stewart

Budget — *Con.*
Debate on — *Con.*
(Humboldt) 2597; Sutherland, 2481; Tolmie, 2591; Turgeon, 2188; Ward, 2400; Warner, 2204; White, 2352; Woods, 2183; Woodsworth, 2242
To continue from day to day, 2101
Resolutions, 2218
Amended, 2854

Building
Costs, 2416. *See also* Housing
Trades
Conference, 582-3
Freight rates affecting, 133

Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Bukowinians. *See* Immigration

Bull Durham Tobacco, comparative prices, 2546

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Agriculture Committee Report, Wheat Board, 726
Civil Servants, appeal, 3079
Customs dept.
Drawbacks, 766
Estimates, 762, 1674
Officials, 764
Valuation of imports, 3413
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 2810
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current and past year, 1675
Export liquor warehouses, 768
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
National Defence Bill, Senate amdts., 2807
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal, 1674
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Public ownership, 1331
Quebec Harbour — Park St. Charles, 1470
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1332
Total trade, statement of, 1376

Bureau of Standards, 235, 1372

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burlington Channel, Bridge, 2007

Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008

Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, retirement, 742-3, 1145, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence Bill

Business Profits War Tax. *See* Taxation

Butter. *See* Agriculture; Dairying Industry; Oleomargarine

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Bylot Island, Mounted Police, 3497

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* References in Address

Cabinet. *See* Ministers and Directorships
Personnel of, 241

Cables, Submarine, ques. 3151-2, 3360

Cadets. *See* Militia and Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1860
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1449
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental railway, 1577
Royal Canadian Navy, 1893
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1208
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Calder, Hon. Senator J. A., 1393

Calder, Senator, United States
St. Lawrence river waterway 1206

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Abbatoir and cold storage plants in maritime provinces, 992
Agriculture
Cold storage facilities, 992-3
Department — salaries, 750
Exhibitions, 993
Fertilizer inspectors, 592
Lecturers, 1023
Saunders, Dr., resignation of, 591
Spruce bud moth, 595, 2668
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2734-8
Blankets, duty on, 3131
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 856
Budget, 2660. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Minister of Justice applauded by Opposition; fallacy of the home market argument; wheat and potatoes; reciprocity with United States; Mr. Chaplin; taxation; inconsistency of

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Prime Minister; sales tax burdensome to people least able to bear it, 2661; duty on clothing and silk goods; failure of budget to carry out Prime Minister's ideas; drawbacks and untaxed exports, 2262; a protectionist budget; tools of production; agricultural implements, prices in Canada and United States; fertilizers and the tariff, 2663; Maine and New Brunswick prices, 2664; cost of growing potatoes; reductions of duty on farm machinery; prospect of Liberals implementing tariff planks, 2665; Finance Minister's disavowal of tariff planks of Liberal platform, 2666; free trade; export duty on pulpwood and round logs; Canadian resources used to develop American industries, 2667; spruce bud moth; import and export duties, payment of, 2668; amendment; tariff revision; recent additions to Conservative party, 2669
Business of the House — concurrence, 1842
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
Directors, 2791
Public ownership, 1939
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3602, 3604
Privilege, question of, 3602
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
New polls to be established, two months prior to election day, amdt., 2815
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, qu. 704
Edmundston public building, 1240
Farm machinery, cost of, 769
Fertilizer Act Amdt., 775, 3041, 3194
Fertilizers
Duty on, 3140-3141
Inspectors, 592
Tariff and, 2664
Transportation rates on, 1022
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways in salmon rivers, 2167
Pollution of streams, 2168
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2818
Fishing Schooner race, 3510

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Forests
Destruction by spruce moth, 1049, 2668
Protection by fire towers, 1048
Gasoline tractors, 2123
Grading machines, 3126
Harness, duty on, 3137
Home brewing, 3141
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2791
Indians
Devon Band, proposed removal, 1216
Expenditure, 1225
Tobique reserve, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Insurance returns, 3254
Manufacturers — free traders, 3140
Militia and defence — annual drill, concurrence, 1842
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
National Defence bill, 745
Naval Service, sale of Niobe, 2065
Penitentiary Act Amdt. 789
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3445-56
Pension Board, staff, 1351
Pensions
Committee on, report, 2996, 3310-24
Commutation of, 1281
Disabilities, 390
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
Potatoes, 2661, 2666
Inspection and sale of, 2744. *See also under this title* Root Vegetables
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Privilege, Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec Harbour Commission — Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197
Root Vegetables, inspection and sale, 2744, 3486
Potato grades, 3370
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293-6
St. John, N.B., terminal facilities, M. 639, 844, 850
Saw-mill machinery, 3127
Senate indemnity, 3509
Silk fabrics, duty, 2662, 3137
Soldiers
Disabilities of, 392
Insurance, 3321
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1342-8
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Salaries, 1342
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Soldier land settlement, 2133, 3408
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2142
Payment of municipal taxation by Govt., 1257
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Steamship service, St. John and Cuba, 2028
Steel plates, delivery of, 3508
Sydney pilotage district, 3508
Widowed mothers, pensions, 1312, 3324
Woollen goods, duty on, 3129

Calgary
Buildings, rental of, 1254
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Live stock branch, qu. 607
Milk inquiry, cost of, qu. 823
Post office building, 1254
Trades and Labour Council, unemployment, 1082

Calydor, sanitarium, 1279

Cameras, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Cameron, Mr. Alex., qu. 606

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections

Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Address in reply, 356. Financial position of western farmer, 356; railway and freight problems, 357; maritime provinces and Confederation; financial condition of country, 358
Automobiles, protection of industry, 2730
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2729. Liberal pledges and promises; platform of 1919, 2729; statements of Prime Minister at Yorkton, Sask.; the budget a repudiation; the tariff, automobile industry, 2730; Sir John Macdonald's view of protection; guiding principle of national policy; Mr. Meighen and agricultural implement duties, 2731; tractors and farm machinery: cotton and woollen clothing; protection and the farmer; protected interests and campaign funds; betrayal of the people, 2732
Cadet services, expenditure, 1137
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy — Essex) for Special Com. 1426
Dominion lands, surveys, 1037
Experimental farm, Canora, 805

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. — *Con.*
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment, 2145
Holland, from, 2145
Medical inspection, 759
Indians
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1224
Saskatchewan reserves, qu. 608
Linen yarn from Canadian flax, bounty, 1361
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public Works Dept.
Filing clerks, 693
Officials, 692
Saskatchewan Indian reserves, qu. 608

Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 397

Camp Borden, Air Force and Civil aviation, 1728

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill

Canada Status of, 1337, 2324. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget; Limitation of Armaments; Naval Service

Canada-Australia-New Zealand steamship service, 3034

Canada Car and Foundry Company, 1696
Car repair contracts, 1696
Amherst shops, 1702
Port Arthur, 1696

Canada Cement Company, 200, 2297, 2300

Canada Gazette
Expenditure, Public Works Dept., 1268

Canada Grain Act. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry (Mr. Meighen) 1770

Canada-Mexico trade, qu. 606, 699, 700, 2989

Canada-Newfoundland Steamship service, 2027

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Exemption from Pilotage Dues) — Res. 1335, 1487; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 2819; 3r., 2820; Senate amdts. 3437
2. (Appointment of Harbour Masters) — Res. 1578, 3009; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3010

Canada Steamship Company
Life-saving equipment, qu. 1284

Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 3499
Plebiscite, 2024

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Provincial legislation) 1r., 1017; withdrawn, 2733
2. (Provincial government control of liquor importation) 1r., 2733; 2r., com., 2997; 3r., 3009
Senate amendments
Concurrence, 3614
Non-concurrence in, 3608
Conference, 3613
Subjects and items discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 3000, neg. 3006
Carriage or transportation, Amdt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3008
Date of coming into effect, Amdt. (Mr. Shaw 3007; withdrawn, 3008

Canada-West Indies-British Guiana service, qu. 2356

Canada-West Indies, South America service, 2027, 3026

Canada's Contribution. *See* League of Nations; Naval Service

Canadian Air Board. *See* Air Board

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Progressive Party; Wheat Board
Agricultural figures, 2649
Fiscal policy and proposals, 2508-9
Memorandum on Wheat Board referred to Agriculture Com., 377. *See* Agriculture and Colonisation Com.
Platform, 2345
Tariff criticisms and proposals, 2509, 2552. *See also* speeches on Budget

Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association, 1320. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See also* Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Canteen Funds. *See that title*
First contingent, qu. 1376
Medical inspection, 3317. *See also* Pensions
Repatriation of dependents, 1711
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, qu. 2038

Canadian Ford Company. *See* Automobiles

Canadian Forestry Association. *See* Forestry

Canadian Freighter. For names of Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels. *See* Vessels

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882, 2888. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Naval Service; Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
Canada-Newfoundland service, 2027
Coal from Japan, 2312, 2406
Cost of, 245, 247, qu. 469. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Dominion Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Employees' wages, qu. 3598
Inquiry as to sale of, 3104
Insurance, qu. 605
Lake marine, qu. 3362
Loans to, 3035
Lumber cargoes for Orient, 2311
Ocean and river service, 3507. *See also* Marine
Ocean freights. *See* British Preference
Outstanding claims, qu. 606
Ownership and operation of, 3037
Passenger traffic, qu. 939
Potatoes, shipment to Cuba, 2028
Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Co. claim, 3514
Shipments by. *See* St. John terminal; Steamship Services
Ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Subsidized steamship services, 3027, 3506
Welland canal, 2756-9
Vessels. *See also that title*
Britisher, steamer, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Freighter, qu. 963
Number of, qu. 469
Scottish, steamer, 3514

Canadian Government Railways, 873. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Deficits, qu. 607
Dining car service, qu. 2040

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237

Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 170. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Tariff, and, 2546

Canadian Mission, Colonel Delphine, 303

Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Grant, 3540

Canadian National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation
Accounting, 1908-18
Advances
$7,000,000, — 2779
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Amount required for, 381
Annual report, 1928
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 873; Canadian Government railways; 873; Grand Trunk system, 877; estimates, 879; freight rates, 879; reorganization, 880; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882; summaries, 882
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors
Bond sale in New York, 58
Branch lines, 1472, 1476, 1956
Bengough extension, 2770
British Columbia, 331
Eastern Maine railway, 1293
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 1965
Kamloops-Kelowna, qu. 937, 1134, 2797
Policy of Government, 1135
Business methods, 1692
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and, 3036
Canadian Northern railway, 123
Acquisition of, 2614
Advances to, qu, 471
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Agriculture, contribution to freight tonnage, 1927
Arbitration, 204
Bonded indebtedness, 190, qu. 368
Assumption by Dominion Govt., 2458
Co-ordination, 1907
Deficit, 191, 1907
Electrification of, 1317. *See also* Electrification
Federal subsidies, qu. 1504
Guarantee bill, 1914, legal expenses, 1667
Indebtedness of western provinces, 229
Insurance, qu. 471
Invasion of Ontario by, 202
Liabilities, qu. 368
Loans and subsidies to, 189-90, 204, qu. 1504, 1921
Mackenzie-Mann
Amounts paid to, qu. 935
Subsidy, qu. 607

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway — *Con.*
Mileage, qu. 368
Operating deficit, 1905
Responsibility for loans, 204. *See also under this sub-title,* Loans
Rorketon branch line, 2139
Subsidiary lines, 202
Taking over of, 190, 1907
Canadian Pacific railway, competition with, 65. *See also* Address; Budget; Railways
Car and locomotive contracts
Canadian Locomotive Company, 2794
Eastern Car Company, 2794
Car repairs. *See under this title,* Rail and Car Repair Contracts
Carey, Mr., 2858
Coal
Importations, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Consolidation, 6. 11, 28, 72, 73, 89. *See also* speeches *on* Address; Budget
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2168
Deficits, 1905-69, 1920
Corrected statement, 1919
Dining car and restaurant service, qu. 2040
Menus, cost of printing, qu. 1931
Rivers and Melville, Sask., restaurants, qu. 2038
Directors, Board of, 1924, 2194, 2791
Appointment of, 1936
Connection with supply companies, 2792
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1924, 1959, 1962
Labour costs, and, 2317
Interested in other companies, 1129
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 1924
Public ownership, sympathy with, 2852
Representation of employees, 2798
Statement of Prime Minister, 2792
Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46
Edith Cavell road, Jasper Park, 1052
Electrical operation, 1206, 1323. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway; *and under this title,* Public Ownership
Electrification, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627
Estimates, 1905
Fraser, Mr., right-of-way agent, 1134
Freight
Careless handling of, 1965
Rates. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Quebec and, 1472-5
Special Committee, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Grain leakages, qu. 1401, qu. 1930
Grain shipments, 2194. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, 189, 196, 203, 342, 1921
Advances, qu, 471, qu. 2037, 3520
$15,900,000, 1969
Branch lines, 3520
British Columbia in, 331
Cost of to the country, 196
Estimated, 205
Subsidiary lines, 203
Grand Trunk railway, 29. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Acquisition, 190, 235, 1922, 2612, 2616
Administration of, 64
Advances to, qu. 471, qu. 2037
$25,750,000, 1969
American mileage, 191, 204
Amount required, 381
Annual statement of Minister of Railways, 877
Arbitration, 128, 205, 2779
Comments of English newspapers, 374, 821
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772
Bonded security, advances, qu. 935
Coal, qu. 606
Deficit, 191. *See also* Annual Statement *under this title*
Employees
Pension rights and status, M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
English stock-holders, 64, 123
Financial statement, 1933
Government ownership, 125. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Kelley, Mr. H. B., 205
Mortgage trust deed, legal expenses, 1667
Officials, salaries, qu. 728
Portland terminal, 353, 920. *See also* British Preference and Canadian Seaports
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Hotels, 2806
Immigration, 1927, 2147, 2165. *See also that title*
Industrial councils, 1061
Insurance, qu. 471, qu. 610
Intercolonial railway, 106-111, 274, 312, 1967, 2688. *See also* Logan; Macdonald (Pictou)
Administration, 275
Domination by Canadian Northern railway, 193-194
Employees, enlistment of, 3518
Freight rates, 275, 355. *See also that title*

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Intercolonial railway — *Con.*
Gaspé and Bonaventure counties, in, 623
Gulf shore and Caraquet railway, qu. 1504
Local management, 313-314, 192
Management, inquiry, 407-8
Moncton headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Operation of, 107, 192
Passes on, 315
Patronage system, 106
Pension fund, qu. 938
Provident fund for employees, 2769
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Snow-cleaning, 313
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, qu. 2038, qu. 2213
Mail service, qu. 2799
Montreal, employees, 1288
National Transcontinental. *See under this title* Transcontinental
Overbuilding, 2569
Passenger traffic, qu. 927
Pension fund, qu. 938
Prince Edward Island railway, 1249
Public confidence, 1928
Public ownership and operation, 1907, 1933, 2193. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Purchases in anticipation of requirements, 1912
Quebec Oriental and Quebec Western railways, 623
Quebec terminals, 1475
Rail and car repair contracts, 1912, 1925, 1958, 2399
Board of management and, 1688-1710
Defective American cars, 1708
Steel cars, 1702-6, 1709
Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways
Regional control, 1923, 2196
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, qu. 2584
Revaluation, 1925
Right-of-way and lease agent, qu. 1633
Rolling stock repairs, 1212. *See also under this title* Rail and Car Repairs
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1774
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293, neg. 1296
Securities, qu. 3154
Shops
Moncton, 1709
Rivière du Loup, 1690
St. Malo, 1699
Transcona, 1705, 1708
Steel cars, qu. 2213
Repairs, 1702-1709

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Telegraphs, qu. 3360
Ties, ques. 934, 2209
Purchases of in Quebec, qu. 1659
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Toronto railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Transcontinental railway, 111, 125, 278, 919, 1921, 2493
Cost, 2193
Enlisted men, allowance to, 3518
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472-5
Grain shipments by, 2194
Lease of Eastern division, legal expenses, 1667
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 545, 2194
St. John valley, 3039
Unification, 1907, 1923-5, 2585. *See also under this title* Consolidation; Public Ownership
Water supply, Ste. Anne-St. Pierre, qu. 2213
Working expenditures, 2779

Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway, 146, 191. *See also* Address; Canadian National Railways; Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway; Freight Rates
Advance in price of stock, 129
Beatty, Mr. E. W., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1606, 1856
Coal lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition with Grand Trunk, 64. *See also that title*
Cost, 2193
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2167
Directors, voting trust, 1936
Electrical operation, 71, 1206. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See that title*
False creek bridge, removal, 3516
Freight Rates. *See that title*
Immigration and, 351
Indian Department, payment to, 3518
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, ques. 2040, 2213
New England states, connection with, 1294
Palais station, Quebec, 1068
Public ownership, 1937, 2329
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688-1710
Rates, *See* Freight Rates

Canadian Pacific Railway — *Con.*
Shares held by custodians of alien enemy property, 1672
Success of, 123
Transcontinental railway, opposition to, 2194

Canadian Patriotic Fund bill
Res. 3156, 3366; 1r., 3366; 2r., com., 3477; 3r., 3484

Canadian Press, Limited, 772

Canadian Red Cross Society bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3387; 3r., 3388

Canadian Representation in the United States, 1383, 2026, 2864, 2990
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments Conference. *See that title*

Canadian Seaports, trade through, 104. *See also* British Preference; Steamship Services; Trade

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., 1677

Canadian Transit Company. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Canadian Wheat Board Bill. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Res. 3174; 1r., 2r., com., 3179; com., 3379; 3r., 3387
Amdts:
(Mr. Johnson, Moosejaw) 3178
(Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 3180
(Mr. Johnson-Mr. Robb) agreed to, 3383

Canadians
Distressed, relief for, 2027
Emigrating. *See* Immigration

Canalization. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland canal

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Chambly, improvements, 3518
Frankfurt, 1189
Georgian Bay, 1184, 1199, 1200-1209, 1319, 1397-8

Canals — *Con.*
Lachine
Widow of late James Innes, allowance, 2779
Manchester, 1189
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764
Construction of storehouse at Ottawa, 2764
Expenditure on, 2860
Improvements, 2769
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges
Improvements, 2768
Roadway, 2768
Traffic through, qu. 705
Panama, Suez and Soo canals, 1203
Trent
Estimates, 2764
Nassau dam, qu. 2457
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Welland, qu. 827, 1184, 1205, 1207, 2747
Contracts for sections 3 and 4, qu. 3600
Co-operation with United States, 2749-51
Estimates, 2747
Amdt. (Mr. Millar) to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758
Port Colborne elevator, claim of Mr. J. A. Jamieson, 1687
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1321. *See also that title*
Tonnage, qu. 936
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Water power rights, 2747. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Cancellation of Leases. *See* Dominion Lands

Canned Fish. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Food

Canned Goods, Marking of. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Canneries, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Cannes Conference, 1716. *See also* Genoa Conference
Submarines, 1845

Canning Licenses. *See* British Columbia Fisheries; Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Budget, 2909. Defeat of Tory party; administration facing serious situation; Progressive party; reasons for

Cannon, Mr. Lucien — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Liberal victory; tribute to Prime Minister; platform of 1919; restoration of constitutional liberty; responsibility for conduct of public officials; responsible government and commission control, 2910; Canadian National Railways; a word to the West; Quebec the friend of the West; provincial autonomy, 2911; railways; Liberalism, hope of the West; division amongst Progressive forces, 2912
Canadian National Railways, public ownership, 1936-42
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, Senate admts., 3615
Limitation of Armaments, 3166
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, payments to, 2772
Militia, arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2092
Naval policy, 2085
Point of order, parliamentary committee, 3354
Public Works estimates, preparation of, 1270
Royal Canadian Navy, 1887-90,

Canteen Funds, undistributed, disposal of, qu. 2215, 3290, 3308, 3328, 3331, 3334, 3346, 3350

Capital Ships. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 1183, qu. 1504

Carey, Mr., and Canadian National Railways, 2858

Caribou. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Address in reply, 155. French language; western opinions, 156; financial and economic outlook in the West, tariff question, 157; freight rates; grain speculation, banking conditions, 158
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, amdt. 1606
Deputy Minister of Finance, 753
Experimental farms, 800

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. — *Con.*
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. 3486
Justice Dept. — Private secretary, 1669
Kindersley post office building, 1254
Militia, annual drill, 1177
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 1253
Telephone lines, Saskatchewan, 2012
Wheat Board, 3181

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Transit Company, bill, 1771
Cold storage, 819
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Dominion Elections Act. Amdt. 2812
Fuel oil, 178
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward Island, 1991
Indians, Sydney reserve, 1215
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Labour dept. increases, 568
Labour men and unions, 228
National Defence bill, 743
Nova Scotia Miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499, 532
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt., appeal, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442
Pensions Committee, final report, 3316
Pensions — Royal Commission, 3327
Unemployment situation, 1076
Steel rails contracts, 1076
Sydney steel workers, 1076

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Civil Service — patronage, 3086
Little Current harbour improvements, 2002

Cars. *See also* Railways
Governor General's, 1688
Repairs. *See* Canadian National Railways
Shortage of. *See* Freight Rates

Cartier Square militia stores shed, qu. 2038

Carty, Captain, qu. 1062

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 2670. Congratulations to Prime Minister upon title of Imperial Privy Councillor; Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; budget proposals; abnormal conditions, 2670; principles of the Liberal party; platform of 1919; Opposition amdt. not to be taken seriously; theories and arguments of the official Opposition and Progressive party; the golden mean; moderate protection, 2671; sales tax; inequality of income tax; burden borne by small wage-earners; proposed exemption of heads of large families; tax on cigarettes and cigars; exemptions from sales tax, 2672; cheque tax; leaf tobacco; tariff reductions; automobile tax, 2673; Borden and Meighen Governments responsible for present conditions; Canadian National Railways, management, board of directors, deficits; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; public debt; economy; Purchasing Commission; Civil Service Commission, 2674; reduction in civil service; public works in Charlevoix-Montmorency; Canada's future, 2675

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1356
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 642
Steamship service, Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Superintendent of Lighthouses, Quebec, qu. 2584

Cash Grants to Soldiers. *See* Soldiers' Bonus

Cassels, Professor Gustavus, 1292

Cattle. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited herds, Health of Animals; Live stock industry
British embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Decline in prices of, 77. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Diseases of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Exported to United States, 2450, 2695
Fordney tariff and. *See* United States, Fordney
Markets for, 977

Cattle Embargo, 93, 334, 361, 970, 973, 979, 985, 989, 992, 1002, 1031, 1283, 2182, 2571, 2597. *See also* Live Stock Industry
Alleged statement of Hon. Mr. Larkin, High Commissioner, 1020, 1463, 1502
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283
Removal of, 2597

Cedar Rapids power, 71, qu. 728, qu. 1375. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Census of 1921, 20, 56. *See also* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics
Agricultural assets and liabilites, 2159
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Appointment of, 1368
Payment of, 1367-9
Irregularities, 1363, 1365, 1367
Population, by ages, qu. 1632
Redistribution, and, 1363-71
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Report of Commissioner, 1366
Verification of figures, 1366

Central Vermont Railway. *See* Grand Trunk Railway

Chair rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497

Chambly Canal. *See* Canals

Champlain, steamship, qu. 1400

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture Dept. — salary increases, 657
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3237
Budget, 2616. Ross rifle, war wagons and equipment; acquisition of Grand Trunk; congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity treaty, 2616; tariff proposals; automobile tax; tax on soft drinks, grape juice, 2617; consumption of farm produce in Canada; discrepancy as to agricultural exports; padded figures; non-agricultural commodities included in statement of exports, 2618; value of home market; agricultural implements, 2619; home and foreign trade in; prices in Canada and abroad, 2620; trend of tariff legislation in United States; Mr. Crerar's prophecy, 2621; farmers' platform; alleged effect of protective tariff; statement that consumer pays $4 for every dollar of revenue collected, 2622; export freight rates, 2623; cost of collecting customs duties; prices of kodaks in Canada and United States; political pledges; speech of late Hon. J. Israel Tarte, 2624
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

Chaplin, Mr. James D. — *Con.*
Cash bonus to soldiers, 402
Cheque tax, 3260
Dominion lands, temporary employees, 1036
Experimental farm employees, 652
Ford automobiles, 3274
Government printing, 1972
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu. 471
Harbours and Rivers
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1993, 1997
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Interior Dept., salary increases, 457
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and Defence
Arsenals, 1979
Lindsay, 2086
Quebec, 2091
Military property in Lincoln county, 1980
Pay of staff, 1982
Permanent force, 1983
Staff reduction, 420
Junior clerks, 416, 419
Transport and freight, 1986
Mutual insurance, 3255
Orders in Council, qu. 934
Printing and stationery supplies, 454
Privy Council officials, 410
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 1244
St. Catharines post office, 1246-50
Rail and car repair contracts, 1709
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls highway, qu. 936
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salaries and officials, 398-9
Salary increases, 386
Welland canal, construction, 2753

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlevoix-Montmorency public works, 2675

Charlottetown, quarantine station, 2021

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks and Banking

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Budget, 2561. Speech of the Minister of Agriculture; Wheat Board; Liberal pledges; introduction of national policy; the amendment; Government's failure to implement promises, 2561; Mr. Murphy at Milton; Government by Order in Council; business and luxury taxes; profiteers; inaction of Minister of Labour, 2562; sales tax; Civil Service Commission; patronage; the tariff; protection and free trade, 2563; statement of Finance Minister;

Charters, Mr. Samuel — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
manifesto of Progressive party; tariff changes; agricultural implements; fruit industry, 2564; pessimistic view of present day conditions; reciprocity; rural population; rural school attendance; value of farm lands; farm production, 2565; automobiles; Ontario Government immigration literature, 2566; future of Canada, 2567
Long Branch rifle range, qu. 372

Cheques. *See* Special War Revenue; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Absence through sickness, 3509
Bonus, 3531
Commission, 3064
Pensions Com., final report, 3337
Senate indemnity, 3509

Chief Architect's Branch. *See* Public Works

Chief Electoral Officer
Assistant, salary of, 3538
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3603, 3606
Report of Fourteenth General Election, of 1921, 1258
Report, printing of, 871
Residential qualification, 1297

Children
Dependent. *See* Income War Tax Act
Health of. *See* Daylight saving; Health
Immigration. *See that title*
Infant mortality in cities, 2634
Miners of, in Nova Scotia, 529
Oleomargarine, effect on health, 178. *See also that title*
Pensions to. *See* Pensions Com. report
Save the Children fund, 3516
School attendance, 2565. *See also* Education
Soldiers of
Alleged ill-treatment, 2638
Education. *See* Pensions Com.
Provision for, 3315-16

China
Commissioner of Immigration in, ques. 2026, 2214
Dr. Tsur, Chinese Consul General, 1776
Eggs, importation from, 177
Treaties with. *See* Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty; Far Eastern Treaty

Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161

Chinese Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens

Chippewa electrical development, 72, 1327. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Civil Service, officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Inverness pier, 1766
Margaree breakwaters, 1767

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Address in reply, 116. Congratulations to Speaker; standing of different parties, 116; race and religious differences, 118; Speech of Hon. Ernest Lapointe; Battlefields Commission, 119; taxation methods, 120; unemployment and housing, 121; Good roads; public ownership, 122; Hydro-electric, 123, 131; public ownership of railways, 133; work of Sir Adam Beck, 134; radial railways, 134; St. Lawrence river waterway, 135; German trade; Senate reform; Civil service reform, 138; Conservative and Liberal gains and losses, 138-139; combines; ties with mother land; High Commissioner, 139
Alienation of natural resources, qu. 2992
Backus, Mr. E. W., lease of timber area, 2805
Blind soldiers, pensions, 3310, 3358, 3404
Bonds, sale of by public tender, 1468
Budget, 2392. Tariff not a political question; Tories and Radicals; Conservatives and protection; national policy; home market, 2392; the Progressives; United Farmers' platform; Liberals and free trade; protection and the growth of cities and towns ;tariff increase world wide; protectionist budgets of Liberal governments; tariff reduction and sales tax increase; Progressives and big interests, 2393; farmers and other producers highly organized; time for consumers to get together; tax burden on urban population; cigarette and tobacco taxes; railway problem; Canadian Pacific and Crowsnest pass agreement; trade with Germany, 2394; trusts, combines and war profiteers; tax evaders; taxation in Ontario; war time amusement tax; cheque tax; protest of Toronto and other municipalities, 2395; posterity should pay; Wheat Board; cost of living; Bank Act; Merchants Bank, 2396; judges serving on political com-

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
missions; prison reform; civil service, 2397; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2398
Business of the House, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1462
Cadet corps, 1147, 1973
Canadian battlefields, 119, 771
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3038
Canadian National Railways, 68
Carey, Mr., 2858
Directors' sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian representation in the United States, 2990
Civil Service retirement fund, income tax, qu. 937
Coal, price of, qu. 2039
Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902
Committee speeches, relevancy, 555-6
Criminal Code — poolselling, bookmaking, etc., 2973
Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214
Customs receipts, qu. 470
Daylight saving, qu, 372
M. (Mr. Kay) 946
Disability soldier cases, 3318
Elevators
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, qu. 3152
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 489
Federal subsidies to Ontario, qu. 2214
France, trade relations with, 2990
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2563-94
Railway Act Amdt. bill (suspension of agreement) 3594; amdt. 3595
Special Com. on, third report, 3560-4
Fuel, price of, qu. 1774
"General" Macdonald's army, reception of, 2256
Government office building in Ottawa, 1252
Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375
Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Judges' Act Amdt. 546
Judges and commissions, qu, 366, 2397
Labour dept., policy, 464-5, 559
Lake of the Woods control, 2805
Joint board, qu. 2970
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3365
Life-saving stations, qu. 367
Merchant lake marine, qu. 3362
Merchants Bank case, qu. 367, 2396, 3604
Case against D. C. Macarow, qu. 2305

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1177
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177, qu. 1285
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Cadet services, 1147, 1973
Expenditure and policy
1890-1913, qu. 1285
Annual drill, proposed reduction, 1613
First Canadian contingent, qu. 1376
Ministers and directorships, 1125
National Defence bill, 742
Naval policy, 2043
Naval Service
Navy men, travelling expenses, qu. 3156
Royal Canadian Navy, 1894, 2043
Patronage, appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Penitentiary inmates, qu. 3362
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442-62
Amdt. (Blind soldiers) 3358, 3404
Pensions
Evidence, 3357
Mothers, qu. 1375
Old age, qu. 1375
Pensions Committee final report, 3309
Postal affairs, qu. 368
Post Office, drop letter rate, 1250
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment (Royal Canadians) qu. 1065
Prison reform, 1277, 2397
Inspection by Grand juries, qu. 1773
Jail farms, qu. 1773
Youthful offenders, qu. 1773
Provincial commissions, Hon. Mr. Justice Riddell and Mr. Justice Latchford, qu. 3600
Public buildings
Flags, 1260
Maritime provinces, 1244
Ontario, 1246-51
Rental and purchase of, 1262
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1467, 1482
Railway Act Amdt. bill (special passenger rates) 1460
Rental and purchase of buildings, 1252
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3391
Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu. 3361
St. Lawrence river waterway, 135, 2398
Correspondence with United States, 2357
International Joint Commission report, 2357
M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Toronto
Customs house, qu. 470
Harbour improvements, 1467

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Toronto — *Con.*
Public buildings, 1246-7
Railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Steam railway freight, qu. 936
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2990
Welland canal, qu. 827
Construction, 1687
Tonnage, qu. 936

Cigars and Cigarettes, tax on. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue; Taxation; Tobacco

Civil Aviation. *See* Air Force

Civil Pensions. *See* Pensions

Civil Service. *See also* Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Absence through sickness, 3509
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence bill
Appointments, 337, 2559, 3065, 3098
Members, and, 3074-3077
Recommendations of. *See under this title,* Patronage
Outside service, post offices, 3073-4
Procedure, 573
Soldiers, 3330, qu. 3361. *See also* Soldiers
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 733, 1258, 2397-8, 2513, 2801, 2805, qu. 3364, 3531
Announcement by Prime Minister, 1503
Appropriation, 3528
Inquiry as to payment of, 2996
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, nurses, 1342
Withdrawal of from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Calder Bill. *See* Public Service Retirement Act
Classification, 455, 466, 494, 693, 3067, 3089
Appeals against, qu. 1508
Arthur Young Company, 1490
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904
Board of Hearing, 1491
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Militia dept., 416
Post Office, money order branch, qu. 1285
Printed copies of, qu. 1930
Responsibility for, 1491
Commission
Abolition of, recommended, 2563, 2674-5
Appointments agriculture dept., 2599
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904

Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission — *Con.*
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368
Commissioners
Annual salary and travelling expenses, qu. 364-5
Appointment of, 2659
Cost of, qu. 364-5
Employees
Number of, qu. 364
Salaries, 3093
Estimates, 3102
Exemptions, 3078-9
History of and legislation creating, 3065
Jurisdiction, 736-7
Salaries over, 2801
Militia dismissals, 423
Officials and employes, qu. 364-5, 3093
Organization branch, qu. 935
Putnam, Mr., C.V., qu. 935, 3090
Powers of, 553, 554
Report, qu. 826
Salaries and contingencies, etc., qu. 364-5, 386, 3091, 3509
Secretary, qu. 826
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and. *See that title*
Deputy ministers, qu. 3364
Increase in salaries, 2805
Militia and Naval Service. *See* National Defence
Dismissals, 3083-3090
Economy in, 401, 423, 2057-61, 2371. *See also* Address; Budget
Examination, 871
Hours, 2321, 2371,
Income tax department, 1663
Industrial councils, 1061
List, qu. 727
Married women employed in, qu. 1658
Memorandum of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Militia services amalgamation, 418-19. *See also* National Defence
Overmanning of, 2371, 2450, 3099. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Patronage and, 199, 2563, 3073, 3080, 3094, 3096
Promotions, 576, 3066
Public Service Retirement Act. *See that title*
Qualifications, 3070
Reduction of, 2674-5
Reform, 138, 3075
Reorganization, 2061. *See also under this title,* Classification
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490
Sherbrooke post office inspector, 1507

Civil Service — *Con.*
Responsibility, 3076
Retirement. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Fund, qu. 826
Income tax, qu. 937
Lightkeepers, 1496
Rural postmasters, 3079, 3095-6
Salaries and remuneration, 552, 2243, 2321, 2397, 2513, 2805, 3075, 3081, qu. 3364
Employees receiving less than $600, qu. 1067
Hours and, 2321, 2371
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Paying of. *See* Interim Supply
Recommendations, 550
Reductions, 2690-1
Salaries of $960 and less, qu. 1660, 1775
Statement of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Tariff Commission, appointment of, 1663
Temporary employees, 1036. *See also* individual departments
Vacancies, filling of, 792. *See also under this title* Appointments

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 3601
Messrs. Fisher & Oughton, Prince Rupert, qu. 1772, 3606
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1337
Income tax collections, 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Militia and Defence, expenditure and policy, 1335
National Defence bill, 678
Naval Service — Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Northwest Rebellion, pensions of Mounted Police, 3523
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1523
Quebec Harbour, appropriations for, 1486
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3443-55
Pensions Com., 391
Final report, 3327
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3400
Revenues from imports, qu. 827
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Doctors Lovering and Taylor, qu. 1211
Industrial disputes, 679
Northwest Rebellion, pensions and claims, 3523
Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Vancouver
Drydock, 3542
Harbour work, 1485
Terminal railway, 1485
War, preparation for, 1335

Clark, Dr. Michael, 295

Clarke Trading Co., transport of supplies, 1681

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clay Products, 1234

Closure, application of. *See* Interim Supply

Clothing, duty on, 2186, 2465, 2662. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Coal. *See also* Fuel; Mines; Natural Resources; Railways
Anthracite importations, qu. 2356, 2686
Bituminous, 2686
British Columbia, mines in, 178
By products of, 3525
Canadian, 2687
Use of in public buildings, 1759
Canadian National Railways
Imported for, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Canadian Pacific lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition
Fuel oil, 2312
United States Mines, with, 2612
Conservation of supply by power development, 1188. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Drumheller mines, 85
Duty on, 2342
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Manitoba from, 1763
Japan from, qu. 963, 2312, 3406
Labour. *See also that title*
Canmore employers and miners dispute, 1058
District No. 18 Board, 1058
Drumheller mines, 86
Employers and miners' dispute, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Nova Scotia Miners' strike, 1054. *See also that title*
Oriental aliens, 2312. *See also that title*
Cumberland mines, in, 2407
Wages in Nova Scotia, 1078. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Lands
Transfer by Canadian Pacific, qu. 2214
United States in, purchase of, 2611
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization Board, 1233, 3524

Coal — *Con.*
Lightboats, for, qu. 606
Mineral development, 686
Mining industry, protection, 2312
Montreal requirements, 630
Nova Scotia, 2412
Freight charges on, 193, 194
Miners. *See that title*
Powdered, 2713-5
Price of, 465, 1758, 1774, qu. 2037, qu. 2039
Effect of freight rates on, 132-133
Reduction in, 1490, 1494
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Importation for, 1763
Railways
Canadian National Railways, qu. 926, 2213
Purchases for, qu. 2306
Grand Trunk Railway, qu. 606
Royalties, qu. 375
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316
Smoky river, lease of coal lands, 3465
Supply, control, 71
Transportation. *See* Freight rates
Waterpowers and, 2182

Coats, Mr. R. H. *See* Statistics, Bureau of

Cocaine. *See* Opium

Cocoa and Chocolate. *See* Customs Tariff

Cockshutt, Lieut. Governor, 1128

Cockshutt Plough Company, Minister of Justice and, 242

Codling Moth. *See* Entomology

Coinage. *See also* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nickel, five cent piece, 1132
Silver, millesimal fineness, 1132

Cold Storage. *See* Agriculture

Collective Bargaining, 2322

Colonial Status. *See* Naval Service; Prime Minister's Conference

Combines, 139. *See also* Address; Budget; Trusts

Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade

Commercial Travellers. *See* Budget; Income War Tax Act Amdt.

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions
Judges serving on, qu. 366, 546, 2397

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation

Commodity Tax. *See* Taxation

Companies Act, Privy Council appeal, legal expenses, 1671

Compensation. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases amdt.

Compensation for Injuries. *See* Air Board Act Amdt.

Compulsory Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.

Compulsory Legislation. *See* Wheat Board

Compulsory Military Service. *See* Military Service Act 1917 Amdt. bill

Con Rein, sinking of, M. (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 1382, agreed to, 1384

Concurrence. *See* Supply

Condensed Milk tax on, 2492, 3264-71, 3409

Confectionery, tax on, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857

Confederation, basis of, 154
Maritime provinces and, 228. *See also* Intercolonial Railway

Conferences
Brussels Financial, 1138, 1292
Building trades, 582-3
Cannes, 823, 1716, 1845
Genoa, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 1292, 1463, 1675, 1715-6, 1845, 2035, 2337
Expenses, 1715
Europe, in, 1336
Imperial, 1864. *See also under this title* Prime Ministers'
International Labour, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments, 7, 1283, 1731, 1737, 1844-95
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert, report M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
National Industrial, qu. 1375
Postal, 7, 15
Potato growers, 3367
Prime Ministers', 1624, 1864, 1883, 2042, 2082
Trades Union, Rome, 1060

Conferences — *Con.*
Washington. *See under this title,* International Labour; Limitation of Armaments

Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153

Connor, James, dismissal of, 1674

Conscription, 22, 61, 90-91, 2570, 2685. *See also* Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt.

Conservation Commission, transfer of employees, 3495. *See also* Interior Dept.; White, Mr. James

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 1210; 2r., com., 3r., 3042

Consortium to re-establish Russian trade, 1463

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Conferences; League of Nations; Naval Service

Constitutionality of Wheat Board. *See* Wheat Board

Consular Agents. *See* Trade and Commerce

Consular Certificates. *See* Customs; Trade and Commerce

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Immigration; Penitentiary Act Amdt.

Contingency Vote. *See* Departments; Estimates; Supply

Coolie Labour. *See* Oriental Aliens

Co-operative Pooling. *See* Wheat Board

Co-ordination. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agriculture dept., travelling expenses, 657
Automobiles and parts, imports, qu. 1633
Automobile tax, 3276
Banks
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, etc. qu. 1182
Board of Commerce, cost, report, qu. 2583
Budget, 2724. The amendment; party politics a curse, 2724; the budget a disappointment; national debt; tax exempt bonds; conscription of wealth during war time, 2725; taxation of implements of production; oil and well-drilling machinery; western problems; grasshoppers, 2726; cattle industry; amalgamation of Merchants' Bank and Bank of Montreal, 2727; banking system, ratio of deposits to capital; credit; distribution of products; Wheat Board; tariff a geographical question; treatment of western Canada, 2729
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National railways, freight rates advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 3419, 3423
Dominion notes, qu. 3153
Esquimalt dry dock, 3541
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Grasshoppers, 2726, 3520
Immigration
Child, 2161
Farmers, 3064
Italian, 2171
Policy, 2161
Indians
Blood reserve, 1219, 1224
Land leased, qu. 2969
Education, schools in Alberta, 1232
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Live stock industry, 991, 2727
Macleod post office, qu. 2804
Penitentiaries, inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Ploughs, duty on, 3123
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., Chairman, 2773-5
Langley, Hon. George, statement, 2773
Redistribution, 1370
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Macleod, 2584
Steel bounties, qu. 3360
Tariff inquiry, 1920-21, cost, report, publication, qu. 2215
Threshing machines, 3125
Total trade, 1900-1921, qu. 1633
Tree-planting on prairies, 1051
Unemployment figures, qu. 3362
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
Wheat Board, 2729, 3182, 3189

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 1672, 3601
Prince Rupert, 3606
Alleged election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Archives Branch, Dr. Doughty, 702
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Civil Service
Commission, 3102
Examinations, 872
Harbour and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Lusitania reparation claims, 3599
Moncton car shops, 1709
Naturalization Act, Amdt. bill, 3104, 3436
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1992
Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill, 1661, 3025, 3148
Rail and car repair contracts, 1708
Secretary of State dept.
Estimates, 701, 1671, 2977, 3499
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Privilege, correction of report in Montreal Gazette, 1721

Corporation Control. *See* Railways

Corporation-Owned Railroads in United States, 67-70. *See also* Railways, Public ownership

Correction of Division List. *See* House of Commons Divisions

Correspondence, quoting from. *See* Speaker's Rulings

Cost of Living, 2349, 2359, 2396, 2578. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Unemployment
Labour Gazette and, 1057
Prices, deflation of, 1216-18
Purchasing power of money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603
Sales tax, and, 2676. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2882. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation on, 2364. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Wages based on, 1303

Cotton Industries
Duties, 2469, 3127. *See also* Customs Tariff
Wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903

Coughlin Shipbuilding Company, 3542

County Courts, establishment in Quebec, 3496

County Fairs. *See* Agriculture, Exhibitions

Courtenay Bay, qu. 365. *See also* St. John Harbour

Courtney, B.C., post office building, 1258

Cow Bay wharf, 1766

Cream Separators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Credits. *See* Banking; Finance; Financial Credits; Housing; Loans; Roumania and Greece; Unemployment

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette, Leader of the Progressive party)
Address in reply, 50. Congratulations to Speaker, Miss Macphail, mover and seconder of Address; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 50-51; election campaign, 51; negotiations between Government and Progressives, 51; attitude of Progressive party, 52; condition of agriculture; wheat marketing, 53; production costs; transportation costs; freight rates; tariff revision, 54; Sir Lomer Gouin; railways, public ownership, 55-56; immigration, burden of taxation, 56-57; soldiers' re-establishment, 57; Limitation of Armaments; Genoa Conference; economy, need for; burden of taxation, 58; redistribution; proportional representation, 59
Adjustment of war claims, 1672
Agricultural exports, figures used in budget debate, 2638
Agriculture
Condition and prospects, 53, 2156, 2471
Dept., salary increases, 588
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
McCoig, Senator, attendance before, 1901
Wheat Board report, 780. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Alien enemy property, 1672
American magazines, 3113
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102
Audibility of debates, 708
Board of Commerce, 1715
British Columbia, and, 2234-9
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 716
Budget, 2459. Congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to Finance Minister; difficult and perplexing problems; unsatisfactory financial position; debt and taxation, 2459; railway expenditures; revenue and expenditure; discrepancy between income and outgo, 2460; limit of taxation about reached; economy; new taxation; reorganization of departments and elimination

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of duplication; new administration buildings; overlapping of Dominion and provincial expenditures, 2461; sales tax, inequitable and unsound; cheque tax; tax on foreign insurance companies, 2462; co-ordination of financial policy; overlapping of taxation; reciprocity with United States; valuation and marking goods; valuation of currency, 2463; trade with Germany; a protectionist budget; no statement of government policy; agricultural implements, 2464; inconsistencies in agricultural machinery schedule; government failure to implement pledges; clothing; boots and shoes; household equipment, 2465; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; tariff platform of 1919; Liberal resolution of 1921; tariff proposals not what country requires; discrimination against United States, 2466; tariff legislation before Congress; American factories in Canada; opposition to protection in United States, 2467; Progressive party unalterably opposed to protection; development of natural resources; home market fallacy; manufacture of rubber goods; cotton; raw material and finished product; protection sectional and selfish; movement of population; exodus of Canadian workmen; maritime provinces under protective policy, 2469; rural depopulation in Ontario; prairie provinces; Vancouver and free port proposal, 2470; agriculture prospers in spite of protection; development of west; prosperity from 1900 to 1912 not due to tariff; export of natural products, 2471; tendency of economic thought in Europe; trade begets friendship; the amendment, 2472; no constructive proposal; amdt. to amdt. proposed, 2473
Business of the House
Budget (amdt. to amdt., Sir Henry Drayton) 2473, 2507, 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2640
Easter adjournment, 820
Empire and Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Government orders, Monday and Wednesday, 1461, 1720
Privilege on Orders of Day, right to raise, 2638

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3036
Canadian National Railways
Deficits, 1920
Canadian Northern, 1907
Immigration, 1927
Public ownership and operation, 1920
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689, 1707, 1925
Revaluation of, 1925
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Civil Service
Commission, 3078
Patronage, 3080, 3096
Cold storage warehouse, Montreal, 819
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3595
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1414-20-29, 1433, 1454
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 3423
Estimates, 762
Officials, 764
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract for steel plates, 1678
Elevators, terminal, administration, 2980. *See also under this title,* Grain Inquiry Commission
Emigration, record of, 2158
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See under this title* Crowsnest
Immigration and, 2157
Genoa Conference, 1715
Cannes Conference, 823
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Governor General's cars, 1688
Grain and grain trade. *See also under this title* Wheat Board
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1933
Russia, competition in wheat market, 2157
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, 2982, 2895
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Immigration
Central European, 2157
Policy, 2156
Railways, and, 1929, 2157

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1394
Intercolonial Railway, maritime management, 193
Interior Dept., economy, 455
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Justice Dept., contingencies, 1668
Labour
Estimates, 579180
Technical education, 459
Liberal party, negotiations with, 34-35, 51
Limitation of Armaments Conference, 9, 3167
Militia and Defence
Co-ordination of services, 417
Expenditure and policy, 1593
National Defence bill, 739-40
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Naval Service
Empire defence contribution, 2081-2
Fleet 420
Policy, 2081
Nova Scotia miners, 508
M. (Mr. Irvine) 542
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation of M. (Mr. Neill) 1821
Ploughs, duty on, 3121-3122
Political inquesting, 404
Population, need of increased, 2158
Privilege, questions of
Agricultural figures used in budget debate, 2637
Member's right to raise on Orders of day, 2638
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1652
Public ownership, 1920, 1923
Rail and car repair contracts, 1684, 1707, 1925
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass) 3595
Railway policy 1920, 1923
Responsibility as leader of Opposition, 73
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 835
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 444
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salary increases, 398, 404
Discussion out of order, 398, 404
Speaker, election of, 4
Speaker, Mr., death of father, 496
Steamship services
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canadian Govt. Merchant marine, subsidies, 3032
Revision of, 3034
West Indies, 3032

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1692
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Tariff, immigration and, 2157
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Treaties of peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3490
Union Government, resignation from, 2490
United Grain Growers, Limited, 2489
Terminal elevator, 2983
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2750
Wheat Board, 377, 2922
Fixation of prices, 2588
Proceedings in Committee, 2934
Wheat Board bill, 3186, 3191, 3384, 3386

Crime. *See also* Criminal Code; Penitentiaries
Foreign immigration and, 1392-4

Criminal Code
Reprinting and revision, 1278, 1717

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 865; com,. 865, 1388; ref. to Special Com., 1395, 1503; report, 1988. *For further stages, see* Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth)
2. Newspaper ownership (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821
3. Scrip Frauds (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 1062; 2r., 3211-3217; com., 3217; 3r., 3221
4. Age of consent; automobile theft; bribing police commissioners; carrying animals by railways; carnal knowledge; clerk of peace, Quebec; indecent assault; protection of English hall marks; recovery of penalties from corporations by civil process; retention of fines by municipalities in Ontario (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1841; 2r., com., 2830, 2973; 3r., 2974; Senate amdts., 3607
Subjects and sections discussed:
Age of consent, 2830-1
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Conveyance of cattle, 2831-34
Feeble-minded person, carnal knowledge of, 2973
Game of chance, 2973
Pool-selling, bookmaking, 2973

Criminal Conspiracies. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Cronyn, Mr. Hume, reference to. *See* Pensions Committee, final report

Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See* Freight Rates

Crude Oil. *See* Fuel Oil

Cruelty to Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Society for prevention of, 2831

Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214

Cuba
Shipment of potatoes to, 2028
Steamship service to. *See that title*

Cultivators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Cumberland, B.C.
Mines, 2407
Voting in, 180

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Gold standard, 1291
Valuation for customs, 2113, 2173, 2389, 2420, 2463, 2599, 2641, 2859, 2875, 2884, 2897, 3223-4. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.

Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, Res. 1132, 3042; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3043

Currie, General Sir Arthur, 1986

Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill (Dumping clause; consular certificates; valuation for duty; currency) 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Act; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Taxation; Trade
Automobiles, tax on. *See* Automobiles
British goods imported, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
Collections, New Brunswick, qu. 607
Consular certificates, 2114, 3477, 3522. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.
Department
Connor, Mr. James, gratuity, 1674
L'Assomption and Montcalm excise officers, qu. 1774
Montreal employees, 1288
Organization, 1674, 2808
Printing, 1674
Salaries, 762
Veit, Mr. A. E., J. M., qu. 1773
Drawbacks, qu. 764, 828, 1067, 2175, 2186, 2662-3, 2840-50, 2895, 3141. *See also* Budget Speeches; Customs Tariff
Ford Motor Co., 2850
Payments of, 1922, qu. 2356, 2849-50

Customs and Excise — *Con.*
Drawbacks — *Con.*
Sugar on, 2850, 3251, 3476-7
Steel rods, refund, qu. 1774
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3410-13, 3477. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Duties
Cost of collecting, 239, 240, 2623-4
Fruit, 164. *See also under this title,* Dumping clause
Fuel oil on, 178
Militia dept., 1978
Per capita payment, 2691
Rebates of, 2175. *See also under this title,* Drawbacks
Valuation for, 2172. *See also* Currency
Excise tax
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu. 1400, 2114. *See also* Alcohol; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, 2852
Beer brewed for private use, 2856
Beet sugar, 2117, 2855. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue
Tobacco, 2115
Canadian raw leaf, 2853
Cigarettes, 2852
German goods, valuation. *See* Currency; Customs Act; Germany; Imports
Imports and exports
By countries, 2109
Marking and valuation of, 2113, 2174, 2410, 2463, 2879, 2897, 3413. *See also* Currency; Customs Act; Customs Tariff
Amended regulation, 2854, 3413
Revenue, qu. 827. *See also* Imports and exports
1911 to 1922, qu. 1661
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Liquor export warehouses, qu. 1211
Liquor imported, excise duties, qu. 828
Marking Act, 2641, 2877-80
Prohibited goods, 3476-7
Receipts, qu. 470
Revenue, qu. 614, qu. 827
Tariff bill, 3476-7. *See also* Customs Tariff
Tariff resolutions, 2118
Amended, 2854
Toronto customs house, qu. 470
Valuation for Duty. *See* Currency, Customs Act
Wines and spirits
Exportation of, 2854
In bond, 3229

Customs Tariff, 1907, Act Amdt. bill (Marking of imported goods; duties; amended rates; drawbacks; prohibited goods) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477

Customs Tariff Items
Adzes, cleavers, etc., 3127
Agate ware, 3118
Anti-dumping clause. *See under this title,* Dumping
Blankets, 3128, 3132, 3231
M. (Mr. Spencer), 3234, neg. 3235
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3236
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce, neg. 3238
Changes in. *See also* Tariff revision
Chinese. *See that title*
Cigarettes, 3107
Cigars, 3107
Clothes wringers, etc., 3140
Coated papers, 3108
Cocoa, 2116, 3106
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Cultivators, harrows, etc., 3120
Dairy tinware, 3118
Drugs, 3114
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3411-13, 3477. *See also* Customs Tariff Act Amdt.
Fishing hooks, etc., 3140
Flannels, 3137
Fruit and vegetable grading machines, 3126
Gasoline, 3115
Glass bottles, etc., 3117
Harness and saddlery, 3137
Hatters' bands, 3139
Hatters' plush, 3141
Incubators, etc., 3126
Iron and steel tubing, 3118
Linen yarn, 3128
Magazines, 3108
Marking Act, repeal, 3104
Milking machines, 3126
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3113-14
Ploughs, etc., 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Pump parts, 3127
Sawmill machinery, 3126
Settlers' effects, 3140
Silk cloth, 3137
Street rollers, 3126
Sugar, 3107
Threshing machines, parts, 3124
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Customs Tariff Items — *Con.*
White cotton fabrics, 3128
Window shades, etc., 3127
Wool and cotton yarns, 3127
Wool and woollen goods, 3233
Woollen clothing, 3235

Dairy Cattle. *See* Agriculture, Accredited Herds; Live Stock

Dairying Industry. *See also* Address; Budget; Oleomargarine
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, 1794
Butter. *See that title under* Agriculture
Competition with other countries, 178
Duties on utensils, reduction in, 2115, 2205, 3118
Exports and imports, 209
Grading of products, 655-6
Implements, reduction of duties on, 2115, 2205, 3118
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited Herds, Health of Animals
National Dairy Council and oleomargarine, 1791
Oleomargarine, 1791, 2205. *See also that title*

Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., qu. 728

Dandurand, Hon. Senator, 1128

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply, 306; parliamentary rights of French language, 306; economy in Government expenditure, 307
Military expenditure and policy, 1593

D'Arcy Island lazaretto, 2021

Dartmouth, N.S. air station, 1724

Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dimissal of, 1902, 2458, 2584

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Wheat Board, participation certificates, funds, qu. 2304

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., Deputy of the Governor General, 3610

Daylight Saving, 227, qu. 372
House of Commons, and, 1282
M. (Mr. Kay) for legislation to prohibit, 942, 943
Amdt. (Mr. Duff) 959; Neg. 1314

Deathbed Cases. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306

Debt, Public. *See* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Deceased Soldiers. *See* Soldiers
Insurance claims of heirs, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act
Widowed Mothers. *See* Pensions

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1801

Deep Sea Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

Deep Waterway and Power Association. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Defence. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service

Deficits. *See* Canadian National Railways

Deflation of Credit. *See* Finance

Deflation and Inflation of prices. *See* speeches on Address and Budget

Delinquents. *See* Juvenile delinquents

Delphine, Colonel, 303

Delta, Manitoba, protective works, 3545

Demers, Captain, 1492

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Income tax, Montreal office, qu. 607

Demobilization. *See also* Militia, Annual Drill; War Claims
Estimates, 1171
Expenditure, 1155, 1163, 1171

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Address in reply, 348. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; immigration; Laurier-Fielding tariff, 348
Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 2887. Tribute to Finance Minister; budget proposals generally satisfactory; extravagance of Union Government; acquisition of Railways; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; credits to Balkan states; revenue and expenditure, 2888; Progressive party; compromise and co-operation Canada a hard country to govern; Wheat Board; freight rates, 2889; railway

Denis, Mr. Jean J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
deficits made good by East; free trade, 2890; tobacco industry, protection of, 2891
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Ministers and Directorships, 1113
Solders' insurance, 3321

Denmark, Expedition to Ellesmere Island, 1751

Dennis Building, Halifax, qu. 3360

Department of National Defence bill. *See* National Defence

Departmental Expenditure. *See* Supply

Departmental Law officers, 683, 2572

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed Mothers

Deportation. *See* Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt.; Oriental Aliens

Depreciated Currency. *See* Currency; Customs

Deputy Ministers. *See* Militia Estimates; National Defence Bill; Naval Service
Salaries of, 752

Deputy Registrar. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt. bill

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, appointment, 5

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Election of, 363
Rulings and statements of. *See also* House of Commons; Marcil; Speaker
Amendments
Already covered, 3147-8
Anticipatory, 2973
Increasing charge on revenue, 3404
Member having already spoken, cannot move, 3558
Moved separately, 3401
Previous, 3148
Bills
Casting vote of Chairman, 3473
New sections proposed, 3445
Private
Com. may not refer back, 1747
Relevancy, 1858
Public
Amdt. dealt with by another amdt. on order paper, 2973

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rnlings and Statements of — *Con.*
Chair
Decision given, final, 3354
Member may not criticise ruling, 555, 2974
Ruling of non-debatable, 1898
Debate
Inaudibility of, 1755
Member speaking given opportunity to answer questions, 1889
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1361
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Decorum, courtesy to member speaking, 2090
Language, "Breach of duty", 3354
Members
Desiring to speak, must rise, 1985
May ask question but not make statement, 2489
May not criticise ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Must put question without argument, 2340
Not in order in discussing ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Speaking, need not answer questions unless willing, 2318, 2619, 2710
Opportunity to answer, 1889
To rise if vote desired, 3456
Ministers
Not required to answer questions, 2777
On item, may discuss general policy, 555
Motions
Amdt. to Amdt. in supply, 1579
Involving charge on revenue, must be made by minister, 3404
Non-debatable
That committee rise, 1181
Supply, in, 1579
Two, amending same item, 1982
Questions to be put without argument, 2340, 2489
Railway Commission, salaries not included in vote, 2776-8
Reference to judges and high officials, 2778
Relevancy, 404, 406, 671, 736, 1470, 1476, 1898, 3141
Cash bonus to soldiers, discussion, 404
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, bill, 1603
Grain Inquiry commission, 2988
Hudson Bay railway, 2780

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements of — *Con.*
Senate, indemnity, 3509
Supply
General policy of department, 560
No question before com. on which to base discussion, 1900
Relevancy, 1135, 2089, 3527, 3545
Lindsay arsenal, 2089
Militia and Defence items to be discussed separately, 1139-40-42
Penitentiaries, 1279
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Quebec riots, 2090
Rails and car repair contracts, 1698
Railway commission, estimates, 2776-8
Railways and Canals, 1135
Two motions, amending same item, 1982
Vote
Casting of, by Chairman, 3473
Desire for in com. to be indicated by members rising, 3456

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Desbarats, Mr. J. B. *See* National Defence

Deserted Wives. *See* Pensions

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Aluminum Electric Co., qu. 728, qu. 1375
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773
Boon, Mr. W. R., qu. 728
Canada-West Indies steamship service, qu. 2356
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Canadian National Railways
Electrification, M. 627
Champlain steamer, sale of, qu. 1400
Civil Service
Classification, printed copies of, qu. 1930
Commission, Mr. Putman, 3090
Imperial council, qu. 2803
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu. 1065
Militia and Defence, permanent force, qu. 2637
Montreal Harbour Commission
Paint purchases, qu. 602
Policemen, qu. 2992
Tugs, qu. 600
Occupational diseases, protection against, M., 1378
Personal explanation, Civil Service estimates, 3365
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, qu. 2804
Veit, Mr. A. E. J. M., qu. 1773

Destructive Insect and Pest Act, qu. 472, 3520. *See also* Entomology

Detective Firms, American, 670

Detroit River
Armed cruisers on, qu. 2214
Regulation of navigation, 1498. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Deville, Dr. E. C., 1044, 1048

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
Address in reply, 341. Women and the franchise, 341; Pacific and Great Eastern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific and railway problem, 342; coal and fuel oil; Japanese and the fisheries, 344; returned soldiers, problems, 345; depletion of British Columbia fisheries, 346; dry dock at Esquimalt; British Columbia tariff views, 347
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1603
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1828
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1523

Digby, N.S., pier, 1760

Digby-St. John Steamship Service, 3035

Dinosaurs, purchase of specimens, 1237

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Directorships. *See* Ministers and directorships

Disability Soldier cases. *See* Pensions Committee

Disallowance of Ontario legislation, qu. 2805, qu. 2992

Disarmament. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Conference on. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Diseases
Infectious. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt.
Occupational, of workmen. *See that title*

Disfranchisement. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Dockyards. *See also* Naval Service
Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752

Doctors. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Payments to, 2572
Reported engaged on Newfoundland-Labrador boundary case, qu. 704, 2572

Doherty, Hon. Manning, 334, 974, 987. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Visit to England, papers, 1283, 1334

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic. Servants, Immigration of. *See* Immigration

Domicile of Voter. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Coal Company. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Dominion Elections. *See* Elections of 1921; Proportional Representation

Dominion Elections Act
Abuses under, 184-5
Amendments, qu. 470
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
Enfranchisement of women of alien birth
M. (Mr. Euler) 473, agreed to, 493
Removal from statute books, 184
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1296, agreed to, 1301

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. (Alien women; Domicile of voter)
1r., 1796; 2r., com., 2809; 3r., 3817
Subjects and sections discussed:
Election day, public holiday
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2812
Elector's residence, change of, 2809
New polls, establishment of
Amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 2815
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486

Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, 2419-20. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Contract for steel plates, claim for damages, 417, qu. 704, 1677-80, 1689, 2170
Legal expenses, 3497
Delivery of seel plates, 3508

Dominion Lands
Contingencies, 1037
Estimates, 1035
Forest reserves. *See* Forestry
Homestead entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries, 1035
Sale of, qu. 376

Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Sub-agencies closed, qu. 1181
Surveys, 1037
Dr. Deville, 1044
M. to reduce, vote, 1039
Reduction of vote by $30,000, 1044-6

Dominion Lands, Notices of Cancellation of Leases bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3465; 3r., 3475
Senate amdts., non-concurrence; free conference 3613; concurrence, 3616

Dominion Lands and Parks
Canadian National parks, 168, 1051
Visitors to, 1052
Migratory birds, 1684
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 990, 998

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatory, Ottawa Building, 1265

Dominion Police. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Public Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Dominion Statistician. *See* Statistics

Dominion Textile Company, 200, 583, 1106, 1130

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B., 702

Douglas Credit System. *See* Finance; Irvine

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Drainage. *See* Dominion lands

Drawbacks. *See* Customs

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 195. Provincial prejudices; Mr. Macdonald of Pictou; Minister of Finance and railways, 196; financial outlook; election, popular support of parties, 197; redistribution, campaign literature, 198; public works and unemployment; Halifax patronage committee, 199; Minister of Labour and trusts and combines; Sir Charles Gordon; Canada Cement and Dominion Textile Companies, 200; British Empire Steel Corporation, 200-1; position of Prime Minister and Mr. Crerar; railway policy, 201; Canadian Northern in Ontario, 202; railway

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Address in reply — *Con.*
lines in United States, 204; national ownership, 205; Sir Lomer Gouin and the big interests, 206; proposed King-Crerar alliance; leader of Opposition and insult to Quebec; 207; tariff present and former, 208; reciprocity; Fordney tariff, 209; imports and exports of agricultural commodities, 209; reciprocity, 208-211
Adjournment, item stands, 596
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2822
Agricultural implements, drawback, 3122
Air Board, 1728, 1735
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Alcohol tax, 1213
American magazines, 3110
Auditor General's office, 793
Budget, date of, inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget, 2127. Loans; congratulations to Minister of Finance; financial situation; revenue, 2171; optimism and work; taxes, estimated revenue from; trade agreements; customs and currency valuations, 2172; German competition, 2173; marking of goods; income tax; tariff changes, 2174; agricultural implements, drawbacks, 2175; alcohol for druggists, 2176; beet sugar industry; new taxation, 2177; trade with United States; unemployment, 2178; political honesty; amdt. proposed, 2179
Business of the House
Members, payment of, 3611
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3010
Pilotage, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3477-86
Census
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Civil service bonus, 3530
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2831
Fines to municipalities, 2832
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com. 1442
Amdt. 1444. *See also under this title*
Freight Rates
Customs Act and Dept. of Customs bill, 3477
Customs and Excise Dept., employees, 765

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Customs tariff
Book and coated papers, 3108
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Drugs, 3114
Gasoline, 3116
Marking Act, 3105
Pump parts, 3127
Wool and Woollen goods, 3129, 3130, 3233
Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill, 3476
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Anonymous letters, 944
Drayton-Acworth report, 126
Elevators, terminal, 2978
Estimates
Accounts chargeable, current or past year, 1675
Discussion of general policy, 767
Exchequer Court, estimates, 1274
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Salaries, 753
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 3011
Fishing tackle, 3140
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3555
Amdt. 3559. *See also under this title* Crowsnest pass
French trade treaty, 3224
German goods, valuation, 2172, 3227
Grain
Inquiry Commission, 2984-6
Shipment of via Quebec, 1466
Grand Trunk arbitration, newspaper comments, 821
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1765
Health dept. estimates, 775
Housing, 774
Immigration facilities at Quebec, 1466
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Inland Revenue
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Sugar beet, tax on, 3242
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Insurance Dept. 792
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Interior dept.
Economy, 456
Salaries, 452
Typewriters, 455
Justice dept.
Appropriations exceeded, 1279
Contingencies, 1669
Labour dept.
Appointments, 462
Salaries, 548

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
League of Nations, 3174
Secretariat, Canada's contribution, 3990
Loans, 2127
New Canadian, 1133
Special Loans bill, 3476
Meat and Canned Foods bill, 3149
Militia and Defence
Amalgamation of services, 419
Naval Service, 422
War claims, adjustment, 2974
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 3199
Naval service, 1737
New departmental buildings, Ottawa, 3541
Non-productive assets, 1467
Nova Scotia miners, 509, 512
M. (Mr. Irvine 540)
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824
Penitentiaries, inmates, increase in number, 1279
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill, 3043
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3404, 3439-64
Pensions
Commutation of, 390
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Prime Minister, secretaries, 411
Printing plants, tax, 3410
Public Accounts, delay in closing, 1264
Public buildings
Coal for, 1759
Expenditure, 1260
Public Service Retirement bill, 3148
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1465-86, 3195
Quebec harbour, Parc St. Charles Co., 1470
Railway Commission, statement of Mr. Carvell, 2774
Redistribution
Census and, 1363, 1369
M. (Mr. Shaw), 1769
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3389, 3397, 3438
Revenue and Audit Act, 3042
St. Lawrence river waterway, correspondence, 2207
Sales tax collections, 1921-22, qu. 1212
Saskatchewan, export of liquor, 3000, 3002
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Capital expenditure, 1279
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Soulanges canal, 2768
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Cheque tax, 3258
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Supreme Court, pre-audit, 1274

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Tariff Commissioner, appointment, 1664
Transcontinental railway, 917
Transportation Costs, Special Com. *See under this title*, Crowsnest pass; Freight Rates
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3547
United States, operation of railways in Canada, 192
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822
Vickers, Limited, 2975-7
War claims
Adjustment of, 2974, 2977
Exchange, 1758
War Graves Commission, 774
Weston post office building, 1259

Drayton-Acworth report, 46, 125, 130

Dredges and Dredging. *See also* Marine; Public Works
Estimates, 2005
Plamonder, 2006
Port Nelson, 2006
Quebec harbour, 1483
Red river channel, 2007
St. Lawrence river ship channel
De Beaujeu bank, 1495
New elevator dredge, 1495
St. Marys river, 2006
Shuswap lake, 2006

Druggists, alcohol for, 2114. *See also* Alcohol

Drumheller mines, 85, 1058

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Beet sugar industry, 2273, 3251
Budget, 2272. Progressives, attitude towards; public debt; duty on beet sugar, 2272; tariff, duty on agricultural implements; farmers not asking special privileges, 2274
Goderich harbour, improvement, 2002

Drury, Hon. E.C., and Drury Government, 63, 125, 127, 134, 334
Lake of the Woods, control. 2991. *See that title*
Land tax, and, 2491

Dry Docks
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Esquimalt, 347
Appropriation, 3541
Pacific Coast on, 2401
Subsidies to, 2008
Vancouver, 2005, 2008, 3542

Drysdale, Mr. Justice, retirement of, 1275

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Air Board, qu. 366
Air Force and civil aviation, 1724
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) bill, 2819
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
Cost, etc., qu. 469
Subsidized steamship services, 3031
Canadian national parks, expenditure, 1681
Canned fish, marking of tins, 3048
Civil Service
Commission, qu. 364
Overmanning, 3099
Patronage, 3094
Rural postmasters, 3095-6
Con Rein, sinking of, 1384
Courtenay Bay works, qu. 365
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) amdt. 959
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation contract, 1677
Fishing schooner race, 1384, 3513
Flags, cost of, qu. 599, 1264, 1268
Halifax terminals, qu. 364
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, details of, 1272
Ontario, 2000
International deep sea racing
M. for encouragement, 1384, 3513
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1490
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Migratory birds, 1685
Military and naval expenditures, reduction, 1139
National Defence bill, 740
Naval policy, 2052
Naval Service
Aurora, cruiser, 2053
Royal Canadian navy, qu. 366, 1848, 1871, 2052
Navigation off Newfoundland coast, aids to, 1498
Nova Scotia pensioners, qu. 615
Public buildings, flags, qu. 599, 1264, 1269
Toronto harbour works, qu. 365
Tourist traffic, 1683
Unemployment, 1683
War service badge, 1754
Wooden ships, qu. 364

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Duties. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff

Dynevor Hospital, 1218

Easter Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Car Company, car repairs, 1706

Eastern La Have Transportation Company. *See* Con Rein

Eastern Maine Railway, 1293

Economic Depression, 6, 10, 85, 157, 237-8, 3299. *See* also speeches on Address; Budget

Economy in Administration, necessity for, 7, 52, 97, 122, 455-6. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Civil Service; Supply

Eddie, Captain, 1493

Edison, Mr. T. A., credit system, 2505

Editorial Committee, 1235-6

Edmonton
Indian school, proposed, 1227-9. *See also* Indians
Post office building, alteration, 1254

Edmundston
Post office, qu. 608
Public building, 1239, 1242

Education
Indians. *See that title*
Orientals in British Columbia, 317. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Rural schools in Ontario, 2385, 2565
School boards, refusal of bank to advance money to, 2627
School lands, 339
School system, 2385
Taxes in school districts, 2714

Eggs
Chinese, importation of, 177
Cold storage in, 2562
Exportation, 813
Imported into Canada, qu. 612
Inspection and standardizing, 177, qu. 727, 811-812

Eight-Hour Day. *See* Daylight Saving; Labour

Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Election of Speaker. *See* Speaker

Election of 1921
Campaign, 21, 40-41, 51, 61, 99, 140, 198, 265, 288. *See also* Address; Budget; Proportional Representation

Election of 1921 — *Con.*
Campaign — *Con.*
Brantford at, 255, 256
Charlotte, N.B., county in, 1997
Funds, and protected interests, 2437, 2732
Literature, 99
Statements by Sir Lomer Gouin, 140
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 1258
Deposits refunded, qu. 1067
Liberal pledges, cash grants to soldiers, 102, 400. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Maritime provinces in, 315-316
Minority government, 197. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Number of votes cast, 197
Pledges and promises, 243. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Rail and car repair contracts, prior to, 1688
Results, 61, 142, 186, 197, 2282, 2654, 2851, 2909-2910,
By provinces, 46
Returning officer, Carleton, 3538, 3602, 3604
Unit of representation, 198
Voters, failure to vote, 1112
Women, 1113

Electoral System. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Power. *See also* Aluminum Company; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Campbell river, 1355
Railways and, 1940

Electrical storm in the West, 3493

Electrification of Railways, 133, 630. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) withdrawn, 639

Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Elk Island Park, fencing, 1051

Ellesmere Island
Danish expedition to, 1751
Royal Canadian Mounted Police at, 3497

Elliott, Mr. William (South Waterloo)
Budget, 2348. Tribute to Minister of Finance; tariff proposals a step in the right direction; national debt; revenue and expenditure; civil service; United States tariff; development of natural

Elliott, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
resources, 2348; markets, building up of industry at expense of agriculture; high cost of living, unemployment; labour conditions; boots and shoes; labour cost; woollen cloth, labour cost, 2350; woollen clothing, price and labour cost, 2350; permanent tariff commission; claims for tariff protection, 2351
Galt post office building, 1247

Embargo
Cattle. *See* Cattle Embargo
Manure, exportation of, 1021

Emigration. *See* Immigration

Empire, British
Foreign policy and defence, 1629. *See also* Limitation of Armaments; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Empire Day adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Debts. *See* Treaties with Hungary and Turkey

Enemy Property. *See* Aliens, Enemy Property

Enfranchisement
Indians of. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Women of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

English River water powers. *See* Lake of the woods

Entomology, 813. *See also* Destructive Insects
Spruce bud moth, 1049

Escheats Act Amdt. bill (Time in which action must be brought)
1r., 2456; 2r., com., 2826; 3r., 3026; Senate amdts. 3486

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt. *See also* Naval Service
Dry dock; 347, 596-7
Appropriation, 3541
Royal naval college at 2047, 2203, 2450

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Essence de l'Erable, qu. 1774

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supplementary Estimates; Supply. For departments, *See their titles*
Accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1263
Classification and preparation, 569
Comparison with last year, 384
Consideration of, 3526
Details of, 1347
Government economy in, 381-382
Information not up to date, 1267
Items, reading of, 3545
Main
Comparison with last year, 381
Tabled, 363
One-fourth vote. *See* Interim Supply
Supplementary, tabled, 1258, 3463
War claims, details of, qu. 1288

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 1132, 1662
Indians, Oka agent, 1217

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 781
Alien Birth, women of, enfranchisement, M., 473, 480
Canadian National Railways
Canadian Northern deficit, 1906
Public ownership operation, 1948
Re-valuation, 1926
Civil Service, promotions, 576
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 950
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1788
Quebec public utilities, 1912
Railway policy, 1948

European Credits. *See* Loans

European War. *See* War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address, 300. Agriculture in a deplorable state; rates on grain; railway consolidation, 300; tariff and trade prevention, 301; national policy a failure, 302: freer trade relations, 303; protected combines; railway question, 304; tariff views of different parties; returned soldier farmers, 305
Agricultural implements
Dumping clause, 2360
Importation by United Grain Growers, 3118, 3119
Agriculture dept., professional men, 588
American magazines, 3113

Evans, Mr. John — *Con.*
Apple industry, 3417
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Beef hides, 3138
Blankets, duty on, 3130
British preference and Canadian ports, M. (Mr. Logan) 711
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1963
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1608
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Crowsnest pass agreement
Telegram of Mr. Motherwell to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 765, qu. 828, 1067
Dumping clause, 2360, 3417
Fruit-growers, protection, 3417, 3425
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2795
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Immigration
Medical inspection, 759
Money qualification, 3058
Unrestricted, 3062
Live stock industry, 989
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Naval policy, 2072
Post office salaries, 2801
Railway policy, 1963
Saskatoon post office building, 1253
Soldiers' land settlement, 305, 2132
Steamship subsidies, qu. 614
Welland ship canal, 2758

Excess Profits tax. *See* Taxation

Exchange. *See also* Finance
Claim by British Admiralty for refund, 1752
Foreign, 2264
Rate of, 286
Soldiers' money on, 3339, 3348

Exchequer Court of Canada
Admiralty, vacancies, 1275. *See also* Admiralty Act
Estimates, 1274

Excise Taxes. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue Act

Exemptions. *See* Income Tax Act; Special War Revenue Act
Pilotage dues, from. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Exhibitions, 2582. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade and Commerce

Exhibitions — *Con.*
Agricultural. *See that title*
Canadian National, 2990
Estimates, 2026
France, in, 2031, 2990
Grants to, 649, 977, 3521
London, 2027
Tampa, Florida, 2026

Expenditure. *See* Finance; Public Expenditure

Experimental and Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explosives Act, 1234

Export Liquor warehouses. *See* Liquor

Exports. *See that title under* Imports and Exports; Trade

Ex-service Men, representative. *See* Pensions Committee

External Affairs, Department of
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Doherty, Hon. Manning, 1283
Papers and memorandum, 1334
Salaries and contingencies, 411, 3509
War claims, adjustment of. *See* War claims

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Butter imports, qu. 614
Canadian National railways, water supply, qu. 2213

Fair Wage Clause. *See* Labour

False Creek, removal of bridge, 3516

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Beet Sugar industry, 2232, 3246, 3251
M. to reduce duty, 3248
Budget, 2229. Fiscal policy; tariff revision; encouragement of native industries; agricultural implements; sales tax; business profits tax; protected industries, 2230-1; automobiles, duty and tax; beet sugar industry, 2232
Customs drawbacks, qu. 2356

Far Eastern Treaty, 3160. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Lands, value of, 2565

Farm Products
Consumption in Canada, 2650. *See also* Budget
Decline in prices, 6, 11, 77, 93, 95, 113, 150, 225, 231. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Live stock
Fordney tariff, effect of, 209. *See also* United States, Fordney tariff
Exchange value of, 2576
Importation, 209
Trade in, 226. *See also* Trade

Farmers
Block in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade; United States
Eight-hour day and, 227. *See also* Daylight Saving
Geographical advantages, 297-9
Immigration of, 145, 225. *See also that title*
Income tax returns, 226, qu. 1063, 2241, 2631. *See also* Income Tax
Labour, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Loyalty of, 526
Need of encouragement, 252
Profits, comparison of, 2333
Protection and. *See* Agricultural Implements; Budget
Remedial legislation, 157
Representation in Parliament. *See* Progressives
Sons, exemption from military service, 440, 448-9, 2685. *See also,* Military Service Act Amdt.
Transportation problems. *See* Freight rates
Want of confidence in future, 143
Western, 146-7, 357
And wheat marketing. *See* Wheat Board
Grievances, 2652

Farmers' Movement and Party. *See* Progressive Party

Federal Civilian Force. *See* National Defence bill; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Federal Elections Act. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Federal Representation by provinces, in 1877, qu. 1183

Federal Subsidies. *See* Subsidies

Feed Control Act, 1011

Female Suffrage. *See also* Dominion Elections Act
Failure of women to vote, 1113

Fertilizers. *See also* Agricultural Fertilizers bill
Cost of, 770
Duty on, 3140-3141
Freight rates on, 1022
Ground limestone, 1024
Inspectors, 592
Natural, exportation of, 1019
Tariff and, 2664

Fiduciary Interest. *See* Ministers and Directorships

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Agricultural implements, duty on, 3120, 3141. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff
Alcohol for druggists, duty on, 2114, 3241
Alleged election promises, Charlotte, N.B. 1997
American magazines, 3108-3111
Appropriation Acts, 363, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Auditor General's office, 793
Auditor General's report
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Referred to public Accounts Com., 1462
Automobiles, 2850, 2853, 3275. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Refund of taxes, 3600
Value up to $1,000 for settlers, 2116
Banks
Circulation, tax on, 2117
Interest rates, 3602
Beet Sugar. *See under this title,* Sugar
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts, 772-773
British Columbia government, criticism, 2237
Budget, inquiries as to date of, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget Speech, 2104; Financial position of Dominion, 2104-17; economy, income and expenditure, 2104; public debt, 2106; loans, 2107; trade, 2108; trade agreements and negotiations; tariff revision, 2110-14; British preference; trade with United States, 2111; Marking and valuation; currency, 2113; certificate of trade or consular agent; tariff reductions, 2114; new taxation, 2116; financial situation; tariff resolutions, 2118

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Supplementary statement, 2842. Acknowledgement of tributes and congratulations, 2842; attitude of Progressives towards Budget, 2842; step in right direction; Liberal policy as declared in 1921, supported by Progressive members; a policy of moderation; tariff and sales tax, 2843; land and inheritance taxes; tariff proposals; tariff revision of 1897; predictions of bankers and manufacturers; trade revival; reduction in duties, 2844; change in policy of Sir John Macdonald; British preference; Sir Charles Tupper; reciprocity; "no truck or trade with Yankees"; opposition of Conservative party to trade arrangement; Liberal party ready to discuss question; value of United States market; Windsor Hall speech, 2846; industrial condition of Germany, 2847; depreciated currency; value of mark and commodity prices; trade with Germany; treaty of Versailles; valuation of currency, 2848; increased taxation effect of currency valuation on Italian trade; a protectionist budget; downward revision; Progressives would not have been able to do more; direction in which Liberal party is looking, 2849; drawbacks and refunds; Ford motor company; Atlantic Sugar refineries; goods in transit; manufacture for export, 2850; Opposition amdt.; Liberal platform of 1919; verdict of electors; proposed changes in budget proposals; amended resolutions, 2851; tax on confectionery; soft drinks; ale, beer, porter and stout; cigarettes; fertilizers and dried beet pulp; cheque tax, 2852; bond and stock transfers, 2853; beet root sugar; raw leaf tobacco; receipts; cigars; automobiles; depreciated currency, 2853
Business of the House. *See also under this title,* Estimates; Supply
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473-74, 2522
Civil government items, 374
Daylight saving, 1282
Member interrupting, must ask permission, 255-6
Privilege, right to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Business of the House — *Con*
Special loan bill, 3151
Supplementary estimates, 3365
Supply, concurrence, 1842
Business profits war tax, 1658, 2024
Canadian battlefields, 772
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3156, 3366, 3477-86
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747, 1771
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr Larkin, 1023
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2852, 3258
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 2852, 3239, 3240
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Confectionery, tax on, 2852
Congratulations to on fortieth year of public life, 3279
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, 1132, 3042
Currency, depreciated, valuation for customs, 2113, 2849, 2853
Customs Act and Dept of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 3222, 3476, 3477
Depreciated currency, 3223, 3224, 3410
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411
German goods, valuation, 3229
Invoices certificates, 3221
Wines and spirits in bond, 3229
Customs drawbacks, 2850, 3141
Customs Tariff
Blankets, 3128, 3131, 3136, 3234
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3238
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Cotton, fabrics, 3128
Gasoline, 3106, 3115, 3116
Glass bottles, 3117
Grading machines, 3126
Hatters' bands, 3140
Invalids' wheel chairs, 3115
Marking Act, 3105
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
Pumping machinery, 3127
Reductions, 3239
Saw-mill machinery, 3126
Silk, 3127
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, claim, 2170
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411.
Estimates. *See also under this title*; Supply
Accounts chargeable to current year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1269
Items, urgent, 409
Procedure, 409
Tabled
Main, 363
Supplementary, 1258, 2465
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Fertilizers, duty on, 2852, 3141
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Deputy minister, 753
Estimates, 751, 1663, 3495
Legal expenses, railways, 1667
Loans, 771. *See also under this title*, Loans,
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Fire prevention, 794
Fiscal year, ending of, 1210. *See also under this title*, Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Fisheries, reduction in duties on, 2116
Fishing schooner race, 3512
France-Belgium trade treaties, 3223
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's office, 751
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure in 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward island, 1989-90
Housing, 774
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imports, marking and valuation of, 2113, 2849, 2853, 3229
Income tax
Cost of collection, 2025
Legislation, 3104
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3278-9, 3359, 3484
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Alcohol for druggists, 2114, 3241
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239, 3240
Home brewing, 3141
Sugar beets, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3143, 3607
Insurance officials, 791
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Bill, 362, 598-9

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Labour and capital, 2117
Liberal platform of 1919, tariff plank, 2529, 2851
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
Loans, 771, 2107
New Canadian, 1131, 1133
Special loans bill, 3476
Merchants' Bank, inquiry, 3604
Nova Scotia miners, 497
M. (Mr. Irvine) 543
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1814
Penny Bank Act Amdt., bill, 1132, 3043, 3148
Pensions to Imperial forces, 864
Personal statement, correction, 681
Private Bills Com., substitution of names, 2355
Public Accounts, closing of, 1210, 1264-66
Public buildings
Flags, 1265
Generally, expenditure, accounts not closed, 1263-66
New, 1256
Public Works estimates, 696, 697, 750
Rail and car repair contracts, 1697
Railways, annual statement, 926
Reciprocity with United States, 2111, 2845-6
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3320, 3392, 3395
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Root vegetables, inspection and sale of, 2744
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786
Co-operation with the United States, 2755
Sales tax, 2116, 2843, 2851. *See also under this title*, Special War Revenue Act
Save the Children fund, 3516
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 442
Special loans bill, 3476
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Automobiles, 3275
Ford company, 3276
Cheque tax, 3258
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Matches, 3263
Mineral waters, 3278
Receipts, 3262
Sales tax, 2116, 3264, 3269
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 3271
Condensed milk, 3268, 3409
Job printing, 3409
Steamship services, 2029

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Sugar
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on beet sugar, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Supply bills, 362, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Supply, concurrence, 1769, 1842
Tariff Commission, 1663
Tariff reductions, 2114, 2844, 2851, 3123
Tariff revision, 2110-14, 2844, 2849
Taxation, increases in, 2116, 2843, 2848, 2851-3
Tobacco, duties on, 2115, 2852-3, 3107, 3239
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
United States
Reciprocity with, 2111, 2845-6
Visit to Washington, 2112
War claims, exchange, 1754
War Graves Commission, 774
Wrangel island, 1750

Filled Milk and cream, qu. 963. *See also* Milk; Oleomargarine

Films, Educational. *See* Trade and Commerce

Finance. *See also* Banks; Budget; Financial Credit; Loans
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Bank deposits, qu. 3155
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Banking conditions, 158
Bonds
And stock, transfers, tax, 2853
Tax-free, maturing, qu. 826
Canada's financial position, soundness of, 2497
Commitments, 208
Credit Systems. *See* Financial Credit
Department
Charges of management, 770, 1663
Deputy Minister, 751
Estimates, 1662
Expenditure, economy in, 1475
Dominion Notes, qu. 705, qu. 935, qu. 3153, qu. 3154
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1271
Legal expenses, 1667
Paper Control inqury, 1673
Salaries, 751, 3504
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Estimate of wealth and production, 2497
Excise profits and watered stock, 2714
Financial position of country, annual statement of Minister, 2104-2118
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Gold standard and credit system, 219

Finance — *Con.*
Grain trade, 2246
Loan department, 220
National wealth, 222. *See also* Natural Resources
Per capita wealth, 2630
Sinking funds, 1663

Financial Conference, Brussels, 1138, 1292

Financial Credit, 208, 219, 221, 2497-8. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money
Banks and, 1290, 2501, 2714
Brussels Conference, 1138, 1292
Community power, use of for private interest, 1291, 2501
Control of, 222, 1292, 2445, 2500
Germany in, 2500
Credit systems, 2634
Attempts to inaugurate
Guernsey Island, 2505
St. Louis Municipal currency, 2506
Definition of Credits, 2503
Douglas system, 220, 222, 2502
Financial organizations, consolidation, 2245-6
Gold standard and, 219, 1291, 2506
Greece and Roumania, qu. 1400
Industrial stagnation and unemployment, 1291. *See also* Industrial depression
Inflation and deflation, 2502
Loans, 1292. *See also that title*
M. (Mr. Irvine) for Parliamentary Com., 1289, 1396
National credit power, 1291, 2499
Private monopoly of, 2501
Purchasing power, 1292
Restricted, 2629-30
Scientific inquiry and experimentation, 1289
Sociological laboratory, 1290
Systems, 2282

Financial Depression and Outlook. *See* speeches on Address; Budget

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2893. Protection and blind partyism; reciprocity, 2893; Ontario farmer not a protectionist; Progressives in Ontario; Laurier naval policy; tariff reductions; public morality and political honour; pledges and promises; Senate reform, 2894; debt and increased taxation; expenditure; reduction of sessional indemnity; drawbacks; protective budget, 2895
Potlach, Indian institution, 1578
Indians serving gaol sentences, 1721

Fines, payable to municipalities, 2832. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Finney, Colonel John, 1189

Fire
Insurance. *See* Insurance
Losses, railways from, 628
Prevention, 794. *See also* Air Service; Forestry; Insurance

First Contingent, training, qu. 1376

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget; Tariff resolutions; Taxation

Fiscal Year. *See* Consolidated Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Boats admitted as settlers' effects, 2116
British Columbia. *See also that title*
Depletion of, 346
Orientals engaged in, 167, 171, 344. *See also* Oriental Aliens
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Salmon traps, 346
Transfer, 2042. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods Act
Canning and curing licenses, 3010
Deep sea, conservation and development, 2169
Department of Fisheries, 2166
Dry salting, 3010
Estimates, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishermen's supplies, 2690
Fishing schooner race. *See* International Deep Sea Racing
Fishing vessels, pilotage, 2819
Fishways in rivers, 2166
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
Guardians, salaries, 2166
Hatcheries, 2169
Herring, dry salting, 3010
Herring, in Alaska, 70
Improved methods, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Licenses. *See* Quebec fisheries
Lobster, 1399, 2817, 2996
Market, 2166
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu. 3598
Officers and guardians, salaries, 2166
Orientals. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Patrol service, 2166
Boats, qu. 1503, qu. 3598
"Phalarope", qu., 1503

Fish and Fisheries — *Con.*
Pollution of streams, 2168
Prince county, illegal fishing, qu. 371
Protection service. *See* Marine; National Defence; Naval service
Publicity and marketing, 2169
Quebec, transfer of, 142. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Rope, twine, etc., duty on, 2359
Salmon, 1399, 2817, 2996
Dry salting, 3010
Sardines, export, qu. 1182
Supplies, reduction in duties, 2116, 2359
Tariff reductions on implements of, 2191
Transportation, 2166
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Fisher and Oughton, Messrs. *See* Aliens

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Protection of Salmon and Lobster Fisheries. 1r., 1399; 2r., com., 2817; com., 2996; 3r., 2997
2. Salmon Curing and Herring Drying. Res. 2306, 3010; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3013

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Marine; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Fishing Schooner Race. *See* International

Flag-Waving, 1265, 1386, 2711

Flags
Cost of, qu, 599
For public buildings, 1260, 1264, 1268

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 634. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Flax
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2834
Canadian bounty on linen yarn from, 1361

Flour
Exports to United States, 209
Insurance on mills, 3255

Flynn, Mr. Harry, and soldiers' bonus, 394, 402

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Gatineau Point-Rockliffe ferry, qu. 1399, qu. 1661
Old age pensions, M., 1303
Post Office
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving $600, qu. 1067
Married women, qu. 1658
Money Order branch, qu. 1285

Food and Drug Act, administration, 2017

Food and Drugs. *See* Health; Meat and Canned Foods

Food Inspection, 820

Foot and mouth Disease. *See* Cattle Embargo

Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214

Foran, Mr. W., *See* Civil Service Commission

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Mr. Henry, credit scheme, 2505

Fordney Tariff. *See* Budget Speeches; United States

Foreign-Born wives of British subjects. *See* Dominion Election Act Amdt.

Foreign Currency. *See* Customs, Marking; Currency
Inflation. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. bill

Foreign Fraternal Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Foreign Loans. *See* Loans

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade

Foreign Monetary Standards. *See* Customs; Currency

Foreign Warships. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens
Crime and, 1392, 2517
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Immigration. *See that title*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1388-94
Textile industries, engaged in, 2518

Forest, Mr. Médard, qu. 2355

Forestry. *See also* Natural Resources; Research; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1047, 1722
Gaspe, 1733
High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Railway belt, B.C., 1730
Fire losses, 628
Fire towers, 1048
Forest area under federal control, 1048
Protection of timber in West, 1046
Pulpwood and round logs, duty, 2667

Forestry — *Con.*
Spruce bud moth, 1049, 2668
Tree culture in West, 1046
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu. 615

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 76. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 76-77; reciprocity with United States; marketing of farm products, 77; tariff revision; railway problems, 78; taxation burdens; immigration, 79
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2149
Assiniboine river floods, 2004, 3546
Boy Scouts, 773
Cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special com., 1424
Distribution of labour and goods, 2149
Fishways, 2168
Freight rates, 1424
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2004
Immigration policy, 2148
Indians
Education, Elkhorn school, 3537
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2086
Naval policy, 2079
Progressives, patriotism, 720
Rideau canal, 2765
Soldier land settlement, taxes, 2134
Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 469
Transportation, 2149
Woollen goods and blankets, 3234

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Fort George, 119

Fort Mississauga, 119

Fort Qu'Appelle Sanitarium, 1345

Fort William
Car repair contracts, 1696-1705
Grain overages, qu. 1210
Terminal elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Agricultural exhibitions, 993
Budget, 2274. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Government policy; amendment; revenue requirements and taxation, 2274; income tax; suggested concession to heads of families; population, suggested methods of increasing; railways and public ownership, 2275; economy in public expenditure, 2276
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 961

Fortier, Mr. H. A. — *Con.*
Demonstration farm at Mont Laurier, 994
Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 643
Ministers and directorships, 1123
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1798

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Carty, Captain, qu. 1062
Chief Architect's branch, Public Works, qu. 963
Civil Service Commission, qu. 826
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1904

Four-Power Treaty. *See* Limitation of Armaments

France
Canadian exhibition in, 2031
Exhibition train from, 2990
Industries, protection of, 2410
Post war conditions, 2643
Trade relations with. 2990. *See also* Trade
Trade treaty with, 2110

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Extension of, 2242
Public ownership, and, 1944

Fraser River Fisheries. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries

Fraser Valley Railway. *See* Vancouver and Fraser Valley

Fraternal Benefit Insurance. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Frauds, Scrip, prosecution for. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fredericton
Military property, 1980
Officers' square, 1980

Free Freight outlay, qu. 704

Free Trade. *See* Address; Budget

Freight, careless handling of, 1965

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Transportation
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Calgary, free outlay, qu. 704
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Comparison between freight and duty, 2175

Freight Rates — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 146, 176, 350, 1412. *See also under this title,* Excessive. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Special Com. to inquire into effect upon Railway Rates
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for, 1213, 1402
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1444; neg. 1457
M. agreed to, 1458
Named, 1502
Reports
First, 1657
Second, 1719
Third, 3546
M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of, 3548
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton, 3559; neg. 3586
Amdt. (Mr. Baxter) 3586; neg. 3586
M. agreed to, 3588
Position of Ministers of Agriculture and Interior on, 242
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Excessive, 33, 47, 54, 78, 83, 131-132, 275, 350, 2219, 2314, 2453. *See also under this title,* Crowsnest Pass Agreement, *and* Speeches on Address; Budget
Export, 2633
Fertilizers, on, 1022
Immigration and, 2157
Lumber industry, 234, 2311
Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
Quebec, and, 1472, 1473
Railway labour, and, 2315
Regulation by water carriage competition, 1688
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1204. *See also that title*
Subsidized steamships, 2028
Wheat on, 235. *See also* Wheat Board

French, early pioneers in West, 2912

French-English Canadians, unity between, 168-9. *See also* Address

French Language, 155
Civil Service classification, qu. 1930
Parliament in, 155, 244, 306, 356
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1351
Soldier Settlement Board, Sherbrooke, qu. 1658

Fruit Industry, 220, 2564
Apple-growing, 171, 967
Importations, qu. 612
Protection of, 225, 2197
Baxter, Mr. Charles W., appointment of successor, 2457
British Columbia in, 2593. *See also that title*
Competition with United States, 2903
Dumping clause, 2280, 2310, 2372, 2593, 2641, 2879 2903. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest pass agreement
Fruit Commissioner, qu. 2457
Grape juice, tax on, 2594, 2617
Okanagan Valley, 162. *See also* British Columbia
Oriental Aliens engaged in, 1535. *See also that title*
Protection. *See* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause
Tariff, 2197
Transportation. *See* Freight Rates
Trees, protection from insects. *See* Entomology

Fuel. *See also* Coal; Mines; Natural Resources
Oil, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Importation, 178
Tank at Louise Basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Peat, 1235
Price, 1490, qu. 1774. *See also* Coal

Further Legislation. *See* House of Commons

Futures, trading in. *See* Wheat Board

Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu. 3599

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Galt post office building, 1247

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Game. *See* Migratory Birds; Dominion Lands and Parks

Games of Chance. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Gaols. *See* Prisons; Penitentiaries

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Budget, 2624. New national policy, 2624; fiscal plank; substantial reduction of customs tariff; British Preference; free

Gardiner, Mr. Robert — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
food stuffs; machinery for conversion of natural resources and raw materials; time to be allowed for industrial readjustment; claims for protection to heard in public; parliamentary committee on tariff; tariff commission, 2625; effects of tariff; exploitation of the people; tariff increases prices but not values; tariff reductions; revenue; land tax; inheritance tax; excise tax on manufactured goods; sales tax, 2626; circulation tax; bank interest violation of Bank Act; withholding of credit from municipality; unemployment; an inequitable budge 2627
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, 1964
Bridge over Red Deer river, 1964
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Cheque tax, 3260
Civil Service bonus, 1258
Dominion lands, oil leases, 1046
Fishing tackle, 3140
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3486
Port Nelson dredging, 2006
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3438
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Steamship services, 2027
Tar Sands, 1236
Timber wolves, 1001
Venereal diseases, 2022
Wheat Board, 785

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Aerial forest patrol, High River, Alta., 1048, qu. 1066, 1723
Agriculture Com. report — Wheat Board, 783
Agriculture dept. — Mr. Duncan Marshall, 651, 652
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Boy Scouts, 773
Business of the House — eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
West Indian trade, 3928; amdt. 3031
Canadian National railway, securities, qu. 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half breed scrip) 3216
Dominion lands, surveys, 1038, 1044
M. to reduce vote, 1039

Garland, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Dominion notes, qu. 3154
Dredging, 2006
Fish culture, 2169
Forest aerial patrol, High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Immigration of children, 2148, 3063
Indians
Blackfoot reserve, pasture lands, qu. 2215
Greater production, 1224, 1288
International boundaries, 1033
Mixed farming, 983
National gallery, 2011
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2043, 2067
Royal Canadian Navy, 2043
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 522
Parliament, fall session, 2608
Pensions Com., report, 3349
Post office, ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscriber, qu. 3599
Redistribution, meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3497
Enlistment in Canadian Expeditionary Force, qu. 2038
Soldiers' land settlement, homestead rights, 2135
Steamship services, 2027, 3028, 3506
Amdt., 3031
Tax-free bonds, qu. 826
Telegraph and telephone lines, Alberta, 2012

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Budget, 2300. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war expenditure; Canada Cement Company; income tax; tariff on agricultural implements; British preference; Mr. Fielding's trip to Washington; trade with United States; civil service dismissals; bonus; superannuation, councils, 2300; sales tax, 2301
Canada-Great Britain postal rate, qu. 3364
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 2300, 3531
Withdrawal from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Commission, salaries, 407
Councils, 2300
Increase to deputy ministers, bonus, salaries, qu. 2805
Remuneration, qu. 3364
Retirement fund, qu. 826
Superannuation, 2300
Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153
Egg inspection, 811

Garland, Mr. W. F. — *Con.*
Exhibitions, prizes, 654
Experimental farms, 811
Grand Trunk, salaries of officials, qu. 728
Highways
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembrooke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, tree planting, qu. 2039
Mail contracts
Gascons-Quebec, qu. 2213
Lachenaie, qu. 2805
Militia dept. shed, Cartier square, Ottawa, qu. 2038
Poultry inspection, 656, 807
Rideau canal, 2766

Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373

Gascons-Quebec mail contract, qu. 2213

Gasoline, price of, 2106, 2296, 2313, 3115

Gaspé Peninsula
Aerial forest patrol, 1733
Fisheries, qu. 1401
Railways, M. (Mr. Marcil) for papers, 623

Gatineau-Point-Rockliffe ferry privilege, qu. 1399, qu. 1661

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Canadian National Railways
Intercolonial
Pension fund, qu. 938
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Rivière du Loup shops, qu. 1181, 1690
Indemnity of members, 3613
Juvenile delinquents, qu. 469
Lighthouse boats, fuel for, qu, 606, qu. 1183
Lighthouses and wireless telegraphy, qu. 370
Prison reform, 1279
Privilege — alleged statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690
Rivière du Loup arsenal, qu. 1181, 1690

Gendron, Mr. R. M. (Wright)
Dennis building, Halifax, qu. 3360

General Election. *See* Election of 1921

"General" Macdonald's Army. *See also* Riley's Army; Unemployment
Government action in regard to, 2458
Reception of, 2256

Genoa Conference, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 2337. *See also* Address; Budget; Conferences
Canadian delegation to, expenses, 1715, 2864

Genoa Conference — *Con.*
Cannes conference, documents, 823
Tabled, 865
Correspondence with Govt. of Italy, 1905, 2035
Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 582
Dominion Textile Company, and, 583-4
Money vote for, 1675
Montpetit, Professor, 582
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Submarines, 1845

Geodetic Survey
Estimates, 1033
Ottawa building, 1265

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Anthropological division
Potlach institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Camsell, Mr. Charles, 1262
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Estimates, 1233, 1236
Maps, 1237
Publications, 1237
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Specimens, purchase of, 1237

George, Right Hon. Lloyd, 2203, 2337
Empire defence, responsibility of dominions for, 1630

Georgian Bay Canal. *See* Canals

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3587-8
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3441
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1319
Trenton Harbour bill, 3494

German Goods, valuation of. *See* Budget; Customs Act Amdt.

German Mark, decline in value of. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated

Germany. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports; Trade
Agents of manufacturers in Canada, 2647
Commercial development, 2643
Competition with, 2114, 2140, 2173-4, 2203, 2412, 2420, 2487, 2878
Credit control, 2500
Exports to Canada, 2408, 2421, 2863
Pocket-Knives, valuation of, 2876
Financial situation, 2499, 2642
Indemnity, payment in goods, 2500

Germany — *Con.*
Industrial condition, 2499, 2847
Labour conditions in, 3227. *See also* Labour
Mark, value of, 2417, 2644, 2848. *See also* Budget; Currency, depreciated
Paper money, 2499
Proposed loan, 2500
Reparations paid to Allies, qu. 375
Tariff wall against goods, 174
Trade relations with, 138, 2183, 2263, 2287, 2347, 2394, 2421-22, 2464, 2487, 2848, 2876
Foreign, 2644
Wages and production costs, 2407, 2499, 2884
War debts, 174
Working hours, 2499

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Inglis boiler works, qu. 732

Gillen Board. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Girl Guides, grant, 774

Glanders. *See* Health of Animals

Glass
Customs duties on, 3117
Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Globe, Toronto, imaginary speeches of Mr. Meighen, 207

Goderich Harbour improvement, 2000

Gold
Central reserves and gold held in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code
Refining. *See* Charges of Management
Reserve. *See* Finance
Standard, 1291

Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration of, 1372

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Agate and granite ware, 3118
American magazines, 3108, 3113
Automobiles, tax on, 3273, 3277
Beet sugar industry, 3250
Blankets, duty on, 3234-5
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 722
Budget, 2429. Tariff record of Liberal party; repudiation of tariff plank of 1919 platform; history of fiscal legislation, 2429; inception of protective

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*

Budget — *Con.*

policy; position of Liberal party on tariff question in seventies; Liberal convention of 1893; condemnation of protection system; campaign of 1911, 2430; reciprocity agreement; Liberal protectionists; the "great apostacy"; the "interests"; possible explanation of Liberal attitude, 2431; expediency of compromise; geographical considerations; examination of protective system without reference to locality or occupation; social versus individual advantage, 2432; trade a form of co-operation, not competition; protectionist philosophy; political boundaries and tariff walls, 2433; tariffs for revenue and protection; "plucking the goose with the least squawking"; direct and indirect taxes; protection by boundary dather than by tariff; encouragement of infant industries; protection of all industries impossible; favourable trade balance; international trade; cheap foreign labour; real and nominal wages; retaliatory tariffs, 2435; diversified industry; decadence of agriculture; effect on manufacturing industries; free raw material and lower labour costs; free trade and advantage to manufacturers; competition against old established industries, 2436; protective tariffs and monopoly; price-fixing combinations; has protection assisted Canadian manufacturers?; the system corrupting, demoralizing and indefensible; contributions to campaign funds; national existence and integrity, 2437; economic self-sufficiency; sentiment in favour of protection; public opinion distorted; quotation from Mr. J. A. Hobson, 2438; consumers not organized to protect themselves; Canadian Manufacturers' Association propaganda; objects of protection; how has the policy worked out?, 2439; loss of population; indictment of system by United Farmers of Ontario; war profiteering; revenue raising expedients, 2440; excess profits tax; no promise of relief in budget; taxes on consumption; sales tax, 2441; income and inheritance taxes; ability to pay, 2442; property tax; taxation of land value; 2443; increased production; booms and depressions; public works; credit control, 2445

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*

Business of the House

Estimates, consideration of, 3527

Mondays and Wednesdays, 1720

Business profits war tax, qu. 1657

Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1961

Cattle embargo, 991-992

Chamberlin, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3498

Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509

Coated papers, duty on, 3108

Condensed milk, tax, 3269

Contingencies, expenditures for, 415

Cotton fabrics, duty on, 3128

Debates, inaudibility of, 1755, 1996

Ford motor company, 3273

German importations, value of, 3228

Governor General's cars, 1688

Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2001

Hydrographic survey, 1746

Immigration

Passports, 3064

Salaries, 3499

Income war tax act, 3278

Indians

Medical attention, 1220

Six Nation reserve, 1222

Lambton, loss of, 3507

Live stock industry, 992

Military expenditures and policy, 1144

Naturalization expenses, 1671

Naval defence, obligation of Canada, 1745

Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1836

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3019

Pool selling, bookmaking, etc., 2973

Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515

Proportional Representation, M. for adoption, 1633

Public buildings, Ottawa

Elevator attendants, 1267

Expenditure, 1268

Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1485

Quebec harbour, parc St. Charles, 1470

Rail and car repair contracts, 1705

Railway policy, 1961

Root vegetables bill, potato grades, 3376

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 843

Senate indemnity, 3509

Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436

Steamship subsidies, contracts, 3034, 3506

Supply, discussion, method of, 1142

Tariff amendments, 3238-9

Telegraph and Telephone lines, 2012

Tools, tax on, 3127

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*
Unemployment
Causes of, 3526
Military expenditures, 1144
Relief, 3526
Wheat Board bill, 3187
Woollen goods, duty on, 3130

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 200, 239, 1128
Genoa conference, 1715

Gordon, Mr. George N. (West Peterborough.)
See also Deputy Speaker
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., payments, qu. 2037

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice and Attorney General)
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 140. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; statements made in last general election, 140; Order in Council government, 141; Quebec fisheries; results of general election, 142
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
Senate amdts. 3611
Budget, 2654. Fiscal policy, protection and free trade; issue of the election campaign; Liberals not free traders; history of tariff legislation; Hon. Alex. Mackenzie; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, 2655; principles which have inspired Liberal party; fiscal policy of Government found in speeches of Prime Minister and Finance Minister, 2656; budget proposals in consonance with declarations of leaders, 2657; expenditure and debt; revenue necessities; manufacturing important factor in developing Canada, 2657; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier on encouragement of Canadian industries; progress of manufacturers since 1870; exodus during last ten years; investment in industrial establishments, 2658; grievances of the West; proposals for tariff reduction; strict economy needed; immigration policy; the amendment; no deception of electors, 2659; budget proposals consistent with Liberal promises
Canada Grain Act
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1133, 1841, 1932
Chamberlain, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills, 1841, 2830, 2973, 3607

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Half-breed scrip, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth
M. for reference to Special Com., 1503
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3468-75
Senate amdts. 3615
Exchequer court
Admiralty vacancies, 1275
Estimates, 1274
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
M. for ref. to Special Com., 1502
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 424, 2830
Judges, Quebec, 3497
Justice department of,
Estimates, 1274, 1668
Litigated matters, 1276
Salaries, 451, 4395
Yukon territory, 1275
King v, Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1133, 1841, 1932
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Nova Scotia Supreme Sourt, vacancy, 3437
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276
Penitentiaries
Estimates, 1276
Inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 545, 787
References to, 21, 26, 55, 206, 207, 239, 242, 243, 1128, 2679, 2682, 2718. *See also* Budget; Ministers and Directorships
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 3042
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Estimates, 2129
Pensions, 2131
Soldiers' civil re-establishment bill, 3597
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2974
Supreme court estimates, 1274
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux expenses, 1669
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Agriculture department
Officers, 650
Professionnal men, 589
Air force and civil aviation, Saskatchewan, 1724
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bank, loans to directors, 1093
Bee-keeping, 592
Bienfait briquetting plant. *See under this title,* Lignite
Blankets, duty on, 3129

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Budget, 2711. Congratulation to Finance Minister; grievance of the West and its solution; briquetting plant at Bienfait, 2712-15; farmers and the income tax; excessive profits and watered stock; banks and credit, 2714; liquor exportation from Saskatchewan; banking system, 2716; cheque tax; national debt, 2717; taxation; Sir Lomer Gouin and protection; tariff on implements of production, 2718; inconsistent attitude of Conservatives towards tariff; a disappointing budget; failure of Government to carry out platform of 1919; similarity of Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2720; Liberals will not implement pledges, 2721
Civil service economy, 793
Clothes wringers, 3140
Criminal Code, carriage of calves, 2831
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Defence branches, amalgamation, 423
Departments, economy in, 458, 793
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Elevators, complaint of unfair dealing, 2987
Entomology, qu. 472, 590, 817
Export liquor warehouses, 768, 2716
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 2489
Grasshopper plague, qu. 472, 590, 817
Harbours and rivers, expenditure, 1272
Harness, hides, prices, 3139
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 546
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization board, 3524
Live stock, diseases, 650
Military district No. 12, 1176, 1602, 1987
Military expenditure and policy, 1148, 1175, 1610
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1175, 1600-10
Customs duties, 1978
Permanent force, 1982
Saving in, 418
Temporary clerks, 587
Transport and freight, 1987
Ministers and directorships, 1091
Ministers, salary increases, 1093
Ocean and river service, 3508
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3017

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Public Works, average salary, 750
Quarantine, 2021
Raw materials, duty on, 3131
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 839
Steamship subsidies, 3506
Woodmen of the World, 1905
Woollen goods, 3137

Government Departments
Co-ordination of, 180-181. *See also* National Defence
Payment to each other for services rendered, 1724

Government, Federal, responsibility for unemployment, 1069-94. *See also* Address; Budget; Unemployment

Government, group system of. *See* Proportional Representation

Government-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Government Printing. *See* Printing; Publications

Governor General
Cars, 1688
Deputy of the Governor General, 3610
Secretary's office, 751
Speech on opening of Parliament; new appointment as Governor General; world-wide economic disturbances and industrial depression; unemployment; decline in prices of farm products; Customs tariff revision; co-ordination of government railway systems, 6; immigration, 6-7; re-establishment and medical treatment of soldiers; natural resources of western provinces; co-ordination of defence forces; limitation of armaments; Genoa conference; Postal conference; need for economy, 7
Address in reply. *See that title*
Warrants, 1990
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Expenditure by, 1353
Genoa Conference, 1716
Penitentiaries, 1670
Unemployment relief, 1719
Welland canal construction, 1687
Yukon territory, 1681

Grading of Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of Militia and Defence and Minister of the Naval Service)
Air Board
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Colonel O. M., resignation, 1727
Estimates, 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1731
Air Board Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 2357, 2820
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol, British Columbia, 1730
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Behring sea patrol, 1736
Business of the House
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742-5, 1900
Canadian institute for the blind, 3541
Canadian Northern, Sir Richard McBride, 202
Civil service salaries, 553
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1411-14
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Ford Motor Company, 3277
Government departments, payment to each other for services rendered, 1724
Gwatkin, General, 422. *See also under this title*, National Defence
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Insurance Act Amdt., 3147
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
Militia and Defence
Adjustment of war claims, 2974
Air force 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Amalgamation, saving, 417-18
Ammunition, reserve of, 2086
Annual drill, 1151, 1179, 1578
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Cadet services, 1972, 1978
Classification, 416
Civil Service Commission, and, 423
Defence forces, 1135
Director of assigned pay, 586
Engineer services and works, 1980
Estimates, 1711, 2974, 3498
Expenditure and policy, 1339
Reductions proposed by Minister, 1578
MacBrien, General, reported utterances of, 1662
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1136-52, 1982
Royal military college, 1985
Schools of instruction, 1985

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. — *Con.*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Temporary employees, 417
Topographic survey, 1985
Transport and freight, 1987
War claims, adjustment, 2098
Ministers and directorships, 1109
Money, purchasing power of, 1151-3
Municipal taxation, payment of by government, 1257
National Defence bill, 363, 417, 547
National Defence bill (No. 27) 644, 657, 668, 733, 746
Air Force, 678
Concurrence in Senate Amdts. 2806
Militia estimates, 421
Services, transfer to, 1747
Naval policy, 2043-72
Naval service
Estimates, 418, 420, 1735, 1843
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Niobe, sale of, 2043-65
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 2043, 2058, 3365
Postponement of debate, 1972
Reduction of naval armaments, 1737
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Trawlers, 1844
War claims, adjustment, 1752
War medals, 1754
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Parents, support of by children, 1308
Pelagic sealing treaty, 1844
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Pensions
Northwest Rebellion, 3523
Widowed mothers', M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., criticism of, 2778
Rideau canal, 2766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
Salaries, 775
Royal Canadian navy. *See under this title*, Naval Service
Royal naval college, Esquimalt, 2048
Salaries Act Amdt. bill, 363, 746
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Special Loans bill, 3358
Supply, discussion, method of, 1142
Survey and map work, co-ordination of, 1986
War claims, exchange on, 1752
War memorials, 2098, 2100

Graham Miss Nora, qu. 599

Graham, Mr., agent at Regina, 682

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834
Banks and, 2246. *See also that title*
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry, 1770
Canadian National railways, grain leakages, 1401, 1930
Canadian Wheat Board, advance, 3541. *See also* Wheat Board
Car demurrage, 2981
Elevators
Private, 2981
Licenses to, 2838
System of, 114, 233
Terminal, 2980
Excess overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837
Fort William
Inspector, 2983
Port Arthur, and, overages, qu. 1210
Government, 233, qu. 3152
Grain Commission, and, 2980
Maintenance and equipment of, 2978
Quebec, 1466, 1471, 1474, 1483
United Grain Growers, 2983
Freight rates on grain, 146. *See also* Freight Rates
Grades, mixing of, 2839, 2981
Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board
Grain Growers and oleomargarine. *See* Oleomargarine
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, qu. 705, 777, qu. 1181, 2839, 2842, 2982
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Terminal elevators, 2980
Grain leakages on Canadian National railways, 1401, 1930
Handling of. *See under this title,* Elevators; Transportation
Long hauls to market, 146-7
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Mixing grades, 2839, 2981
In transit, 2838
Montreal harbour, shipment of grain through, 1489
Oats, price of, 225

Grain and Grain Trade — *Con.*
Overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837, 2838, 2980
Per capita production, 2159
Price fixed in Liverpool, 1203-08
Production and shipment, 1203
Quebec, shipment of grain through, 1466, 1471, 1472
Russia, competition of, 2157
St. Lawrence river waterway, 269, 1183, 1317, 1325. *See also that title*
Sample market, 2838
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co., 2989
Screenings, recleaned, 2490
Selling without growers' permission, 2989
Shipment. *See under this title,* Montreal; Quebec; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Shrinkage and leakage in transit, 232. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Speculation in, 158. *See also* Wheat Board Bill
Transcontinental railway, 2194
Transportation, 235, 300. *See also* Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal
Water by, 69-70. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
United Grain Growers, terminal elevator, 2983
Wheat
Marketing, 2915, 2951, 2969. *See also* Wheat Board
Production and cost, 2333

Grain Growers Grain Company, alleged contribution to political organization, 2488

Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938

Grand Manan, wharves and breakwaters, 1993

Grand River bridge, qu. 1287

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grape Juice, tax on, 2117, 2594, 2617

Grasshopper Plague, qu. 472, 2726, 3520

Gravel, Mr., Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Great Britain
British Preference. *See that title*
Free trade and, 2526. *See also* speeches on Budget

Great Britain — *Con.*
Imports from, qu. 966. *See also* Imports and Exports; Trade
Income tax reductions, 2860
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368
Merchant Marine, 2379
Protection of industries, 2408-9
Tariff legislation, 2267
Trade with. *See* British Preference; Trade

Great Lakes, life-saving service, qu. 367

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Tidewater Association, 1319. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great War Veterans' Association. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill; Returned Soldiers
Cash grants to soldiers, policy on, 394. *See also* Soldiers Bonus
Charges against Pensions Board, 3041. *See also* Pensions
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration, 2155
Oleomargarine, 1798
Oriental immigration, 1514

Greece
Commission on credit to, 303
Loan, qu. 1400

Grey, Lord, letter to Governor General on military protection, 1136

Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification
Montreal post office, 1633
Post office inspectors, 1507

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Charlotte County, Mr. Todd's election promises, 1997
Grand Manan, Campobello and Deer islands, wharves and breakwaters, 1993-7
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1993
Patrol boat Phalarope, qu. 1503
St. George public building, 1240
Sardines, price for export, qu. 1182

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 2021

Guernsey Island of, credit system, 2505

Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company, qu. 1400

Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 192

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Air Board
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Expenditure, 1725
Details of, 1730
Air Service, forest patrol, 1047
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-68-73
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
British Ministry of Shipping, claim, 1752
Budget, 2874. Amended resolutions, 2874; depreciated currency, valuation of, 2875; trade with Germany; pocket knives; effect of Minister's proposal, 2876; marking of goods, effect of repeal; German aluminum goods; German agents seeking orders in Canada; Canadian valuation of German goods; favourable position of German manufacturers; anti-dumping clause; fruit industry, 2879; marking of goods; government by Order in Council, 2880
Burstall, Sir Henry, 742-3
Business of the House
Point of order, bill ref. to Com., 1395
Saturday sittings, 2032
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2997
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian National Railways, enlisted men, allowance, 3519
Census, completion of, 1364
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carriage of calves, 2831
Scrip frauds, 1396
(Mr. Woodsworth) 1395
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Criminal Code and Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Demobilization, 1155
Expenditure for, 1163
Vote, 1171
Departmental solicitors, 683
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Women of foreign birth, enfranchisement, 476
Dominion lands and surveys, 1035, 1038
Topographic survey, 1043, 1986
Dominion observatory building, 1266
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women. M. (Mr. Euler) 476
Escheats Act. Amdt. bill, 2829, 3026
Finance, loans, 771
Govt. departments, payments to each other, 1726

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh — *Con.*
Govt. publications, demand, 1374
Gwatkin, Major-General, 742
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1997
Amdt. to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure, 1269
Ontario, Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1988
Quebec, 1999
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Immigration of farm workers, 3052
Indian Affairs, officials, 683
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 2830
Labour dept., salary increases, 564
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Military expenditures, 1138
Militia and Defence
Ammunition,
Reserve of, 2086
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
Annual drill, 1154, 1155
Artillery ammunition from Great Britain, 1154-73
Liberal attitude in 1920, 1921, and 1922, 1154
Arsenals, Lindsay, 2085
Cadet services, 1972, 1977
Expenditure and policy, 1594
Permanent force, 1983
Reduction of staff, 586
Topograpric survey, 1043, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2976
Ministers and directorships, 1094
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Munitions, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
National Defence, Department of, bill, 659, 738, 1747
Bill should be preceded by resolution, 547
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval policy, 2051
Naval service
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Royal Canadian navy, 1846, 1972
Royal naval college, 2049
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Parliament buildings, 2014
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 787
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Progressive party, attitude towards redistribution, 1364

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—Con.
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1238
Ontario, 1251, 1259
Public Service Retirement Act, 3025
Public Works estimates, 964, 747
Contingency vote, 748
Reductions, 698
Quebec harbour advances, 1473
Redistribution and the census, 1364
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1340
Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717
Steamship services, 2020, 3505
Survey and map work, proposed co-ordination, 1033, 1986
Toronto harbour improvement, 1474
War claims, adjustment
Naval service, 1752
Vickers, 2976
War medals, 2977
War memorials, Vimy, 2100
Warlike stores, sale of, 1171
Wheat Board, 2968
Wrangel island, 1751
Yukon territory, 1034
Radiotelegraph service, 1750

Gwatkin, Major-General, 421, 422, 742, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence bill

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Alex., qu. 606
Cattle embargo, Mr. Doherty, 989
Customs tariff, ploughs, 3231
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 704
Hatters' plush, duty on, 3141
Labour dept., employees, 566
Lake of the Woods bill, 2309
Lindsay arsenal, 1979
Military expenditure and policy, 1179
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1179
Expenditure and policy, 1597, 1617, 1984
Permanent force, 1984
Plough parts, duty on, 3123, 3231
Riordon Company, taxes, qu. 607, qu. 927
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3373-4

Half Breed Scrip, Frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Halifax. *See also* Naval Service
Dennis building, qu. 3360
Fortifications, 1581
Ocean terminals, qu. 364
Ocean tonnage, 2008

Halifax — *Con.*
Patronage committee, 199
Port of. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Public buildings, expenditures, 1244
Quarantine station, repairs, 1238, 2021

Halkett, Mr. Andrew, 3051

Hamilton
Post office building, 1246-51, 1258
Queenston-Hamilton highway, qu. 471

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Parry Sound lighthouse inspector, qu. 827

Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 192-3, qu. 471. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Hanna-Medicine Hat line, 1965

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2033
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway Co., 1183, qu. 1504
Coal
Anthracite, importations, qu. 2356
Public buildings, for, 1763
Defence, deputy ministers, 419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Edmundston public building, 1239, 1251
Election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Experimental farms, 795
External Affairs, contingencies, 3509
Graham, Miss Nora, qu. 699
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
High Commissioner, 414
Indians, Devon band, removal, 1215
Insurance premiums, tax, 3256
International operation of railways, 192
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Justice department, contingencies, 1669
Labour investigators, 462
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647
Matches, tax on, 3262
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and defence
Military property at Fredericton, 1980
Transport and freight, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1987

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. — *Con.*
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nova Scotia
Coal strike, 461
Supreme court vacancy, 3436
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Pension Board, appeals, 391
Post Office Dept.
Printing and stationery, 691
Reorganization, 2800
Rural delivery, 2800
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1991
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1243
Public Works estimates, 693
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Reid Newfoundland railway, 2027
Root Vegetable bill, 3369
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 735
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Acquisition by Canadian National railways, qu. 1774
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, survey, 2768
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Salary increases, 391
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Sorel shipyard, qu. 605
Statistics, Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Steamship services, 2029, 3506
War trophies, director, 702
Wharves in tidal waters, qu. 2209
White slave traffic, suppression of, 3497

Harbour Masters. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Harbours. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual Harbours, *see their titles*
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec and Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers
Alberta, 2004, 3547
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Esquimalt, 3541
Estimates, 1269, 1765, 1988, 3541
Expenditures on, 1465
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Little Current, 2002
Manitoba, 2003, 3545

Harbours and Rivers — *Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commission bill
New Brunswick, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Provincial wharves, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765, 3545
Expenditure, 1921-22, 1269
Ontario, 1999
Port Arthur and Fort William, 3541
Prince Edward Island, 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1283. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
St. John
Expenditure, qu. 1401
Improvement, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Shuswap lake, wharf, 3547
Toronto, 3541

Harding, President, 69
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 133, 1184

Hardy, Hon. Senator, A. C., 2695

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Address in reply, 307. Liberals and Progressives, 307; immigration; railway policy; 308; manufacturers and raw material, 309
Aliens, taxation of transient, 2155
Customs department, secretaries, 764
Foreigners, 2155
Hog cholera, garbage feeding, 1007-9, 1028
Immigration
Policy, 2154
Undesirable, 2154
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Com., final report, 3350
Public buildings, Ontario, repairs, 1250

Harvest Excursions, 337

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Rural postmasters, 3080

Hatters' Bands, Plush, and bindings, 2855, 3139, 3141

Hawaian Islands, Japanese immigration, 1515

Health. *See also* Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Department
Estimates, 2017
Salaries, etc., 775
Diseases, infectious of prisoners. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Honey, 2017
Housing, and, 121. *See also* Housing
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021. *See also* Immigration
Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Quarantine, 2021
Unemployment, 86-87
Venereal diseases, qu. 935, 2022

Health of Animals. *See* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases

Hearst Publications, 3111

Herring,. Dry-salting. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Hides, price of, 2623, 3138

High Commissioner in London, 58
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Cattle embargo, and. *See also that title*
Alleged statement on, 1020, 1463
Income and taxation, 139
Salaries, etc., 413

High Cost of Living. *See* Cost of Living

High River, Alta.
Aerial Forest patrol, 1050, qu. 1066, 1723

Highways, 63, 75, 122
Banff-Windermere, 1051, 1681
Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63
Dundas Street, Halton county, qu. 1065
Edith Cavell, 1051
Grand Circle tour, 1683
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 471
Indian reserves, 1216
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Ontario, qu. 372
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, treeplanting, qu. 2039
Road materials, investigation, 1234
Road projects, submitted, qu. 2040
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls, qu. 936
Soulanges canal road, 2768
Tourist traffic and, 1682
Transcontinental, 319, 2636

Highways — *Con.*
Transportation, 1939
Unemployment relief, 1082
Windermere road, 1051, 1681

Hikers. *See* Macdonald's Army; Riley's Army

Historic Sites, 119. *See also* Battlefields Monuments, qu. 469

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 785
American magazines, importation of, 3108-09, 3112
Budget, 2675. Expected modifications in budget proposals, 2675; taxes on cheques, confectionery and cigars; sales tax and cost of living; dissatisfaction of Agrarian party with budget; tariff record of Liberal party; pledges and promises broken, 2676; reduction in agricultural implement duties; protection and the maintenance of industries; record of Conservative party; inconsistencies of Liberals; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech; his letter to West Durham electors, 2677; unrestricted reciprocity; commercial union; Mr. Fielding's disavowal of tariff items of Liberal platform; concealment of views on public questions; reciprocity; government created by big interests, 2678; big business behind Sir Lomer Gouin, 2679; Proposed coalition of Agrarians and Liberals; national railways; responsibility for railway building, 2680; effort to form Liberal-Progressive government; progressives and reactionary factions in government; Minister of Marine and Fisheries; conflicting opinions in Liberal ranks; national railways; speech of Minister of Justice; full value for support of big interests; protection; diversified industries, 2682; relief from burdens not to be had through tariff reduction; feeling between East and West; rural depopulation of Ontario; agricultural conditions; manufacturers in unsatisfactory position, 2683; amenities of rural life, 2684
Canada's credit, 1919
Canadian National railways, deficits, 1919
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1298
Empire-Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Finance, deputy minister's salary, 752

Hocken, Mr. H. C. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Income taxes, qu. 705
Labour dept.
Mr. Harrison, 575-6
Promotions, 576
McDonald, Mr. John N., qu. 3361
Military expenditure, 1137
Military hospitals, expenditure, 1261
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Flags, 1265
Water, 1266
Public works estimates, 747, 748, 1261
Reciprocity, Mr. Putnam, 2286
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 833
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1314
Welland canal, and, 2754
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 388, 398
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 2456
Welland ship canal, 2754

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Animal contagious diseases, 2103
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2013
Water powers, surveys, 1051

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Budget, 2331. Financial obligations; precarious position of agriculture; Canadian workman, purchasing power; unemployment, 2331; Western Canada; statements prepared by Manitoba Agricultural College staff; wheat production and cost, 2332; farmers' profits compared with those of other businesses, 2333; probable permanency of conditions; rural discontent; the solution, 2334; drastic tariff reductions; lower freight rates, wider markets; tendency to lean on government, 2335; protection and the agricultural industry; Fordney tariff; opportunity for reductions in Canadian tariff; Genoa Conference; Mr. Lloyd George and spirit of nationalism; source of revenue; development of basic industries, 2337; the amendment, 2338; broken promises; tariff commission; redistribution; party system of government, 2339
Census, completion of, 1365
Cost of living, 1175, 2331
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Immigration statistics, 756-7
Labour dept., salaries, 551

Hoey, Mr. R. A. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1175
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1175
Quebec arsenal, 2097
Ministers and directorships, 1111
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Winnipeg river, bridge, 2011

Hogs
Cholera. *See also* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Health of Animals
Compensation, 1028
Extermination of, 2594
Grading, 2594

Holiday on Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Holland, immigration from, 2144

Holland, Lee, order for deportation of, 1283

Holland, Major, death of, 2821

Holstein Cattle trade with United States in, 2695

Holt, Sir Henry, 1128

Home Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Home . Markets. *See* Budget; Markets; speeches on Address

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldiers' Land Settlement
Re-entry, 1041

Honey, 2017

Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Industrial and Scientific Research

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse Racing, Federal control of, 2596

Horses. *See* Live Stock

Hose, Captain. *See* Naval Service

Hosmer, Mr. Charles R., 1128

Hospital Ships
Claim by British Ministry of Shipping for loss, 2975
Exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1053, 1751, 3544, 3612. *See also under this title,* Audibility of Debates
Adjournments
Easter, 546, 820, 823
Empire day and Ascension day, 1760, 1769, 1905
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
M. (Mr. Irvine) Nova Scotia miners, 497; withdrawn, 545
Audibility of debates, 385, 411, 658, 708, 1053, 1578, 1721, 1751, 1755, 1996, 2831, 3544, 3613
Bills, money, to be preceded by res, 547
Business of the House
Budget debate, probable date of conclusion, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Further legislation, 2996, 3041, 3103, 3151, 3364-5
Government orders, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1460, 1719
Private members', 1719
Public accounts, closing of, 1210
By-elections. *See under this title* Vacancies
Chamber, acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Committees, Select Standing, 8, 323. For proceedings and reports, *See* titles of the several Committees
Changes in, 497, 545, 596, 871, 1398
Powers of, 326
Criminal Code, reprinting of, 1717
Debates
Audibility of. *See under this title* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Official Report of
Committee
Appointed, 325
First report, 1132, 1258
Second report, 3359
Incorporation of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Tabulated statements in answer to questions, 1132, 1660
Decorum
Conversation, 1755, 2640
Courteous bearing to member speaking, 2090
Deputy Speaker, election of, 363. *See also that title*
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5
Divisions
Budget
Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar), ruling of Mr. Speaker on, 2523

House of Commons — *Con.*
Divisions — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton), neg. 2912
Correction of division list, 2971; Corrected list, 2972
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means, agreed to, 2913
Crowsnest Pass Agreement
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) and amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1457-8
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, amdt. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1163
Freight Rates, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of third report of Special Com. on Transportation Costs, 3586
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 3435
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) neg. 1131
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and Importation, discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1840
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) and amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1577
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 843
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) neg. 450
Estimates, 2026. *See also that title*
Discussion of particular item on M. to go into Com. of Supply, 1337
Expenditure, qu. 2583
Expense of sittings and cost per hour, 1476, 2170, 2635
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Indemnity
Payment of, 361
Proposed reduction, 2513, 2690, 2895, 3613
Internal Economy Commission, 8
Members
Attendance of, 2513
Deceased
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., memorial to, 1929
McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Argenteuil) 39
New
Election and introduction of
Bouchard, Mr. Georges (Joseph) 1929
King, Hon. J. H., 496
Ouimet, Joseph Rodolphe, 323
Private, business of, 1719

House of Commons — *Con.*
Members — *Con.*
Speeches, length of, 2450, 2635
Ministers and directorships. *See that title*
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473, 2507
Speaker's ruling, 2519
Non-debatable
That Com. rise, 1181
Oleomargarine (Mr. Neill) time fixed for discussion, 1719
Redistribution, M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion, 1719
Supply in, 1579
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the Day
Right of member to raise qu. of privilege, 2638
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Petitions, Birnie, Mr. Alex. and others, 1929
Privilege
Baxter, Hon. Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3492
Caldwell, Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Copp, Hon. Mr. — Correction of report respecting War claims, 1721
Crerar, Hon. Mr. — Budget debate, agricultural figures quoted in, 2637
Deslauriers, Mr. — Correction of speech, 3365-6
Fielding, Hon. Mr. — Clerk Assistant, 687
Gauvreau, Mr. — Statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Hoey, Mr.—Denial of newspaper reports. 2458
Johnston, Mr. (Last Mountain) — Charge that Progressives are delaying budget debate, 2692
Kay, Mr. — Wheat Board, 872
Maclean, Mr. (York) — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Right of member to raise qu. on orders of the day, 2638
Questions
Lengthy answers to, 1660
Tabulated statements in official report of debates, 1132
Returns
Inquiry for, 1283, 1988, 2042
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Rules, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Senate, and, expenditure, qu. 2583
Sergeant-at-Arms
Parliamentary messengers, qu. 1376, 1335

House of Commons — *Con.*
Sittings
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Saturday, 1905, 2032, 2458
Suspended, 3611-14
Wednesday at 3 p.m., 49
Wednesday evenings, 1905, 2033, 2170
Speaker. *See that title*
Speeches, length, 2450, 2635
Staff
Chief accountant, salary, qu. 2583, qu. 2803
Chief of stationery division, 3608
Law branch, 2304
Organization, 3221
Amended, 1335
Reading room, assistant curators, 1335
Stenographers and messengers, pay, qu. 1376
Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1579
Discussion of particular item of estimates on M. to go into Supply, 1337
Motion, movers of, 1579
Motion for, latitude in discussion, 2238
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459

House of Commons and Senate Act Amdt. bill. *See* Ministers and Directorships; Salaries Act Amdt.

Housing, 121, 219, 774, 3524. *See also* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Building costs, 2417
Returned soldiers, for, 271, 3304, 3314, 3321-22, 3329, 3332. *See also that title*
Shortage of, 1072
Unemployment, and, 3524

Howe, Hon. Joseph, 1387

Hubbs, Mr. John (Prince Edward)
Alcohol tax, retail druggists, 1213

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444
Immigration-Criminal Code bills, 3283
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3199, 3210

Hudson's Bay Company
Northwest country and, 148
Supplies to northern Indians, 1712

Hudson Bay Railway, 2602
Completion of, 2779

Hudson Bay Railway — *Con.*
Hudson Bay
Navigability and fishery resources of, 2781, 2779-99
Port Nelson, 1970
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1208, 1325
Senate committee, report, 2781

Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993, 3314

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 224. Reciprocity and class legislation, 224; immigration and unemployment, 225; Prince Edward island markets and government inspection; income tax, administration of Act, 226; sales tax; daylight saving; eight-hour day and farmers, 227; labour unions; railways and the maritime provinces, 228
Administration, economy in, 3077-8
Budget, 2225. Financial situation, debt, expenditure, economy; borrowings, 2225; the amendment, 2226; income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227; sales tax; extravagant war expenditures, 2228; Wartime Elections Act, 2229
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1925, 1956
Canned goods, inspection of, 3049
Civil Service Commission, 3076
Civil Service, economy, 2060
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1989
Income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227
Military expenditures and policy, 1143
Militia, annual drill, 1144
Montague, P.E.I., post office building, 1264
Railway policy, 1956

Humane Society, Criminal Code Amdt., 2831

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1526
Pension Board, charges against, 2994
Postal revenue, qu. 2040
Remuneration of railway employees — Mr. McCrea, 2316

Hungary, Treaty with, 3359, 3490, 3547. For Bill, *See* Peace Treaties

Hutterites. *See* Immigration

Hydro Electric, 632, 1326, 1937, 2327, 2747. *See also* Electrification; Maclean, Mr. (York); St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Commission, 1937
Difference with Ontario Government, 1080
Power development in Ontario, 63, 71, 131, 1950
St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1188-9. *See also that title*

Hydrographic Survey, 1736, 1746. *See also* Naval Service

Hyndman Commission. *See* Grain Inquiry Commission

Ice-breakers
Claim of Canadian Towing & Wrecking Co., 1677
Repurchase of, 1490
Thunder Bay, at, 1677
Vickers company contract, 320

Iceland, immigration from, 2144

Immigration, 6-7, 56, 79, 80, 82, 88, 145, 164, 182, 236, 282, 297, 311, 336, 348, 2243, 2254. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Labour; Oriental Aliens; Unemployment
Advantages, 2516
Agents,
Bonus to, 3062
Promises by, 3058, 3063
Agricultural labourers, 297, 2143, 2161, 2193, 2514, 3053-5
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2147
Alien enemies, 2146
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Attitude towards the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
British, 2144, 2150, 2515
Artisans, 2258, 2516
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Buildings, repairs, etc., 1757
Bukowinians, 2159
Canadian National railways, and, 1927
Canadians emigrating, qu. 1182. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Central European, 2154-8, 2166, 2477
Child, 2144, 2148, 2153, 2161, 2163, 3063
Chinese, 2026. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Commissioner at Canton, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

Immigration — *Con.*
Classes prohibited after May 9, 2514
Crime, and, 1392-4, 2517
Deportation. *See* Immigration-Criminal Code Bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Aliens trafficking in drugs, 2019
Desirable, 3057
Domestic servants, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Doukhobors, 167, 2160
Eastern Canada, 2165
Eastern Europe, 80
Emigration from Canada, 2260, 2372, 2516, 2865. *See also* Population
Canadians, qu. 1182
Exodus from Canada, 2478, 2516
Losses through, 2516
Record of, 2158
Europe, from, 308. *See also under this title,* Central European
Follow up policy, 2160
Foreign-born and crime, 1392-4, 2517
Galicians, 2159
Great Britain, from, 2480
Growth of wealth under, 13
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment of, 2145
Holland, 2144
Holland, Lee, deportation of, 872, 1282
Household workers, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Icelandic, 2144
Industrial centres, from, 236
Inspection, 2143
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 171
Italian, 2171
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Land, speculation in, 2152-9
Language qualification, 2515
Literature, Ontario Government, 2566
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2151, 2153, 2518
Manitoba Liberal Convention, res. 2478
Maritime provinces, and, 2165
Meals for immigrants, qu. 2971
Medical inspection, 2021, 2143
Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Emigration to Mexico, qu. 732, 2160
Mentally unfit, 2145
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148, 2208, 3058
Montreal Board of Trade res. 2517
"Nomination system", 3056
Oriental, 319, 2143. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Asiatic, 173, qu. 732
British Columbia in, 167

Immigration — *Con.*
Oriental — *Con.*
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction of, qu. 1289, qu. 1399
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Oriental Aliens, 319. *See that title*
Poland, 2145
Policy
Criticisms, 2579
Minister's statement, 17, 2143, 2476, 2481
Physically fit, 3055-6
Printers, 3055
Problems of, 350
Qualifications, 2479
Quebec, facilities at, 1465
Racial groups, 236
Assimilation, of, 2517
Rate of, 269
Reception of the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
Regulations, 249-250, 2148, 2215, 2513-14
Res. of Manitoba Liberal Convention, 2478
Restricted, 167, 2513-14, 3056
St. John immigration buildings, 2027
Scandinavian, 2144
Shandro's plan, 2153
Sifton, Sir Clifford, and, 268
Undesirable, 1389, 2154
Ukrainians, 3061
Unemployment, and, 151, 182, 225, 1071. *See also that title*
Union of Canadian municipalities resolution, 236, 2155
United States, from, 658, 2147, 2150, 2162, 2477. *See also that title*
Work, lack of, 251. *See also under this title,* Unemployment

Immigration Act
Disqualification of British-born under, 1389-91

Immigration Act Amdt. bills
1. Trial by jury, deportation, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 864
Ref. to Special Com., 1388-94, 1502
Additions to Special Com., 1719
Special Com. reports, 1988, 2519, 3104, 3156. *See also* Criminal Code bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
Final report, 3280
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to refer back, 3282-83
Amdt. neg. 3286
M. (Mr. Archambault) to concur
M. agreed to, 3286
(Subjects and sections discussed)

Immigration Act Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Trial by jury — *Con.*
Arrest without warrant, 1390
Assumption of powers of government, 1391
British subject, naturalization of, 1391
Decision of immigration authorities, 1389
Deportation of British subject without trial, 1390
Domicile, 1389
Enemy aliens, 1389
Foreigners, 1392
Organized Government, disbelief in, 1389
Overt acts and thoughts, 1390
Prohibited or undesirable classes, 1389
Repeal of provisions of 1919 Act, 1392
Retroactive legislation, 1391
Trial by jury, 1388
2. Intending Immigrants to make written application. (Mr. Neil) 1r., 2207

Immigration and Colonization
Department
Civil government estimates, 3499
Contingencies, 3051
Deputy Minister, qu. 2970
Estimates, 1711, 2026 2143, 3499
Representative at Canton, China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214
Salaries, etc., 754, 3502

Imperial Conference. *See also* Conferences; Prime Minister Conference
Naval defence, 1864

Imperial Convention of Teachers, grant, 1673

Imperial Council, qu. 2803

Imperial Defence. *See* National Defence bills

Imperial Forces, pensions. *See* Pensions

Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237

Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, 2517

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Budget; Customs; Imports

Imports and Exports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Germany; Trade
Agricultural figures, 209, 2618-19
Automobiles and parts, qu. 1633. *See also that title*
British goods, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
By countries, 2109
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Duties, 2668. *See also* Customs

Imports and Exports — *Con.*
Exports
Decrease, 2579
Fiscal years, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu. 1376
Restriction of exports, 2883
United States, to, 209. *See also* United States
1911-1922, qu. 1661
Germany, from, 2421, 2644. *See* Germany
Marking, 2113, 3476-7. *See also* Customs
Meat, of, qu. 610
Quantity, and, value of, 2182
Revenue from, qu. 827
Statement for last three years, 2109
Structural steel, qu, 1931
Valuation, 2113, 3413
For duty, amended regulation, 2854

Income Tax. 2174, 2220, 2691, 2693. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation; Ways and Means
Administration of, 226, 2024
Aliens, non-residents, 1301
Amount collected, qu. 366
Average, by classes, 2298
Banks, payments by, 1400
Branch, appointments to, 1663
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Civil Service retirement fund, qu. 937
Classification of taxpayers, 1063
Collections, 60
In 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Manufacturers, from, 60
Commercial travellers, 2174, 3484. *See also* Income War Tax Act Amdt.
Comparison with systems of other countries, 2227
Exemptions, 2275
Farmers, and, 352, 2714
Great Britain, reductions in, 2860
Inequalities, 2672
Inquiry for legislation, 3103
Montreal office employees, qu. 607, 1288
Payments by grades, qu. 3362
Revenue and classification of taxpayers, 1063, qu. 1399
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Winnipeg, qu. 1340
Riordon Paper Company, qu. 927
St. John, N.B., office, qu. 826
Systems in other countries, 2227
Widows and widowers, 2174

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res. 3478; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
Sections and subjects discussed:
Banks not entitled to deductions, 3485

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill — *Con.*
Sections and Subjects discussed — *Con.*
Exemptions, 3359
Children, 3484
Forms, 3486
Non-resident aliens
M. (Mr. German) 1301, agreed to, 1303
Taxation of American citizens, 3485
Travelling expenses of trainmen and commercial travellers, 3485

Indecent Assault. *See* Criminal Code

Indebtedness. *See* Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

Index, Unrevised Edition. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Indian Act Amdt. bill (Enfranchisement of Indians; Ownership of land)
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3191; 3r., 3194

Indian Affairs, Department of
Estimates, 1214, 1712, 3536
Salaries, etc., 681

Indians
Agents. *See also under this title,* Reserves
Oka, 1217
Sturgeon Falls, qu. 1285
Agitation and unrest, 1223
British Columbia, 1713
Lands, 330
Legal expenses, 3536
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1220, 1224
Complaints, 1223
Destitute, relief for, 1712-14
Edmonton school, proposed, 1227-9, 3536
Education, 1227, 1715, 3536
Edmonton school, 1227-9, 3536
Elkhorn school, 3537
Morley school, 1218, 3536
Red Deer school, 1229
Round Lake school, 3537
Stony reserve, qu. 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.
Expenditure, 1216, 1225
Field and garden seeds, 1712
Food allowance, 1220
General expenses, 1226, 1712
Greater production campaign, 1216-20, 1224, 1288
Half-breed scrip frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code
Health, 1220, 1230
Hospitals and medical attention, 1218-24, 1713

Indians — *Con.*
Janse brothers, land in Ermineskins reserve, 1713
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and northwest, 1218
New Brunswick, 1215
Nova Scotia, 1214
Number in Canada, 685
Ontario and Quebec, 1216
Potlach Institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Indians serving gaol sentences for, 1578, 1721
Reserves
Blackfoot, 1224
Greater production, 1288
Pasture land, qu. 2215
Blood, 1219
Land leased, qu. 2969
Devon band, proposed removal, 1215
Ermineskins, 1712
Keeseekoose-Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Oka, Indian agent, 1217
St. Peters, qu. 472
Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Six Nation, 1220-1
Stony, 1218
Education, qu. 965, 1227, 3536
Sydney
Medical attendance, qu. 2216
Proposed transfer, 1215
Tobique, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Settlers. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Smallpox and other diseases, 1714. *See also under this title,* Health
Treaty No. 11, 1219, 1227
Tuberculosis, 1714
Yukon, 1226

Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372

Industrial Conference. *See* National Industrial Conference

Industrial Depression, 6. 10, 52, 85, 105, 210, 212, 218, 219, 223, 235. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour
Investigation Act, 1054, 1058. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners

Industrial Re-establishment. *See* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment

Industrial Warfare. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade
Basic and secondary, 2384
Boot and shoes, cost of labour, 2350

Industries — *Con.*
Canadian, encouragement, 2658. *See also* Budget
Exhibitions of industrial products in France, 2031
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1289, 1396
Home, 2149, 2229. *See also* Budget
Key, 2379
Infant, encouragement, 2434
Manufacturing, 2377
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Protection and maintenance of, 144, 2677, 2409-11
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1318
Subsidizing, 2402
United States, branches in Canada, 2389, 2546
Woollen, cost of labour, 2350

"Industry and Humanity", reference to, 253, 534

Infant Mortality, 1380, 2634

Infectious Diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Inglis Boiler Works, qu. 732

Inheritance Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Excise duties changed). Res. 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Sections and subjects discussed:
Alcohol for druggists, 3241
Beet sugar, 3246
Amdt. (Mr. Fansher) negatived, 3252
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239
Home brewing, 3141, 3142, 3252
Molasses, 3242
Raw leaf tobacco, 3241
Sugar, 3242

Inquiry for Returns. *See* House of Commons, Returns

Insect Pests. *See* Agriculture; Destructive Insect and Pest Act; Grasshoppers

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Inspection and Sale of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Insular Dominions. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Insurance
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 605
Canadian National railway, qu. 471, qu. 610

Insurance — *Con.*
Claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance
Fire prevention, 794
Foreign companies, tax, 2462
Fraternal benefit societies, 3143
Mutual companies, 3477. *See also* Special War Revenue
Premiums, tax on, 2117
Returned Soldiers, 3306, 3313. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance bill
Beneficiaries, 3328
Returns. *See* Special War Revenue bill
Soldiers, etc., 791
The People's Insurance Act, Great Britain, 1304
Unemployment, 1069-84
Sickness, and old age, qu. 1375
Woodmen of the World, 1905

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3143; 3r., 3148; Senate admts. 3607

Inter-Allied Permanent Committee on Disabled Soldiers, 3403

Intercolonial Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Interest, 1921. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Committee, 378, 598
One-fourth vote suggested, 373
Position of Opposition last year, 378-385

Interim Supply Bill. *See also* Appropriation Acts
Res. 378; 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599

Interior Department
Canadian National parks, 1681
Conservation Commission employees, transfer to, 452-3
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Estimates, 452, 1033, 1270, 1680, 3517
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Migratory Birds, 1684
Nelson, Mr. Frank, salary, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
Statistics, 1366
Topographical maps, qu. 1632
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275

Interlocking Directorates, 2503. *See also* Ministers and Directorships

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundary Commission, 1033

International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373

International Deep Sea Racing, M. (Mr. Duff) 1384, 3510

International Disarmament Conference. *See* Limitation of Armaments

International Harvester Company, 2382

International Institute of Agriculture, 969

International Joint Commission, 70. *See also* Electrification; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Report on St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1185, 1191, 1193, 1197, 1199, 1206, 1315, 1396, 1469
Welland canal, 1688

International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk lines in United States

International Opium Convention, qu. 1066

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Inverness Pier, 1766

Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs Act Amdt.

Ireland-Halifax cable, qu. 3360

Iron and Steel Industry. *See also* Steel
Structural steel importations, qu. 1931

Irrigation
Preservation of forests and, 1723
Southern Alberta, 761

Irvine, Mr. William (East Calgary)
Address in reply, 211; death of Prime Minister's brother; congratulations to Mr. Speaker, important matters contained in Speech from Throne, 211; industrial problems; social evolution, 212; complicated political system, 213; Labour party, 214; party system of government, 215; origin of parties, 216;

Irvine, Mr. William — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
official Opposition; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 217; co-operation in government; production, consumption and unemployment, 218; unemployment insurance; industrial disturbance, 218; housing; gold standard and credit system; 219; protection and wages; home markets, 221; credit systems, 222; trade competition, 223; industrial problems — British labour party, 224
Agriculture and unemployment, 3058
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1082
Budget, 2495. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; taxation; public debt; chasing the financial blue-bird; colossal lie upon which budget is based; credit proposal to meet expenditures and debt; panic of national leaders, 2496; soundness of Canada's financial position; bank balances and real wealth; estimate of wealth and production, 2497; difference between production and consumption; average income of Canadian bread-winner; purchasing power, 2498; credit question at centre of national problems; Germany's industrial and financial position, wages, working hours; paper money, 2499; payment of indemnity in goods; proposed German loan; control of credit, 2500; the banking system; starting a new bank; issues of new money; issue of currency by Govt.; interest; private monopoly of social credit; indebtedness of Canada, 2501; inflation and deflation; under consumption; shut off interest taps of financiers; the Douglas system, 2502; definition of credit; ability to produce and deliver goods; a social asset; banking and interlocking directorates, 2503; regulation of prices, 2504; schemes proposed by Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. T. A. Edison, 2505; practical attempts to inaugurate credit system; island of Guernsey, 2505; St. Louis municipal currency; the gold basis; collapse of financial system; investigation of banking system, 2506; taxation of consumer; the amendment; attitude of Opposition; amendment to the amendment, 2507; attitude of Progressives; Farmers' platform; fiscal policy of Canadian Council of Agriculture; speech of leader of Progressive party; tariff proposals of Canadian

Irvine, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Council of Agriculture, 2509; tax on unimproved land values; inheritance tax, 2510
Debate, M. for adjournment, 2448, 2451, 2455
Business profits war tax, 2024
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Government railways, deficits, qu. 607
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1953
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 3478-84
Customs department, estimates, 769
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Financial credit, M. 1290
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Gold in central reserves and chartered banks, qu. 2971
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393, 3285
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022, 3060
Labour department
Employment specialist, 461
Statisticians, 462
Wage investigators, 463
Labour and unemployment, 3060
Loans, five year maturities, qu. 2993
Mackenzie-Mann subsidies, qu. 607
Military expenditure and policy, 1150, 1617
Ministers and directorships, 1120
Non-taxable bonds, qu. 2971
Nova Scotia miners
M. to adjourn House to discuss, 497, 539; withdrawn, 545
Quarantine. immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3456
Pensions Com., final report, 3345
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1745
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Shoe industry, protection, 3238
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1617
Tariff against France, 2032
Unemployment
Insurance, 1081
National Conference, 1082
Public works and highways, 1082
Relief, 2023
Situation, 1080
Standing committee, 1082
War, causes and effects of, 1618

Isle Perrot bridge, *See* Bridges

Italy
Genoa Conference, correspondence, 1905, 2035
Immigrants from, 2171
Trade, effect of currency valuation, 2849

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Air Board, 1722
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Archives branch, 703
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (petition in bankruptcy) 1395
Budget, 2513. Immigration, restrictive regulations; certain classes of immigration prohibited after May 9; agriculturists; farm labourers and domestic servants, 2514; discrimination in favour of British immigrants; language qualification; attempt to secure farmers bound to fail, 2515; artisan class should be admitted; immigration of the last ten years; exodus; loss of a million people; advantages of immigration; immigration into the United States, 2516; resolution of Montreal Board of Trade; curious notions in regard to immigration; Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire; assimilation of races; foreign-born and crime, 2517; Miss Macphail's objection to sheepskin coats; foreigners engaged in textile and other trades; government by Order in Council, 2518
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, amdt., 3000, neg. 3006
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, appointment of, 1368
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3498
Cigars and cigarettes, tax, 3240
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Criminal Code revision, 1717
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 477
"Foreigners and crime" propaganda, 1392, 2517
Grecian and Roumanian loans, qu. 1400
Immigration, 2513-2517
Department of, 3500
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black, qu. 2970, 3500
Dutch, 2144

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. — *Con.*
Immigration — *Con.*
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Meals for immigrants, 2971
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1391, 1392
Insurance premiums, taxation, 3254-5
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Palestine, mandate over, 1716
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Steamship subsidies, qu, 614
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974

Jamieson, Mr. J. A., claim of, 1687

Japan
Army reduction, 1610
Coal, importation from, 2406. *See also* Coal
Immigration from. *See* Oriental Aliens
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights and disabilities of Canadians in, qu. 1289, 1511, 2208
Treaty with, 1510. *See also,* Limitation of Armaments

Jasper Park, Edith Cavell road, 1051

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Air force and civil aviation, High River, 1734
Customs tariff, woollen clothing, 3235
Irrigation, Southern Alberta, 761
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Live stock, loss through wolves, 990, 1001
Rotary rod weeders, duty on, 3121
Sales tax, 3272
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, salary increases, 406

Job Printing. *See* Special War Revenue, Sales Tax

Joggins, breakwater, 1767

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moosejaw)
Address in reply, 112. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; position of Progressive party, 112; agricultural conditions, 113; marketing of grain, 114; tariff; natural resources of western provinces; public ownership of railways, 116
Agriculture, retirement of Dr. Saunders, 590, 3522
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103, 2737

Johnson, Mr. R. M. — *Con.*
Canada Grain Act
Constitutionality of, 2837
Overages, 2838
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3009
Canadian National railways. Bengough extension, 2770
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 472, 2951. *See also under this title*, Wheat Board bill
Advance to, 3541
Customs, dumping clause, 3419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472
Goderich harbour, grain shipment through, 2002
Government publications, 1374
Grain companies, default of, 2837
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 427
Justice dept, estimates, 1668
Labour dept.
Temporary clerks, 567
Wage investigators, 462-3
Lignite Utilization Board, 3526
National Defence bill, 2808
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Public buildings
Heating, 1759
Western provinces, discrimination against, 1254
Quebec harbour advances, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity, 590, 3522
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, Fort Qu'Appelle sanitarium, 1345
Threshing machines, 3124-25
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2762
Wheat Board bill, 3177, 3180, 3182, 3188, 3384
Amdt. 3178

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Accredited herds, diseases, 968
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2220. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity; financial situation, 2220; revenue and expenditure; debt; war obligations; profiteering; failure to tax wealth; tariff reductions; sales tax, 2221; income tax; immigration; increased production, 2222; markets; trade with United States; Wheat Board; amendment, 2223; failure of Government to propose progressive policy, 2224

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 469
Cultivators, etc., duty on, 3120
Customs Act, valuation, 3415
Dominion lands, sale of, qu. 376
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Immigration
Deputy Minister, 757
Officials, 760
Implement parts, duty, 3120
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Militia and Defence, pay of staff, 1982
Ministers and Directorships, 1120
Ottawa public buildings, 1252
Ploughs, etc., duty on, 3121
M. to reduce, 3121
Printing Bureau, plant and publications, 1971
Privilege, Progressives and delay in budget debate, 2692
Redistribution and the census, 1370
Rural and urban population, qu. 376
War memorials, 2101

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Canadian National railways, coal importations, qu. 2213
Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938
Le Blanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773
St. John terminal facilities, 848

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.; Exchequer Court; Justice; Supreme Court
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Admiralty, local judge in, 1274
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment at, 3496
Judges Act, Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Nova Scotia Supreme Court vacancy, 3436
Political commissions, on, 2397
Provincial commissions, on, qu. 366
Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Salaries, 2512, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Judges Act Amdt. bill (Saskatchewan Court of Appeal
Res. 424; 1r., 429; 2r., com., 546; 3r., 547
Senate amdts., 2830

Judicial Districts. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Justice
Administration of
Exchequer Court, 1274

Justice — *Con.*
Administration of — *Con.*
Litigated matters, 1276
Pecuniary Claims, 1276
Penitentiaries, 1276
Supreme Court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Civil Government, 1668
Estimates, 1274, 1668, 3495
Minister of, directorships and, 242-3. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Pecuniary claims convention with United States, 1276
Prisons and penitentiaries, inspection of by Grand Juries, 1279
Salaries and contingencies, 451
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, expenses, 1669

Juvenile Delinquents
Prison farms for, qu. 1773
Special schools for, qu. 469
16, 17, and 18 years old, qu. 1773

Kamloops
Model city, 318
Post office building, 1255

Kamloops-Kelowna Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Kamouraska, vacancy, 1459

Kay, Mr. W. Fred (Missisquoi)
Agricultural implements
Standardization of parts, 2406
Appearance of Senator McCoig before Com. on Agriculture, 2406
Agriculture and Colonization Com. reports
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900
M. for concurrence in fifth report, 2915
Wheat Board, 657, 703, 726, 776, 865, 1929
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial to, 2101
Daylight saving, M., 942-3
Privilege, Wheat Board, 872
Reference to, 1282

Kelley, Mr. Howard G., qu. 729

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Air force and civil aviation, 1723
Animal contagious diseases, compensation, 2806
Budget, 2280. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2280; attitude of Progressives to old parties; little change in policy indicated by budget proposals; new taxes; principle of taxation; depression throughout the country, 2281; position

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of the farmer; workingman and business man; labour and capital; public debt; credit system, 2282
Canteen funds, undistributed, qu. 2215
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3216
Immigration regulations, compliance with, qu. 2215
Soldier land settlement, 2141
Soldiers' pay, exchange on, qu. 826
Winnipegosis wharf, 3545

Kemp, Sir Edward, ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Address in reply, 142. Constituency of West Edmonton, 141-142; conditions in western Canada; tariff question, 143; protection of industries, 144; immigration, 145; Wheat Board; freight rates on grain; Crowsnest pass agreement, 146; soldier settlers, 147; railways, western provinces, natural resources, 147-8; half-breed scrip, 148
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Banks, income and note circulation taxes, qu. 1400
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Scrip frauds) 1062, 1395, 3213, 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for steel plates, 1680
Edmonton bridge, 2007
Harbours and rivers, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2005
Indians, 1232
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515
Public buildings, furniture, etc., 1758
Public Works dept., average salary, 749
Rural mail contracts, subletting, 2801
Steamship subsidies, fair wage clause, 3506
Steel industry, 769

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2737
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Liquor, export of, 3005
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, wheat carriage, 3039
Customs
Drawbacks, 769
Officials, 765
Valuations, 3416

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred — *Con.*
Dairy Grading Act, 652
Director of Commercial Intelligence, 700
Immigration figures, 758
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Railway finances, qu. 471
Sugar beet industry, 3245

Kennedy, Hon. William C. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3035
Canadian National railways
Annual statement, 873
Branch lines, Bengough extension, 2771
Canadian Northern, advance to, 1905
Consolidation, 1963
Deficits, 875-86
Corrected statement, 1919
Directors, 2791
Appointment of new board, 2772, 2794
Representative of employees, 2794
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Grand Trunk Pacific
Advances to, 3520
Branch lines, 3520
Intercolonial, employees' provident fund, 2769
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, 1135
New board of directors, appointment, 2772, 2794
Rolling stock, repairs, 1212
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Transcontinental, allowance to enlisted men, 3518
Canadian Transit Co. bill, 1772
Canals. *See also under this title,* St. Lawrence
Rideau, 2769
Soulanges, 2768
Trent, 2764
Welland, 2747
Construction, 1687
Port Colborne elevator, Jameson claim, 1687
Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
Freight Rates, M. for Special Com., 1213, 1402-3, 1502
Gaspe railways, 627
Governor General's cars, 1688
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 1970, 2798
Ottawa-Kingston highway, 2794
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689

Kennedy, Hon. William C. — *Con.*
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2774
Representation of labour, 2776
Railway estimates, 407-8, 1133, 1905, 1933, 2747
St. John valley railway, 3039
St. Lawrence river waterway, surveys, 2768
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2768
Shipbuilding, cost of, 3508

Key Industries Act, 2424

Kindersley, post office building, 1254

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Big Bay point, sunken vessel, removal of, 2006
British Columbia govt., reply to criticism of, 2237
Courtenay Bay, 2014
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Introduction, 496
National gallery, 2011
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1547
Public buildings
Appropriations and expenditures, 1921-22, 1259
Calgary, 1254
Coal for, 1758
Edmundston, 1240
Flags, 1264
Furniture purchases, 1757
Galt, 1247
Generally, expenditure, 1260
Halifax expenditures, 1244
Hamilton, 1246-51, 1258
Heating, 1758
Kamloops, 1255
Maritime provinces, 1243
Montagu, P.E.I., 1264
Ontario, 1245
Ottawa, 1252
Dominion observatory, Geodetic survey, 1266
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
New departmental, architects' designs, 3541
Water, 1266
Parliament buildings, 2014
Architects' fees, 2014-16
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
Tower, 2016
Quebec, 1245

King, Hon. J. H. — *Con.*
Public Buildings — *Con.*
Rentals, 1259
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
St. Catherines, 1258
St. John quarantine station, 1240-1
St. George public building, 1240
Saskatoon, 1253
Swift Current, 1253
Toronto, 1246-7
Victoria, 1255
Weston, 1260
Public Works
Dredging, 2005
St. Marys river, 2006
Drydocks,
Esquimalt, 3541-2
Vancouver, 1255, 2005, 2010
Harbours and rivers, 1988
British Columbia, 2005
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1991
Provincial wharves, 1992
St. John, 2014
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
Inverness pier, 1760
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Ontario, 1999
Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Quebec, 1998
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2005
Selkirk, wharf, 2004
Shuswap lake wharf, 3547
Winnepegosis wharf, 3545
Public Works dept.
Employees transferred, 696
Estimates, 692, 747, 749, 1238, 1270, 1755, 1988, 3541
River guaging and metering, 2011
Roads and bridges, 2007
Edmonton, bridge, 2007
St. John, N.B.
Harbour improvement, 2014
Terminal facilities, 849-50, 851
Telegraphs and telephones, 2012
Humbolt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Yukon radio-telegraph service, 1750

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2301. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressives from Ontario; fiscal policy; small percentage of land under cultivation; drift towards the cities; infant industries; reciprocity with the United States; tariff proposals, 2302; friendly relations between Canada and United States, 2303
Grand Trunk railway, employees pension rights and status, 2041

King, Mr. J. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Address in reply, 38. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 38; welcome to Lord Byng; late Mr. Peter McGibbon; Miss Macphail, 39; remarks of the leader of the Opposition; followers of Mr. Meighen in present Parliament, 40; campaign literature and election results, 40-41; natural resources of western provinces, 41; treaties; Imperial Conference, Limitation of Armaments, 42; customs tariff revision, 43-44; position at Liberal Convention, 44; railway situation; government ownership, 45-46; marketing of wheat, 46-47; railway freight rates; party formation and names, 47; negotiations with Progressive party, 48; Liberal administration, 48-49; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Motherwell, 49
Ammunition, artillery, shipment from Britain, 1154, 1156, 1163, 1165, 1172
Annual drill, 1155, 1165
Demobilization expenditure for, 1155-65
Annuities, 776
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Assiniboine river floods, 1842
Auditor General's report, 424
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 2803
Banff-Windermere road, 1681
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Ethier) 1662
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Board of Commerce, 1715
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
International disarmament conference, papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
British Columbia house, London, purchase, 3537
Budget, 2537. Conflicting amendments evidence of wisdom of budget proposals, 2537; taxation, re-adjustment of; speeches of Progressive and Op-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
position leaders; extreme points of view; amendment to amendment; a protectionist budget; repeal of protectionist legislation; reduction of duties; effort to carry out Liberal policy; protection versus free trade not the issue, 2538; tariff revision; amendment; no constructive suggestions; Sir Henry Drayton's tariff proposals of 1920, 2539; platform of National Liberal Conservative party; trade with the mother country; disregard of political honour; promised revision of tariff, 2540; pledges of Liberal party; Liberal Convention of 1919; chart, 2541; statement of policy last session; budget consistent with campaign utterances; no deception of electorate, 2542; Mr. Meighen's London speech; Liberal handbook, 2543; tariff revision on basis of revenue; duties on instruments of production and necessaries of life; pledges fulfilled; tribute to Finance Minister; stability and confidence, 2544
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Customary procedure, 7
Debates on naval service estimates, 1899
Easter adjournment, 546, 821, 823
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, adjournments, 1769, 1905
Estimates, 569, 2167, 3527
Govt. orders on Monday and Wednesday, 1460
Legislation to be introduced, 2996, 3041, 3102, 3103, 3365
Mines and Minerals Com., 1398
Mondays and Wednesdays, 49, 1719, 2169
Order of, 374
Private members', 1719
Prorogation, 3365
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Quotations from anonymous letter, 1480
Saturday sittings, 2033, 2458
Wednesday sittings, 49
Evening, 2169
Canada Grain Act, Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1770
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts. 3613-4
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Coal importations, from Japan, 2406
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National parks, 1681
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation of system, 2585
Co-ordination, 73
Directors, sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian representation in the United States, 1384
Canadian Wheat Board bill. *See under this title,* Wheat Board
Cattle embargo, alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1463
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., claim of, 3498
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 871
Civil Service
Appointments, 573-4
Bonus, 733, 1258
Appropriation, 3528-36
Inquiry as to payment, 2996
Economy, 424
Salaries, 552
$960 and less, 1660
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Coal
Importation from Japan, 2406
Mined by Orientals, 2407
Con Rein sinking, 1384
Contingencies, vote for, 415
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half-breed scrip) 3220
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 865, 1719
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting, 1717
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, 2458
Death of brother, Dr. MacDougall King, 211, 224, 230, 276
Debates, Official Report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeau, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Deputy Speaker, election, 363
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1334
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion Lands, cancellation of leases bills, Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1236

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Estimates, classification of, 569, 2167, 3527
External Affairs
Salaries, 412, 3509
Secretaries, 411
Fielding, Hon. Mr., congratulations to, 3279
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1293
Freight Rates (Crowsnest pass agreement)
Special Com., ref to
M. (Mr. Kennedy), Essex) 1213, 1432-8, 1453-4
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Reports, 3546, 3560
"General" Macdonald's army, 2256
Genoa Conference, 582, 823, 1715
Cannes documents tabled, 865
Correspondence tabled, 865
With Italy, 2035
Reported subscription to consortium, 1463
Grand Trunk Arbitration
British newspaper article, 374, 822
Grand Trunk railway, pension rights and status of employees
M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
High Commissioner
Alleged statement re cattle embargo, 1463, 1502
Office of, 414
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Organization, amendment of, 1335
Sittings suspended, 3611-14
Staff, 3221
Immigration
Chinese, 3437
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 1711
Oriental. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864, 1388, 1394, 1719
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Indians
Estimates, 1712
Potlach institution, 1578
Number serving gaol sentences, 1721
Interim Supply bill, 379
Interior dept., printing and stationery, 1680
International Disarmament. *See under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
International Labour conference, 3437, 3490
Report and printing of, 3601
Japan
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights of Canadians in, 1289, 2208

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Labour dept. estimates, 564, 569, 577
Lake Huron marine allowance, 1930
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3206, 3211, 3435
League of Nations
Permanent secretariat
Canada's contribution, 2990
Expenses, 3173
Protocols of proposed amdt. to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171
Limitation of Armaments, 786
Papers, 1283
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Res., 3157
Treaty tabled, 9
Liquor importation, 733. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 639
Ministers and directorships, 1098
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Munitions, shipment from Britain, 1154-65-72
National Defence bill, 547, 662, 680
Natural resources transfer to western provinces, 1017
M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence 1509
Provincial governments, correspondence with, tabled, 1769
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval defence, 1873-1899
Naval service
Gift of ships to Canada, 2051
Royal Canadian navy, 1873-1899
Newmarket, speech at, 35
Norris, Premier, statement on freight rates and natural resources, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 536, 597
Occupational diseases, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 1381
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3427-35
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill), time for discussion, 1719
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
Immigration
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1554, 1573-6
Japanese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Parliament, fall session, 3608
Pensions, Insurance, etc.
Special Com., appointed, 496-7
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Prime Ministers' Conference, 5
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, reported statement of Lord Lee, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Proceedings tabled, 8
Prime Ministers' secretaries, 411
Privy Council
Estimates, 410
Private secretaries, 410
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1655
Public buildings appropriations, 1259
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec fisheries, 8
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Railway Commission, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 2774, 3491
Redistribution, 733
Bill to be introduced next session, 3608
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719, 1769
References to, (Sir Henry Drayton, "jilting Quebec") 206, 1365, 1754, 2969. *See also* Address; Budget
Regional Bureau of the International Catalogue of Scientific literature, 3528
Returned soldiers. *See also under this title,* Pensions; Soldiers
Announcement of Govt.'s policy, 2637
Unemployment of, 2458. *See also under this title,* Unemployment
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Industrial disputes, and, 666
M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 834
Macleod detachment, reported removal of, 2585
Russian relief, 3516
St. Lawrence river waterway
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Correspondence with United States Govt., 2357, 2583, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
International Joint Commission, report, 2357
Treaty with United States Govt., 2207, 2760
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Soldiers' bonus, 396
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 431, 437
Speaker, Mr.
Bereavement of, 496
Congratulations to, 3489
Election of, 1

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Steamship services, 2027
Tariff commissioner, appointment of, 1666
Tourist traffic, 1682
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Returned Soldiers
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Federal, provincial and municipal obligations, 1073-9
Insurance, 1073
Relief, 1719
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1073-9
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
War memorials, 2099
Washington conference papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
Wheat Board, 378, 783, 2921, 3179
Concurrence in report of Special Com., delay, 2306
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Wheat Board bill, 3190, 3383
Wrangel island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208
Yukon territory, administration of, 1681

King-Crerar Alliance, negotiations, 48, 206. *See also* references in Address

King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision. *See* Canada Grain Act

Kingston
Election petition, 2692
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Klim, competition with milk, 981

Knives, German production of. *See* Budget; Customs Act; Currency; Guthrie; Stevens

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal royalties, qu. 375
Customs tariff, ploughs 3230
Easter adjournment, 546
Experimental farms, 800
Hudson bay railway, 2750, 2779
Mines dept., field work, 690
Natural resources of western provinces, 457-8
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted Police, 3523

Knox, Mr. Andrew — *Con.*
Port Nelson, examination of masters and mates, 1491
Rideau canal, 2769
Riordan Company, taxation, qu., 372
Royal Canadian Mounted Police pensions
Inadequate, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1495
Welland ship canal, 2750

Kodaks, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Kootenay, Burlington channel bridge, 2007

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
American magazines, 3109
Budget, 2358. Congratulations to Finance Minister; testimony of opposition to wisdom of Minister's proposals, 2358; tariff an issue no longer, burden of taxation; revenue tariff; sales tax; the workingman; cost of living; articles which do not pay the tax; interpretation of customs law; fishermen's rope; lumber; technical ruling of officials; agricultural implements, 2360; revenue tariff; England's tariff policy; protective duty counterbalanced by excise tax; origin of protective tariff in United States, 2361; manufacturers and war profits; propaganda of Canadian manufacturers; alleged reconstruction committee, 2362; election campaigns of 1896 and 1911; reciprocity with United States; increase of population under Liberal and Conservative rule; immigration, 2363
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia, civil pensions, 3499
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Rail and car contracts, 1693, 1694
Unemployment at Sydney, rail orders in advance, 1691

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Oriental Aliens; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding; Unemployment
Administration, 1058
British labour party, 224
Bureaux, 3314
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Wages, qu. 3598
Canadian National railways
Representation on Board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Labour — *Con.*
Canadian Pacific, conditions on, 2315
Capital and, 2117, 2191, 2250, 2282. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Coal. *See also* N. S. Miners
Canmore and Drumheller, miners' dispute, 1058
Competition with foreigners, 2154, 2435
Orientals, with, 317, 345. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Conditions, 2350
Cost of living, 1175, 1303, 2331. *See also that title*
Costs, 2317, 2349-50
Cotton industry, wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903
Lower, 2436
Department
Annuities branch, 776
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu. 937
Classification, 494
Director of Technical Education, 578
Estimates, 1053, 1719, 1970
Officials and economy, 464-5
Printing bureau, 1970
Salaries and contingencies, 458, 493, 548
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce item, 562, 579, agreed to, 581
Statistical branch, 1366
Technical education, 459, 460, 578
Temporary clerks, 548
Wage investigators, 462
Departments employing organized and unorganized labour, qu. 2303
Distribution of, 2149
District No. 18, board, 1058
Economic injustice to, 2323
Eight-hour day, 184, 2311. *See also* Daylight Saving
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Espionage, 670-9
Exodus of workmen, 2469
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Farms, on, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration
Genoa Conference. *See that title*
Germany, conditions in, 2411. *See also* Germany
Hours, 2317. *See also under this title,* Eight Hour Day
Housing, 219. *See also that title*
Immigration of farm workers and domestics, 2480, 3053-4. *See also* Immigration
Industrial centres, 236
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1054, 1058

Labour — *Con.*
Industrial disputes, Mounted Police and, 667, 679. *See also* Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth)
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Report, printing of, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour Gazette, 1053, 1057
Leaders, 2118
McAdoo award, 1707
Mounted Police and, 670. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth): National Defence bill
Nova Scotia miners. *See that title*
Occupational diseases, protection against M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 829, 1378, withdrawn, 1382
O'Dell, Mr., on cost of labour in boot and shoe industry, 2350
Old age pensions, 1303. *See also that title*
Organized, 2321, 2324
Oriental, 2330. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Party, composition of, 214
Public ownership and, 130
Quebec harbour commission, wages of employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 2315
Canadian National, 2315
Representation on board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors
Canadian Pacific, 2315
Costs, 2317
Wages, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Railway Commission, representation on, 2776
Skilled, protection of, 2379
Specialization of, 2149
Strike-on-the-job, 1054
Strikes, 2320, 2322
District No. 18, miners' strike, 1058
Nova Scotia miners. *See also that title*
Gillen board, 1054
Railway employees, 2324
Winnipeg, 841, 1068
Cost of trials, qu. 1182
Literature, 837
Trades Union Conference, Rome, 1060
Unemployment. *See also that title*
Agriculture and, 2158, 2331
Calgary Trades and Labour Council, 1082
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Relief, 1719, 1970, 2022, 3526
Situation, 1069
Steel workers, Sydney, 1076
Trades and Labour Congress, and, 1081

Labour — *Con.*
Unions, 228, 2295, 2317-8, 3059
International, 2317
Unorganized, 2628
Unrest, 14, 17, 90. *See also* Address; Budget
Wages
Average income, 2498
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3598
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Germany, in, 2407
Investigators, 462
Protection, and, 2298
Quebec Harbour Commission, employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417
Shops, 1707
Real and nominal, 2435

Labour Gazette, 1053-7
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu. 1903

Labrador Boundary, qu. 704, 2572

Lachenaie, Que., mail service, qu. 2805

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply, 321, 326; four parties in politics, 321; Liberal party in British Columbia; Hon. John Oliver, 322; national railway, 326; returned soldier problems, 327; natural resources of prairie provinces, 328; British Columbia claims, 329
Belgium, trade with, 3223
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3538
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 720
Budget, 2276. Tribute to Minister of Finance; Budget of sixteen years ago; promises and policy of Liberal party, 2277; the amendment; tariff changes; British Columbia industries and protection, 2298; danger of Japanese competition; results of protective policy; weakness of budget; trade with Germany, 2279; sales tax; dumping clause and fruit industry, 2280
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Canneries, inspection of, 3048
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1448
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3191
Labour estimates, increase, 495
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Importation, 654

Ladner, Mr. L. J. — *Con.*
Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Manufacture and importation of, 1797
Regulations under Act, qu. 1902
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824, 3014
Appeal, 3023
Penalty, whipping, amdt., 3015, 3020
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1528
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-56
Pensions Com., final report, 3339
Potlach Indian institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1650
Vancouver dry dock, 1255, 1484, 2010
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Budget, 2895. World war and its consequences; motion and amendment; opposition arguments; Liberal platform of 1919; pledges and promises, 2896; Agrarian party; amendment to the amendment; standard of public life; currency valuation; dumping clause; marking of goods, 2897; insufficient reasons given for vote to defeat Government, 2898
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1944
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1566

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques-Cartier)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 959

Lake Marine. *See* Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Grain; St. Lawrence river Waterway

Lake of the Woods
Control board, 2025
Joint board, 2805, qu. 2970

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, Repeal bill
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3199; 3r., 3435

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507

Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual drill, 1154
Budget, 2567. Beer tax; war and taxation; tax free bonds, 2567; commercial patriotism; national railways, 2568;

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
responsibility for overbuilding of railways; proposal to sell system to Canadian Pacific; freight rates, 2569; public ownership will lead to ruin; war and conscription, 2570; preparation for war; naval service; militarism; cattle embargo; public debt, 2571; parliamentary counsel; Hon. C. J. Doherty, reported engagement in Labrador - Newfoundland boundary case; payments to, 2572; departmental lawyers; co-ordination of law branches, economy, 2573
Civil Service classification, appeals, 1508
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract, 1678
Farm labour, cost of, 1163
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Lawyers, employment of by department of Justice, 1678
Manure, exportation of, 1018
Military expenditure and policy, 1153
Militia and defence
Military districts, 1775
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Militia council, qu. 2039
Naval council and officers, qu. 1774

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Accessible for homesteads, 87
Location of. *See* Criminal Code, Scrip frauds
Percentage under cultivation, 2302
Private ownership of, 1927
Public. *See* Natural Resources
Right of Canadians to hold in Japan, 2209
Settlement, 182-3. *See also* Soldier Land Settlement
Speculation in, 2404. *See also* Immigration
Undeveloped, settlement of, 236
Unimproved values, tax on, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Unoccupied, 2603
Western, cost to the immigrant, 2157

Langley, Hon. George, statement respecting Railway Commission, 2773

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Budget, 2628. Congratulations to Finance Minister; the great unorganized body of wage-earners; clerks, book-keepers, commercial travellers and office assistants; cheerful acceptance of burden of citizenship; union government; day of reckoning; debt; curtailment of expenditure, 2628; restoration of pur-

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
chasing power; adjustment of tariff to financial exigencies; retail trade and prices, 2629
Georgian Bay canal, 1199
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1199
Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu. 1285
Postmaster, qu. 1285
Sudbury mail contract, qu. 1285

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Budget, 2585. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2585; leader of Opposition; amendment; no violation of Liberal platform; political pledges and honour, 2586; a Liberal budget; no political party in favour of free trade; campaign bogeys; an academic question; protection an economic heresy; national as opposed to individual interest; geographical considerations, 2587; United States farmers and protection; Wheat Board, fixation of prices; financial and economic consequences of war; tariffs of Switzerland, Belgium, Holland and Spain, 2588; Government tariff proposals, 2589; Liberal platform of 1893; reciprocity; not free trade but freer trade; revenue tariff; protection and revenue features of tariff legislation; exaggerated statements as to Canada's condition, 2590; hatred and class war; the future; fair play for the government, 2591
Business of the House, questions, 1660
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Harbours and harbour masters, 1578
Pilotage dues, 1487, 2819, 3009
Coolie labour on British ships, 2043
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Co.
Contracts, steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., settlement of, 2170
False Creek bridge, 3516
Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Marine and Fisheries
Department of, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2167
Marketing, 2109
Protection service, 678

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2306, 2817, 2996, 3010
Fishing schooner race, 1387, 3510
Genoa Conference, expenses, 1715
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864
International deep sea racing, 1387, 3510
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 428
Lambton steamer, loss of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Limitation of Armaments, 3169
Marine and Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Fisheries
Biological board, 3051
Capt. Demers, 1492
Department, estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Icebreaking, 1677
Life saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Marine agencies, 1496
Marine signal service, 1499
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, Capt. Eddie, 1493
Ocean and river service, 1494, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1496
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
Port Dalhousie, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Dredges, 1494
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3045, 3149
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, amdt. to amdt. to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091
Montpetit, Prof., 582
Montreal Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Revenue, 1465
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488, 3199
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2067
Transfer of services to Marine and Fisheries, 3611
Navigation, Rainy river lights, 1499
Pilots and pilotage, administration, 1499
Fees, regulation of, 1500
Prince Rupert Dry dock and Engineering Co., claim, 3514

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Quebec fisheries, 377
M. (Mr. Marcil) 619, 622
Quebec harbour
Parc St. Charles Co., Limited, 1470
Revenue and expenditures, 1471
Quebec Harbour Commission
Papers, 1584
Political patronage, 1477
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464-86, 3195
Fair wage clause, 1469
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3399
Steel plates
Contracts, 1677
Delivery, 3508
Trenton harbour bill, 3493
Vancouver
Ballantyne pier, 1485
Drydock, 1485
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 1929, 2821, 2996

Larkin, Hon. P.C. *See* High Commissioner

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu. 2355
Lightkeepers, qu. 1904, qu. 2215

Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu, 366, qu. 3600

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canadian military responsibilities, 1629
Canadian Northern loan, 1957
Canadian ports and German submarines, 2089
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Monument, qu, 936
Naval policy, 1849
Old age pensions, 1305
Railway administration, 202
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1333, 1398

Laurier-Fielding Tariff, 141, 144, 208, 290. *See also* Address; Budget

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Budget, 2398. Tribute to Finance Minister; extravagance and mismanagement of former government; public debt; unfair treatment of province of Quebec, 2398; no confidence in public ownership of railways; transcontinental railway; Champlain market station; St. Malo repair shops; car repairs, 2399; St. Charles river improvements; wharf at Ste. Pétronille;

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
wharf at St. Grégoire de Montmorency; expenditure and economy, 2400
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1474

Law, Bowman B., M.P., the late, memorial tablet, 2835

Law Officers
Departmental, 1678, 2573
Opinion of. *See* Canada Grain Act, constitutionality

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herd system, 2739-41
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, qu. 2739, 3362
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Budget, 2510. Finance Minister's proposals disappointing; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; better trade relations with United States; apology for having voted against reciprocity; rejection of treaty a disaster; live stock industry; little difference between two old parties; origin of Progressive party; promises and performance of Liberals; the amendment; broken promises of Conservatives; Mr. Meighen's declarations on tariff policy; salaries of Ministers and judges, 2512; proposed reduction in indemnities of Senators and Members; Civil Service bonus; shortening of session; absence of members from House, 2513
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2003
Health of animals, tuberculosis, 3522
Immigration, Hutterites, 3060

League of Nations. *See also* Limitation of Armaments
Article X of the Covenant, 3170
International Labour Conference, 1060
Permanent secretariat, 2026
Canada's contribution, 2990
Protocols of proposed amendments to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171

Leases, Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773

Lee, Lord, of Fareham, 1852. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Legal Expenses, 1668. *See also* Justice; Law Officers
Companies Act, appeal, 1671
Departmental counsel, 1678, 2572-3
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., damage claim, 1677
Employment of outside lawyers, 1678
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, 1669

Legal Officers, concentration of, 683, 2572-3

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu. 2209
Experimental farms, 806, 808
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495
Migratory birds, 1685
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1792
Richibucto repair works, qu. 375
St. John income tax office, qu., 826

Legislation. *See also* House of Commons; Senate
House of Commons, 2026
Printing, 1972
Senate, 2026

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement with Japan, 1459

Lepers, Number of, 2021

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Sugar beet industry, 3243-4

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Letters, Anonymous, quoting from, 943-944

L'Evénement, Quebec, 1480

Levis
Gravel, Mr., resignation from Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477
Lightkeepers, qu., 2583

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 149. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; common platform in politics, 149-50; real conditions in the West; Great War burdens, 150-151; unemployment; wider markets, agricultural and economic conditions, 151-152; tariff and protection; natural resources of western provinces, 153-154; consolidation of railways, 155
Blankets, duty on, 3233
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) Amdt. 722

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. — *Con.*
Budget, 2256. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressive party and government; fiscal policy; free trade; similarity of Liberal and National policies, 2257; forty-four years of protection; tariff for revenue; reductions in tariff and increases in sales tax, 2258; economy; Welland canal; St. Lawrence river waterway; emigration and race suicide; cigar and cigarette duties; automobiles; luxury tax, 2260; British preference; reciprocity with United States, 2261
Canadian National railway, public ownership, 1954
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canned fish, marketing, 3049
Cattle embargo, 1020
Cigars and cigarettes, duty, 3239
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1368
Dominion Election Act, residential qualification, 1301
Dominion lands, 1036
Experimental farm, Swift Current, 796, 3521
Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines, 3520
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment of Judge, 3496
Indians, education of, 1230
Mines dept., field work, 690
Mixed farming, dairying, 996
Naval service, 1737
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1676
Paper cups, 3115
Pilotage dues, 1500
Post Office estimates, 692
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 1645
Public Works estimates, 692
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689
Railway policy, 1954
Railways, branch lines, 1688, 3520
Residential qualification, 1301
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldier settlement, land purchase, 2140
Swift Current
Experimental farm, 796, 3521
Post office building, 1253
Tractors, duty on, 3123
Welland canal construction, 1688, 2260, 2749

Liberal Convention of 1919. *See also* Address; Budget
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 397, 429

Liberal Convention of 1919 — *Con.*
Old age pensions, 1305
Platform, 25, 2529, 2541, 2896, 2910
Tariff, 2466, 3235
Mr. Fielding's disavowal, 2666
Res. of 1921, 2466
Position of Mr. King, 44-45

Liberal Party
Administration of railways before 1911, 189
Appointments, 138
Big interests and, 242. *See also* Big interests; Ministers and Directorships
Caucus, 1338
Fiscal attitude, 2430. *See also* Address; Budget
Gains and losses, 138-9. *See also* Elections of 1921
Government, 188
History of, 2430, 2548-9. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Interpretation of Liberalism, 26
Opposition in, and Estimates, 378-385

Library of Parliament
Joint Committee on, 211, 326
Salaries, 3517
Staff, 3091-2

Life-Saving Service. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Lights and Light-Keepers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Fuel for lightboats, qu. 1183
L'Assomption and Montcalm, qu. 1904, qu. 2215
Lévis, qu. 2583
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677, 3508
Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, 1498
Parry Sound inspector, qu., 827
Pensions of lightkeepers, 1496
Salaries and allowances, 1497
Superintendent, Quebec district, qu. 2584
Wireless telegraphy, qu., 370

Lignite. *See* Coal

Limitation of Armaments, 7, 10, 20, 42, 58, 1143, 1174, 1179. *See also* Military Policy; Militia and Defence; National Defence
Air service, 1731
Approval of treaties signed at Washington, 786, 3157
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert, 1283
Report of, 1737, 1743
Canada's representation, 43

Limitation of Armaments — *Con.*
General Smuts, 1283
Naval armament, reduction of, 1737, 1844-5. *See also* National Defence; Naval Service
Naval holiday, 1737
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Sherman, General William T., 1336
Submarines, 1845
Treaty tabled, 9

Lindsay Arsenal. *See* Militia and Defence

Linen Yarn
Bounty, 1361
Dominion Linens, Limited, 1362
Duty, 3128

Ling, Mayor. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Liquor. *See also* Alcohol; Canada Temperance Act; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, tax on, 2117, 2852, 2857
Beverages, containing 2½ per cent proof spirit, 2857
Bootlegging, cost to country, 2282
Confiscation of, 2997
Export, 2716
Warehouses in Saskatchewan, 767-8, qu., 1211, qu. 1660, 2997
Government, sale of, 1017
Importation, 733. *See also* Canada Temperance Act
British Columbia into, 1017
Excise duty on, qu. 828
Saskatchewan into, qu. 2037, 2303
Quebec government, and, 71
Sales tax on ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2852, 2857

Little Current
Harbour improvement, 2002
Tugboat, 3086-7

Live Stock, 333, 971, 2511. *See also* Accredited herds; Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals
Animals, cruelty, to. *See* **Criminal Code** Amdt.
Associations, grants to, 1027
Bacon, 1025
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Carload and free freight policy, 1029
Commission men, 1031
Competition, 2695, 2698
Destruction by wolves, 990, 998

Live Stock — *Con.*
Estimates, 1018
Exhibitions, 3521. *See also* Agriculture
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Fordney tariff, effect on, 2453-4. *See also that title*
Garbage feed, 1029
Grants to exhibitions, 3521
Hog cholera, compensation, 1028
Hogs, grading, 1025
Industry, 334. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Marketing in United States, 94
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
National live stock records, 1026
Pure bred sires, 1032
Sheep-raising, 2592
Stallion clubs, 1031
Stockgrazing and feeding, 3522
Stockyards, 1030
Trade with South America, 647
Tuberculosis, 2595

Lloyd George. *See* George, Lloyd

Lloyds, steel plates, delivery, 3508

"Loafing-on-the-Job". *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Loan Companies, 2299
Proposed taxation of, 2299
Renewal of loans, 1476

Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; Com., 3142; 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Loans. *See also* Finance; Special Loans bill, 2107, 2171
Domestic, 2694
Five-year maturities, qu. 2993
German, proposed, 2500
Grecian, qu. 1400
Morgan, Messrs, J. P., & Co., 1131
New Canadian, $100,000,000, announcement of, 1131, 1133
New York, 2107-27
Roumanian, qu. 1400
Soldiers, to. *See* Soldier Settlement
Special Bill. *See* Special Loans bill
$100,000,000, 1292, 1131

Lobster Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Lobster Fisheries. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Local Council of Women, Hamilton, Oleomargarine, 1835

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Acoustics of Chamber, 708, 3612
Address in reply, 105. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 105. Intercolonial railway, management and operation, 106; history of the Intercolonial; 107; separate operation necessary, 111
British preference
And Canadian seaports, M. 493, 707, 725
Goods imported through United States, qu., 375
Budget, 2684. Mr. Hocken's flirtation with Progressives; official Opposition; Bourbons; decline of Conservative party; optimism should give place to despair; the amendment; platform of 1919; changed conditions, 2684; public promises; conscription of farmers by Union Government; tariff; not sufficient time for investigation; boot and shoe industry; problem of unemployment, 2685; leader of Progressive party; revenue necessities; transportation; income, inheritance and land taxes; no question of free trade or protection; revenue tariff; incidental protection; not a protectionist budget; anthracite and bituminous coal; suggested duty on anthracite; bituminous coal duty, 2686; distinction between revenue and protective tariffs; importance of Canadian coal industry; imports; valuation of imports for duty purposes, 2687; British preference and Canadian seaports; direct shipments; transportation question as it affects the maritime provinces; South African railways, 2688; Intercolonial railway; sales tax; exemptions, 2689; fishermen's supplies; economy; civil service salary reductions; indemnity of members; equality of sacrifice; Opposition and budget; compromise on tariff issue; reciprocity; a united Canada, 2691
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial, 106-111, 2688, 2689
Employees, enlistment, 3519
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702, 1925
Revaluation, 1926
Transcontinental, enlisted men, allowance, 3518
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Coal
Anthracite and bituminous, suggested duty on, 2686
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Public buildings for, 1759

Logan, Mr. Hance J. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Lignite Unitilization board, 3525
National defence, 422
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 523
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1310
Prison reform, 1278
Rail and car repairs, 1702, 1708, 1925
Unemployment
Canadian coal miners, 1759
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702

Logan, Mr. R. S., 728

Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372

Long Sault. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

L'Orignal wharf, 1212

Louisburg quarantine station, 2021

Lovering, Dr., qu. 1211

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Bridgetown post office accommodation, 1245
Budget, 2270. Waste of time in useless discussion; slow progress of Nova Scotia, 2270; freight rates and trade restrictions; reciprocity; emigration; sectional interests, 2271; public debt; financial chaos; taxation; tariff reductions, 2272
Civil Service patronage, 3084
Rural postmasters, 3080

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Bovine tuberculosis, Carman, Man., deputation, 2743
Budget, 2451. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions not sufficient; handicap upon agriculture, 2451; farmer cannot pass on taxation; manufacturer beneficiary of protection; agriculture the basic industry; implements sold cheaper in foreign countries than in Canada; agricultural depression, 2452; injustice of protective tariff to farmers; freight rates reduction; marketing of wheat; export markets; reciprocity with United States; effect of Fordney tariff on live stock industry; potatoes and poultry products; garden truck; Kubanka wheat; freight rates; statement of Mr. Sandford Evans; wheat and commodity prices, 2454; war profiteering;

Lovie, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
income tax; religious institutions penalized, 2455
Civil Service bonus, 3535

Low, Hon. Thomas A. (South Renfrew)
Budget, 2445. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff views of Mr. Good; serious problems confronting government; effort to reduce expenditure, 2445; the tariff; the home market; agricultural production; ratio of exports to domestic consumption; agricultural implements; reciprocity agreement; railways, 2446; freight rates; history repeating itself; cheap transportation for the West; national ills and financial burdens; progressive immigration policy, 2447; settlers from the United States, England and northern Europe and countries

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Canada Grain Act, car demurrage, 2981
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1861
Elevator overages, qu. 609
Immigration, Mr. Shandro's proposed colony, 2159
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1519

Lumber. *See also* Tariff resolutions; Timber
Cargoes for the Orient, 2311
Dressed on one side only, duty, 2360
Freight rates on, 175, 234, 2311. *See also that title*
Japanese, acquisition of timber in British Columbia, 2310
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Orientals in industry. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)

Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599

Macarow, Mr. D. C. *See* Merchants' Bank

Macbrien, General, 1151, 1169, 1179, 1617
Reported utterances, 1662
Topographic survey, 1986

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply, 186. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker and previous speakers, 186; results of election, 186-7; Mr. Meighen's political campaign, 186-8; responsible government once more restored; public ownership of railways, 188; Canadian Northern and government railways 190; Grand Trunk lines

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
in United States, 191; Intercolonial railway management, 192; deficits on railways, 194; financial burdens, 195
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 783
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (pilotage) 1487
Canadian National railways, 190
Coal
Importations, qu., 926
Purchases of, qu., 2306
Insurance, qu., 471, qu., 610
Operation, 66
Public ownership, 1924
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3480
Civil Service classification, 494-5
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1440-2
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion notes and gold reserve, qu., 705
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3570
Grand Trunk, coal for, qu., 606
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 427, 429
Labour dept., temporary employees, 566
Naval defence, 1743
Naval service
Reduction in, 1743
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
Rail and car repair contracts, 1706
Redistribution of 1914, 1369
Reference to, 2536
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
War claims, loss of hospital ship, 1753
Washington disarmement conference, 1743
Yukon territory
Administration, cost of, 1681
Population, and expenditure, qu., 2456

Macdonald, "General", army of, 3315
Reception of, 2256

MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772

MacInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Immigration Commissioner in China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
Address in reply 159. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; boots and shoes, tariff on, 159-160; statements of Mr. Meighen and Sir Lomer Gouin, 160; Tory party, 161; tariff revision, 162; fruit-growing in British Columbia; protective tariff and fruit; railway situation, 166; immigration; Orientals in British

Mackelvie, Mr. John A. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
Columbia, 167; natural resources; soldiers' re-establishment; attitude of Sir Lomer Gouin, 168; unity between French and English-speaking Canada, 168-9
Budget, 2196. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; fruit-growing industry; Liberal platform of 1919, 2197; promises and performances; British preference, 2198; reciprocity; dumping clause, 2199; fruit growing industry, 2200; taxation; retrenchment; militia expenditure; cadet training, 2202; naval service; German trade and competition, 2203; the amendment, 2204
Cadet training, 2202
Canadian National railways, Kamloops-Kelowna line, 1134
Customs, dumping clause, 2199, 3422
Dominion lands, sub-agencies closed, qu., 1181
Entomology, codling moth, 814, 816
Fruit growers, protection, 2197, 2200, 3422
George, Rt. Hon. Lloyd, 2203
Interior dept., publicity agent, 454
Militia, expenditure and policy, 2202
Naval college, Esquimalt, 2047, 2203
Naval service, 2203
Royal Canadian navy, 2047
Oriental Aliens, M., (Mr. McQuarrie) 1534
Telegraphs and telephones, Okanagan district, 2008

Mackenzie and Mann, 189. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Loans to, 189-190
Subsidy, qu. 607, qu., 935

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 353; national railway system; Grand Trunk railway and Portland terminus, 353; Intercolonial railway, 354; natural resources of Prairie Provinces, 355; returned soldiers, 356
American magazines, 3110
Biological Board, 3051
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, and, 3033
Canadian National railways, Intercolonial employees, 3519
Canadian Red Cross Society, 3387
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

MacLaren, Mr. Murray — *Con.*
Canned goods, marking, 3048
Cold storage, 3521
Edmundston public building, 1240
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1273
Immigration
Medical inspection, 3052
Officials, 756
Imports of British goods, qu., 966
Inter-allied permanent commission, 3403
Military expenditure and policy, 1149
Militia estimates, 588
Naval policy, 2053
Negro point, breakwater, 2013
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3403, 3442
St. John Ambulance Association, 3387
St. John harbour, 2013
Submarine cables, qu., 3151, qu., 3360
Tracadie lazaretto, 2021
West Indies subsidies steamship services, 3033

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 335. The Prime Minister and Prince Edward Island, 335; Progressive and Liberals; potato trade, 336; harvest excursions; civil service; railway situation in Prince Edward Island, 337; Intercolonial railway; tariff; natural resources and Prince Edward Island, 338-9
Census enumerators, 1366
Civil Service Commission, 364
Hog cholera, 1029
Illegal fishing, Prince county, qu., 371
Migratory birds, 1684
Rail and car repair contracts, 1710
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Theshing machines, 3125
Tormentine reef, buoy, 1490
Unemployment, Canadian National railways, 1710

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Budget, 2859. Amended resolutions; effect of taxation on trade; depreciated currency; Germany, trade with; debt and revenue necessities, 2859; income tax expenditure, reduction of, 2860; economic problems and proposed remedies; Progressive party not an occupational group; class organization; restriction of output; consequences of the war; European recovery; interdependence of nations; international trade; international politics, 2862; German rehabilitation; reparation payments; restriction of German exports, 2863; Canadian representation at Genoa Conference; reciprocity with the United States; tariff legislation of Congress; Canadian representation at Washington; business conditions, 2864; emigration; reconciliation of adverse interests; Maritime Provinces commercial relation with rest of Canada, 2865; Ontario and Quebec, industrial development; Prairie Provinces, 2866; British Columbia; depression of trade; exchange value of commodities; primary products low in price; manufactured products abnormally high, 2868; wages, labour conditions and production; deflation of manufactured products; effect of taxation on prices; amendment, 2869; Liberal platform of 1919; tariff revision vertically and horizontally; chart and compass; Prime Minister's utterances at convention and in campaign, 2870; protection and free trade, 2871; United States competition; compromise on fiscal policy; tendency in United States towards reduction of tariff, 2872; imports and interests, 2873

Maclean, Hon. A. K. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Ownership and operation of, 3036
Subsidized steamship services, 3029
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1420-6. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Freight Rates, Transportation costs, Special Com., Third report, 3456
M. for adoption of, 3548-55
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143, 3145
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Naval policy, 2055
Naval service
Royal Canadian navy, 2055
Royal Naval college, 2055
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against western provinces, 1254
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464
Rideau canal, 2764
Welland ship canal, 2763
Wheat Board powers, 781
Wheat Board bill, 3175, 3180, 3380, 3385
M. Com. rise, neg., 3383

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York)
Address in reply, 63. Public ownership of utilities; hydro-electric developments, 63; public ownership of railways, 64;

Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
competition of C.P.R. with government-owned railways, 64-66; corporation-owned railways in United States, 67; water transportation, 69-70; electrical developments, 71; transportation and marketing of wheat, 72; co-ordination of government railways, 73; railway grades and duplication; community centres, 75; goods roads, 75-76
Alien enemy property, 1672
Blake, Hon. Edward, 2655
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 723
Budget, 2321. Mr. McCrea and organized labour, 2321; war profiteering; pulp and paper industry; speculation in paper stocks; collective bargaining, 2322; farmers and strikes; the farmers' bloc in United States Congress; economic injustice to labouring population; railways, public ownership; consolidation of national railways, 2323; strikes of railway employees; organization of capital, labour and industry; Canada's status; federation of dominions with written constitution; court of last resort; the war and defence, 2324; scientific methods of destruction; race aggression; transportation; bill of rights of Canadian public services; nationalization of transportation communications, banking, marketing, waterways, finance, 2325; post office, express, telegraph and telephone services, cables; community centres, 2326; St. Lawrence river waterway; water-borne competition with railways, 2327; national banking system of United States; watered stock; co-ordination of railways, 2328; opposition to public ownership from Canadian Pacific Railway; new taxation; soft drinks; cheque tax; immigration, 2329; Oriental labour; redistribution, 2330
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
New board, appointment of, 2722
Shares held as alien property, 1672
Census
Completion of, 1365
Enumerators, 1366
Cheque tax, 3259
Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 175-6. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 632
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 491
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3564
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Hydro-electric Commission and Ontario Govt., 1080
Hydro-electric power developments in Ontario, 1937
Manufacturers and profiteering, 3275
National Defence bill, 680
Prison reform, 1278
Privilege — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Public ownership, 1933
Quebec fisheries, 622
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass agreement) 3595
Railway policy, 1933
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Returned Soldiers'
Bonus, 3290
Early announcement of government's policy, 2637
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3392
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1326
United States, co-operation with, 2752-55
Sugar beet industry, 3249
Toronto and York county, representation, 1365
Traffic charges on boat services, 182
Unemployment situation, 1080
Water-power rentals, 2747
Welland canal, 2747
Co-operation with United States, 2752-55
Wheat Board, 2967

MacLennan, Mr. Justice, Admiralty Court at Quebec, 1275

Macleod, Alberta
Post Office, revenue, building, qu., 2804
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, detachment at, 2584

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Alleged statement, denial of, qu. 3221
Annual drill, 1174

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. — *Con.*
Budget 2384. Liberal party and protection; no material gain in budget proposals; argument of Mr. Raymond; basic and secondary industries; effect of protection, rural depopulation, 2384; protection of industries at expense of agriculture; rural schools; United States farmers demanding protection; unsatisfactory school system; farmers' credits; high transportation costs; taxation of all for the benefit of the few, 2385; proof that farming does not pay; importance of agriculture in development of Canada; trade and national greatness; high protection and revenue; the manufacturer the principal beneficiary, 2386; infant industries; cotton and woollen goods; discrimination against goods used by common people in favour of luxuries; direct and indirect taxation; national expenditure, 2386
Immigration
Child, 2153
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2153
Policy, 2153
Military expenditure and policy, 1174
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 533
References to. *See* Address; Budget
Rural population, movement towards cities, 2153, 2384
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Supervisor of expenditure, 405

McAdoo Award, 2315, 2317. *See also* Canadian National Railways

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Address in reply, 316. Oriental question in British Columbia, 316-17, 319; soldier settlement, 318; unemployment; transcontinental highway, 319; Oriental immigration, 319
Budget, 2635. Length of speeches; free trade; tariff on farm implements and mining machinery; dumping clause, 2635; transcontinental highway, 2636
British Columbia and Progressive party leader, 2239
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3039
Loan to, 3036
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1746, 1770
Chinese, arrival of at Vancouver, 3437, 3604
Civil Service
Bonus, 3533-5
Commission, 3072

McBride, Mr. T. G. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt., branding of cattle, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 2635, 3419
Debates, inaudibility of, 1053
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases, bill, 3465
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 2006
Elevators at Vancouver, 2980
Experimental farms, 804-5
Fuel oil, tariff against, 1761
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2984
Housing, 774
Hudson bay railway, completion, 2797
Immigration, Chinese, 3437, 3604
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, qu., 937, 3797
Kamloops post office building, 1255
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3507
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, 1978
Lindsay arsenal, 2088
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce item by $110,000, 2091
Milking machines, 3270
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1531
Pensions Com., report, 3351
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 3196
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Shuswap lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547
Soldier land settlement, 2142
Steamship services, 2027
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2008
Woollen blankets and clothing, 3135

McCoig, Senator, leave to attend Agriculture Com., 1900, 2406

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Agricultural exhibitions, 984
Agriculture Com., report, Wheat Board, 748. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Budget, 2898. Amendment; political promises; tariff revision, 2898; tribute to Finance Minister; old and new taxes; reciprocity, 2899; Sir George Foster's trip to Australia and China; treaty of 1854; abrogation; efforts at renewal; trade routes; acquisition of railways in United States, 2900; trade complications; wheat market; manufacturers of Eastern Canada, 2901; purchasing power of West; position of the farmer; changed conditions, 2902; self-

McConica, Mr. T. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
contained country or world power; production costs in United States; hothouse industries; competition with United States; fruit industry; debt; financial problem of the United States after Civil War; work; opportunities multiplying; high protection, 2964; substantial reduction of tariff; congratulations to Prime Minister, 2905
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1856
Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1609
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract, 1678
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 428
Live stock industry, 985
Mixed farming, 985
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 525
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Soulanges canal, 2769
Welland ship canal, 2743, 2753
Wheat Board, 3183
Point of order, 2935
Wheat Board bill, 3381

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 2314. The railway situation; high freight rates; deficits, 2314; Government ownership; international labour unions; McAdoo award; eight hour day; labour costs in general, 2317; remuneration of railway employees; specialization of work; strikes; thrift and industry, 2316; reduction of labour costs necessary; incorporation of labour unions; formation of labour board; walkouts and lockouts should be made illegal; arbitration for settlement of labour disputes, 2319; civil service, 2320
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1857
Organized labour, 2321-2

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Multigraph machines in departments, 1508
Population by ages, qu., 1632
Quebec Harbour Commission, wages of employees, 1465
Unemployment, 2318

McDonald, Mr. John N., qu., 3361

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Bonus, 1503, 3529

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. — *Con.*
Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission, 3071
Ottawa, Gas Company bill, 1657
Pensions Com., final report, 3331

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Solicitor General)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2822
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Baddeck wharf, repair to, 1765
Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765
Budget, 2604. Group representation in Parliament; Progressives; duties of citizenship, 2604; public men; tribute to Finance Minister, 2605; Liberalism in Nova Scotia; one change of government in fifty years; Hon. George Murray, 2606; Right Hon. Sir John Thompson; opposition criticisms; responsibility of former government for public debt, 2607; methods of collecting revenue; new taxes; war debt; extravagance; unfit men mobilized; patronage, 2608; Ross rifle; purchase of military equipment; amendment; no suggestion to offer; Liberal platform of 1919; trade with United States, 2610; reciprocity; transportation facilities; purchases of railways in United States; seaports at New London and Portland; purchase of coal lands in United States, 2611; competition with Canadian mines; taking over of Grand Trunk, 2612; Liberal opposition to proposal, 2613; Canadian Northern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific; verdict of the people, 2614; campaign promises made good; record of Liberal party; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2615; time to restore prosperity, 2616
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2837
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
First reading, 1017
Withdrawn, 2733
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, (No. 132) 2733, 2997
Date of coming into effect, 3007
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation, 916
Public ownership, 1939
Criminal Code Amdt. bill., 2831
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2809
Concurrence in amdts., 3486
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Dominion franchise, 1300

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. — *Con.*
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3473
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2826, 3026
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486
Grain trade, alleged abuses of, 2840
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 1765
Interruptions, point of order, 558
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 2991, 3202
Opium and Narcotic drugs, prosecutions, 2017, 3019
Public buildings, Ontario, 1248-51
Statutes, arrangement with Mr. W. J. O'Connor for revision, 1718
Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2031
Transcontinental railway, 917
Wheat Board, point of order, 2933

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3362

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Audibility of debates, 411
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Boy Scouts, 773
Budget, 2417. The Tariff a tax; German competition; purchasing power of the mark in Germany; working hours and conditions; production costs; Mr. Bristol's speech "made in Toronto"; prosperity of the United States; tendency towards free trade, 2418; Nova Scotia coal and steel industries; Dominion Iron and Steel Co.; watered stock; free trade in Australia; western farmers and protection; congratulations to finance Minister; inflation and depreciated currency; German competition, 2420; German imports and exports; cheap labour; international hatred and bitterness; treatment of French Canada after siege of Quebec, 2421; spirit of international peace and comity; trade with Germany; German rehabilitation necessary for stabilization of world conditions; fiscal policies of Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, 2422; free trade Great Britain; the big industries; the Safeguarding of Industries Act; history of free trade movement in England; the carrying trade of Great Britain and the United States, 2424; budget proposals; sales tax, 2425; cumulative payment by consumer; tariff reductions; Liberal

McMaster, Mr. A. R. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party and tariff; revisions of 1904 and 1907, 2426; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberal platforms of 1893-1919, 2427; abuses of protection; price-fixing by manufacturers; tyranny of the trusts; collars and silk stockings; the new feudalism; the amendment, 2428; Liberal party stands for progress and freedom, 2429
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Depreciated currency, 2420, 3411
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3467-75
Empire defence, Canada's responsibility, 1629
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 483
Essence de L'Erable, qu. 1774
German valuation of goods, 3227
Girl guides, 774
Immigration figures, 758
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
MacBrien, General, utterances of, 1662
Militia and defence, expenditure and policy, 1628
Ministers and Directorships, M., 1084, 1128
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Point of order, reading of documents, 560
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1648
Public Accounts Com., first report, 1460
Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Root Vegetables bill, 3376
Sales tax, 3265
Special War Revenue, flour, 3265
Voting when paired, explanation, 1462
Wheat Board, 2957, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3189, 3380
Amdt, 3384; agreed to, 3385

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech moved, 10. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Miss Macphail; Lord Byng, 10; abnormal conditions at home and abroad; financial burdens; state-owned railways; agriculture unprofitable; tariff revision, 11; natural resources of western provinces, 11-12; seat for Hon. Mr. Stewart; unemployment; returned soldier problems; forest and mineral wealth, 12; immigration; wider markets, 13; War-time Elections Act; labour troubles; harmony between races, 14

McMurray, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068, qu., 1182
Budget, 2474. Serious financial conditions, 2474; national debt; railroad deficits; legacy of the war; no constructive proposals; shifting the burden; production of wealth; Canada's future, 2475; immigration policy of former Liberal government; development of the West; prosperity interrupted by war; aggressive immigration policy needed, 2476; immigrants from central Europe; settlers from United States, 2477; exodus from Canada; statement of Lord Shaughnessy; declaration of Manitoba liberal convention; qualifications of the immigrant; criticisms of immigration policy answered; conditions in West improving, 2479; immigrants from the British Isles; foreigners and Canadian national life; the labour argument; policy of the United States; Canada's problems less than those of other countries, 2480; probable results of active immigration policy, 2481
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1439
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 3205
Natural resources, prairie provinces, 1017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1527
Winnipeg strike, cost of trials, qu., 1182

McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation of, 2805

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Asiatic immigration, qu., 732. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
British Columbia fisheries, M., 851
Budget, 2233. Progressive party' attitude towards Government; tariff reductions, 2233; reciprocity; British Columbia, protection of farms, mines and fisheries, 2234; free trade; immigration; unemployment; the amendment; pledges and moral code of the Liberal party; "political trickery"; Hon. John Oliver, Premier of British Columbia, criticism of by Vancouver Sun; alleged purchase by provincial government of warehouse site from President of Liberal Association; Vancouver World; resignation of provincial Attorney General, 2237; Minister of Public Works; national debt, 2238

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, coal mined by Orientals, 2407
Carriage of mails, qu., 825
Census enumerators, payment of, 1367
Civil Service bonus, 733
Patronage, 3084
Salaries $960 and less, qu., 1660, qu., 1775
Condensed milk tax, 3269
Exhibitions, grants to, 1026
Indians, New Westminster agency, 3536
Oliver, Hon. John, criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2026, 2236-37
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018, 3016
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
M. for exclusion or, 1509
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 169, 622. *See also under this title,* British Columbia Fisheries
Small manufacturers, 2710
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798
Widowed mothers, pensions, 3293

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Budget, 2545. Congratulation to Finance Minister; budget proposals disappointing; speeches of leaders; debt, taxation, idle factories; unemployment; abandonned farms; readjustments in economic structure; downward revision of the tariff; failure of protection, 2545; sales tax; suggestion from Canadian Manufacturers Association; protectionist budget; revenue; investment of American capital in Canadian industries; abuse of Customs tariff by United States companies, 2546; duty on cigarettes, cameras; comparative prices in Canada and United States, 2547; tariff reduction; ability to compete with outside industries; Progressive party, 2548
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Customs revenue, 770
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Saskatchewan, liquor export, 3006

Machinery. *See* Agricultural Implements

Madawaska customs collections, qu., 607

Magazines, American, imports of, 3109

Magna Charta, 1388

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Contracts. *See* Post Office

Mail Services. *See* Post Office; Railways; Steamship Services

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 719
Budget, 2387. Tariff and taxation proposals of Minister of Finance, 2387; consideration given to all sections of country; sales tax; stamp and stock transfer taxes; automobiles tax; the tariff, 2388; United States tariff; reciprocity; British preference; American branch industries and export trade; marking and depreciated currency acts, 2389; income tax; effect on capital; confiscation; enterprise should not be discouraged; immigration, 2390; emigration; the farmer and industrialism; problems of prairie provinces; markets; transportation costs; fiscal policy, 2391
Goderich harbour improvement, 2001
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, Amdt., 2035

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply, 263. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; speech of Mr. Raymond, 263; different tariff policies of Liberals, 264; election campaign, 265; record of Union Government, 266; defeat of Union Government, 267; immigration; national debt and railway problem, 268; natural resources; St. Lawrence river waterway, 269; race and creed bigotry, 270; soldiers' re-establishment and pensions, 271; housing; tariff and protection, 272; railway rates, 273
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2261. Congratulations to Finance Minister; loans; Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2261; resolution moved by Minister of Finance while in opposition; the tariff, 2262; farmers and the budget; trade with Germany, 2263; foreign exchange; protective legislation in the United States; tariff for revenue; free trade not possible, 2265; sectional demands; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; St. Lawrence river waterway; the home market; sales tax, 2266; Great Britain and tariff legislation; 2267; free trade

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
and protection, 2268; advisory tariff board or commission; cheque tax, 2269; receipt tax; the amendment, 2270
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, claims qu., 606
Canadian National railways
Grain leakages, qu., 1401, 1930
Orders in anticipation of requirements 1698
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3481
Canadians emigrating, qu., 1182
Census, remarks by Mr. Johnston (Last Mountain) 1370
Civil Service Commission, 3087
Cost of living, 1057
Daylight saving, 948-9, 961
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1366
Dominion lands and surveys, 1037, 1039
Election pledges, cash bonus to soldiers, 403
Empire and Ascension days, 1760
Employment offices, 1058
Fisheries estimates, discussion, 2166
Forest protection, 1048
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 1999
Health, department of, 2017
High Commissioner's office, 414
Immigration
Estimates, opportunity for consideration, 2162-4
Physically fit, 3055-6
Policy, 756
Immigration dept., labourers, 3054
International Labour Conference, 1060
Labour Gazette, 1057
Labour, technical education, 460
Militia and defence
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Expenditure and policy, 2092
Officials, 586
Staff reduction, 422
Naval service staff, 418, 422
Navigation lights in Rainy River, 1499
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017, 3016
Prohibition, and, 2017
Parliament buildings, tower, 2016
Patronage, rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 788
Pension Board, 392, 1350
Regulations, change, 2995
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1361
Widowed mothers, 1311
Pensions Committee, final report, 3302-3

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Point of order, general policy, 556
Public building, location of services in, 1757
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1698
Returned soldiers, alleged treatment of children of, 2638
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3394, 3400
Revenue and protective tariffs, 719, 2265
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1200
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Grain transportation, 2758
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 445
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Estimates, details of, 1347
Expenditure, 1340
Hospital staff, 1345
Salary increases, 387
Soldiers' disabilities, 392
Unemployment relief, 1352
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers, land settlement, 2023
Statistics, co-ordination of work in, 1366
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1697
Tariff, permanent advisory board or commission, 2269
"Tories and militarists", 1598
Unemployment
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Situation, 1074
Vancouver and Fraser Valley bill, 798
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2758
Wheel chairs for invalids, 3115
Wrangel island, 2208

Manitoba
Agricultural College, western agricultural conditions, 2332
Court of appeal decision on Canada Grain Act, 1770, 1841, 1932-3. *See also* Wheat Board
Flags on public schools, 1265
Forestry in, 1046
Harbours and rivers, 2003
Liberal Convention, res. on immigration, 2478
Natural resources, control of, 24, 1018. *See also* Western Provinces
Norris, Premier, on freight rates and natural resources, 1017, 1213
Unemployment conference, 1069
University of, percentage of students of foreign extraction, 2151, 2157
White Mud river fishway, 2167

Manufactured Goods, tax on. *See* Customs Tariff

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers' Association
Eastern Canada in, 2901
Income tax paid by, qu., 1063-4
Production of wealth by, 2378
Progress since 1870, 2658
Propaganda, 2362
Protection of, 55, 102-3, 144, 153, 303, 343, 2435-2440. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget
Sales tax. *See* Special War Revenue

Manure, exportation of, 1018. *See also* Fertilizers

Maple Products. *See also* Health

Maple Products Act, administration of, 2017

Maps, Topographical. *See* Dominion Lands and Surveys

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Air force and civil aviation, 1733
Budget, 2905. Twenty-two years of parliamentary life; interest in the West; 2905; Liberal party and western development; a united Canada; hardships of pioneers, 2906; conditions and advantages of the western railways; market for the farmers; employment for the workingman; reciprocity; opposition of manufacturers; 2907; trade relations with United States; tariff reductions; British preference; development of St. Lawrence waterway; better understanding between East and West; the amdt., 2908
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Sub-amendment (Mr. Crerar), 2473
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Canadian representation in the United States, 1383
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Census enumerators
Appointment of, 1371
Payment of, 1368
Census figures, verification, 1366
Civil Service
Commission, 3072
Patronage, 3074
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Debates, official report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
Fisheries, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
French-Belgian treaty, 3223

Marcil, Hon. Charles. — *Con.*
Gaspe railways, M. for papers, 623
House of Commons staff, stenographers and messengers, qu., 1376
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Insurance claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349
Meat and canned foods, 3047
Montreal Harbour Commission, Capt. Landry, 1481
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 3019
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444
Pension Commissioners, Quebec representation, 1350-1
Pensions, widowed mothers, 3293
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1656
Quebec fisheries, 377, M., 493, 616
Receipt tax, 3262
References to, 1298
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3395
Root Vegetables, potato bags, 3377
Rulings as Acting Speaker:
Member moving res. has right to close debate, 540
Member withdrawing motion, 545
Relevancy, 3539-40, 3542
Res. involving charge on revenue, 3476
Supply, point of order, 1337
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703
Dominion Elections Act, qu., 470
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, qu., 377

Marconi Company, 1736, 1749

Margaree breakwater, 1767

Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service. For vessels, *see that title*
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Biological Board, 3051
Demers, Captain, 1492
Deputy Minister of Fisheries, 2166
Derelicts, removal, Windsor, N.S., 1493
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166, 3507
Examination of masters and mates, 1490

Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Life-saving
Equipment, qu., 1284
Services, 1494
Stations, qu., 367
Lighthouse and coast service. *See that title*
Little Current tug boat, 3086
Marine agencies, 1495
Marine signal service, 1499
Meteorological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Newfoundland coast, 1498
Rainy river lights, 1499
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 1676, 3507
Expenditure, 1494
Murphy, Capt. Frank, compensation, 3508
Relief of distressed seamen, 1676
Steel plates, 3508
O'Hara, Captain, 1490
Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Exemption from dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Publicity and marketing division, 2169
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Removal of obstructions from navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, maintenance, 1494
Select Standing Com. on, changes, 1398
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Sorel shipyard
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, 1062
War claims, adjustment of, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, etc., 1493
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Lambton, 1497

Maritime Provinces
Coal fields, 108, 2611. *See also* Coal
Condition prior to Confederation, 107
Intercolonial and, 107, 192. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Natural resources, 340. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1243
Railways, 131
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316

Mark, value of. *See* Currency, depreciated; Germany

Marketing of Wheat. *See* Wheat Board

Markets, Foreign, 221. *See also* Trade
Necessity for, 2149. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Reciprocity and. *See that title*
Restricted, 343

Marking Act. *See* Customs

Marking of Goods. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Address in reply, 243; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; unity of purpose in government; elections and the province of Quebec, 244; government by co-operation; railway situation, 246; merchant marine, 247; tariff revision, 248; Liberal tariff views; immigration, 249, 250
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 246-247
Insurance, qu., 605
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 486
Mines and Minerals, Com., on, 1398
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-55
Pensions Committee
First report, 726
Final report, 3286, 3348
Adoption of, 2253
Meetings, 3335
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3393
Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Speech on tariff before election, 240
Vickers, dry dock, qu. 936

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647, 754, 1012, 1032. *See also* Agriculture
Cattle embargo and, 1032

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Agricultural exhibitions, 995-6
Barkhouse, Capt., 1748
Biological Board, Mr. Halkett, 3051
British Empire Steel Corporation, taxation, qu., 1067
British Preference and Canadian seaports, 719
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, passenger traffic, qu. 939
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771
Canned lobsters, inspection, 3048
Civil Service
Inside service, 580-1
Overmanning, 3081, 3100
Patronage, 3087

Martell, Mr. L. H. — *Con.*
Coal transportation on national railways, 1763
Cold storage, 818, 996
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 951
Departmental law officers, 683-4
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1163
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Fisheries Protection service, 678, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Food inspection, 820
Income tax, qu., 366
Indians Sydney reserve, medical attendance, qu., 2216
Labour department salaries, 549
Legal costs, 2772
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. Halifax, payments to, 2772
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1491
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Ocean and river service, 3507
Select Standing Com., on, 1398
Wrecks, investigation, Capt. Demers, 1492
Meighen, "the King-maker", 35
Military expenditure, 1137, 1141
Militia dept., officials, 741
Motion transferred, 942
National Defence bill, 665, 737
Nova Scotia miners, 524
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drugs bill, 3022
Parents, support of by children, 1310
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2015
Pelagic Sealing treaty, 1844
Pensions
Limitation of time for application, 2995
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445-62
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim, 3504
Removal of derelict in channel at Windsor, N.S., 1493
Royal Canadian navy, 1855, 1890
St. John terminal facilities, 849
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1343
Steamship services, freight rates, 2028, 3032
Welland ship canal, 2749
West Indies steamship services, 3032
Wheat Board, 3182
Windsor, N.S.,
Lease of wharves to C.P.C., 2749
Wreck at, 1493
Women and the franchise, 483

Massey-Harris Company, 1106, 2175. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Masters and Mates. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Matapedia Valley. *See* Quebec Oriental Railway

Match Industry, Occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Matches
Bill respecting, 1r., 3598
Tax on, 3262

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Baxter, Mr. Charles, successor to, qu., 2457

Meat and Canned Foods Act, administration of, 967

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3044; 1r., 2r., 3050; com., 3050, 3149; 3r., 3150

Meat Inspection, 226. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle Embargo

Meat Products. *See also* Live stock

Meats, Cold storage. *See* Agriculture

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions Committee

Medical care. *See* Indians

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act

Medical Inspection. *See* Immigration

Medicines. *See also* Opium and Narcotics
Duties, reductions in, 2116

Mediterranean of America, 1202. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 19. Congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail; New Prime Minister; Limitation of Armaments conference, 19-20; census returns; expansion of trade, 20; Liberal speeches and campaign literature; Sir Lomer Gouin and Mr. Mitchell, 21; natural resources of western provinces, 22; tariff revision, 24; Liberal platform; speeches of Sir Lomer Gouin, 26; Hon. Walter Mitchell; the Prime Minister on the tariff, 26-27; Mr. Raymond, 27; Mr. Marler, 28; public ownership; 30; wider markets; Minister of Agriculture, 32; reciprocity pact; reduction of freight rates, 33; Liberal administration; negotiations with Progressives, 34; Mr. Crerar, 34-35; Newmarket speech; Union Government negotiations, 35; Mr. Gardiner's statement, 36; responsible government, 37; Orders in Council, 37-38
Agricultural implements, duty, 3119
Agriculture Com. report, 726, 776, 1929. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Agriculture dept., Mr. Duncan Marshall, 645
Air Board, 1722
Details of expenditure, 1728
Estimates, 1722-35
Alien property, custody at Prince Rupert, 3606
Alpine Club, 794, 1053
Archives, 702
Assiniboine river floods, relief measures, 3491
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 10, 2802
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Birthday, congratulations on, 3102
Borden, Sir Robert, correspondence, 373
International disarmament conference, 1283
Budget, 2523; Tribute to Finance Minister; financial position; debt; taxation and fiscal policy; moderate protection, 2524; free trade principles; the Netherlands, Belgium, 2525; Great Britain; abandonment of protection would mean disaster to Canada; ability to compete abroad; reciprocal trade; peculiar situation of Canada; United States an intermediary between us and the outside world, 2526; east and west routes of trade; reciprocal arrangement with United States; rejection of Reciprocity treaty; Fordney tariff, 2527; American farmers and competition in home market, 2527; free trade in wheat; results seen in United States tariff legislation; amendment, 2528; Liberal pledges broken; brazen apostacy; British preference; microscopic reduction in duties; Liberal platform of 1919, 2529; Finance Minister should have declared his position; tariff; general reduction and detailed adjustment, 2530; voters betrayed; contract broken; revised policy of Liberal

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party; declaration of Prime Minister; promised reductions in duties on food, 2531; clothing, building materials; failure to implement pledges, 2532; responsibility of Progressive party; invitation to Government to abandon pledges; grant to returned soldiers; Mr. Crerar's position, 2533; amendment to amendment; failure of Progressives to achieve their desire; responsible government; agricultural implement duties; 2534; Opposition votes for government; freight rates; faults of the budget; German and Austrian trade; exchange; inflation of currency; marking of imports, 2535; Government by Order in Council; dumping clause; possible tariff reductions; sales tax; Mr. Raymond and agricultural implement duties; Hr. Macdonald (Pictou) and steel and coal duties, 2536; special platforms for individual constituencies; Government's difficulties of their own creation, 2537
Budget amendment, 2338
Building trades, 583
Business of the House, 373
Amdt. to amdt., (Mr. Crerar) 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742, 1900
Debates, Official, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Decorum, 2090
Delay in proceeding with, 7
Further legislation, inquiry, 2996, 3102, 3365
Government orders on Mondays and Wednesdays, 1461, 1720
Privilege, right of member to raise on orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Supplementary estimates, 3364
Wednesday, hour of sitting, 49
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (Pilotage) 1487
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts., 3614
Canadian National parks, 1053
Canadian National railways
Accounting, 1918
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Canadian Northern, 1907
Deficits, 1918

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Estimates, 1907-54
Minister's annual statement, 912
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 394, 2533
Liberal pledge, 400
Relevancy, 404
Cattle embargo, 985
Alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1022, 1463
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368, 1372
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Chinese customs tariff, 3168
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service Act, 1368
Civil Service
Classification, Arthur Young Co., 1491
Economy, 2057
Marine and Fisheries department, 1491
Militia services, organization of, 423
Reorganisation of, 2061
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1491
Russell, Mr. T. A., superannuation of, 1667
Coal for public buildings, 1758
Committees, changes, 497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Half-breed scrip, 3103, 3211, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth Special Com., second report, 1988
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 104-11-21-24-49-53. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 2535-6, 3119, 3413, 3421
Estimates, 763
Valuation for duty, 3225, 3414
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Defence, preparation for, 1621. *See also under this title,* National Defence
Demobilization, military hospitals, 1262
Deville, Dr., 1044, 1048
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283, 1334
Dominion Elections Act, 470
Dominion Iron & Steel Company
Contract for steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., 2170

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Dominion lands
And surveys, 1044
Homestead re-entry, 1042
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, bill, 3466-75
Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1235-6
Election campaign, 21, 187
Election of Speaker, 2
Election promises, 21
Liberal handbook, 400
Ellesmere Island, 1751
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 479
Estimates
"Appropriations not required," 1269
Information not up-to-date, 1267
This year's accounts charged to previous years, 1715
Exemption of farmers' sons, 440
Experimental farms, expenditure, 1264
Extra-territorial rights, 1068
False creek bridge, 3516
Finance, deputy minister, 751
Fire prevention, 794
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3589
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3589
Special Com., ref. to, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213
Third report, 3589
Gasoline tax, 3116
Gaspé railways, 627
Genoa conference, expenses, 1715
Geological survey, co-ordination of survey work, 1236
German goods, valuation, 3225
Government departments, payments to each other, 1724
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50
Grand Trunk Railway
Arbitration, British newspaper article, 375
Financial statement, 1933
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure for 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward Island, 1270
High Commissioner
Alleged statement of, 1022, 1463
Office, 414
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1503, 1988
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Immigration dept., 3051
Black Mr., appointment, 3500
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 755
Work of, 760
Immigration of Hutterites, 2160
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Income tax
Comparison with systems in other countries, 2228
Naturalization, and, inquiry as to legislation, 3103
Non-resident aliens, M. (Mr. German) 1303
Income War Tax Act. Amdt., 3359
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3192
Indian Affairs
Estimates, 681, 684, 1712
Indians
Agitation and unrest, 1223
Complaints, 1223
Expenditure, 1216
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Six Nation reserve, 1222
Soldiers Settlement Board, 1222
Stony reserve school, 1229
Insurance department, 792
Interim Supply bill, 380
Interior Department
Conservation Commission employees, transfer, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
International Labour Conference, 3437
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 424, 428
Justice dept. salaries, 452
Labour department
Duplications, 577
Salaries 550
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 2991, 3200, 3207, 3435
Lawyers, employment in Justice dept., 1679
League of Nations, 3162, 3171, 3174
Limitation of Armaments, 43
Loyalty of western Canada, 1023
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Com. on Agriculture, 1900
Marine and Fisheries
Life-saving service, 1494
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Steamers and icebreakers, 1490
Marler, Mr., and railway situation, 28, 247
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3501
Meat and canned foods, 3045, 3050

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, proposed reduction of vote, 1620-9
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2091, 2096
War claims, adjustment of, 417
Mines department
Additional officials, 689
Estimates, 686
Ethnologist and ornithologist, 687
Ministers and directorships, 1104
Montreal Harbour Commission, 1489
National Defence bill, 663, 674, 734, 738, Senate amdts., 2807
Natural resources, transfer to western provinces, 41-42
M. for correspondence, 1509
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 3436
Naval defence, 1862-1900
Naval policy, 2056-81
Naval service, 1738
Empire defence, contribution to, 2081
Niobe, sale of, 2065
Royal Canadian navy, 1741, 1862-1900, 2056
Empire defence, needs of, 1741
Minister's proposals, criticism of, 1741
Staff, 418
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 503, 524-539, 544, 597, 1054
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Ocean and river service, expenditure, 1494
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3426-32
Orders in Council, government by, 663, 2535-6
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1561, 1567, 1575
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Parliament buildings, lighting, 1755
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Peace and war, 1621
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1350, 1351
Charges against, 3041
Representation of Quebec, 1351
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1353
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3522

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Ploughs, duty on, 3123, 3125
Amdt. (Mr. Johnston, Last Mountain, 3230
Political alliances, 2097
Political promises — Mr. Hoey, 2338
Portage la Prairie exhibition, qu., 1391
Post Office estimates, 691
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504
Prices, deflation of, 1216
Prime Minister, private secretaries, 410, 412
Prime Ministers' Conference, 1629
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, 1742
Lord Lee, reported statement of, 1742
Report, reference to, 5
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Privy Council, increases, 410
Promises of Union Government, 2339
Public buildings
Coal for, 1758
Flags, 1264, 1268
Generally, expenditure, 1262
Heating, 1758
Maritime provinces, 1243
Ontario
Alleged neglect by former government, 1249
Appropriation and expenditure, 1245-59-60
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
Water, 1266
Public expenditures, 1249
Public Works
Classification, 693
Estimates, 692, 697, 699, 747
Public buildings, 1755. *See also under this title,* Public Buildings
Salaries, 749
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493 622
Quebec Harbour Commission
Inquiry for papers, 1283
Political patronage, 1477
Resignation of former commissioners, 1477-8
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1477
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission
Chairman, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3491
Freight rates, 193

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Railway estimates, 409
Railway policy of Government, inquiry, 407
Railways, annual statement of minister, 921
Raymond, Mr., and the tariff, 255, 2536-7
Reciprocal trade with Australia, 10, 2802
Inquiry for correspondence, 9
Reciprocity with the United States, 2845
Redistribution, 733, 3611
Census, and, 1364, 1367, 1371
Resolution should embody bills, 3179
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 734
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 673
Estimates, 2129
Ruling of Chair, 3354
St. John quarantine station, 1241
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 844
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Secretary of State, estimates, 701
Seed grain advances, 1053
Seed grain commission, 1011
Soldier land settlement, 3294, 3296
Estimates, 2135
Homestead rights, 2135
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2139
Taxes, collection of, 2135
Soldiers' bonus, 393, 394, 400, 404, 436, 2533
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1262
Medical treatment, 392
Parliamentary Com., 393
Salary increases, 385
Unemployment relief, 1352
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3597, 3609
Sorel shipyards, dismissal of employees, 1283
Speaker, Mr., bereavement of, 496
Speaker's election, 2
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 580, 1366
Statutes, revision of, 1718
Steamship subsidies, 3505
Steel, structural, importation, qu., 1931
Stefansson expedition, 1750
Supply. *See also under this title,* Estimates
Concurrence, 1769
Method of discussion, 1142
Motions in, 1579
Latitude in discussion, 2238
Supreme Court estimates, 1274
Tariff Commissioner, appointment of, 1663
Tariff revision, 2540
Tourist traffic, 1682

Meighen, Right Hon Arthur — *Con.*
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Trade and Commerce officials, 700-01
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490
Trial of Indian Lebeaux, expenses, 1669
Unemployment
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Canadian coal, use of by railways, 1759
Insurance, 1080
Policy of government as to, 3491
Relief, 1719
Situation, 1079
Welland canal, 2750
United Grain Growers, agricultural implements, 3120
United States, discriminatory legislation 1303, 2527-8
Washington conference. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
Empire naval defence, 1744
Papers, 1283
Welland canal, 2750
Western provinces, natural resources. *See* Natural Resources
Wheat Board, 2915, 2924, 2953, 3175, 3184. 3190, 3381, 3386. *See also under this title,* Agriculture Committee
Concurrence in report of special Com., delay, 2306
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3495
Winnipeg strike, Mr. Alfred J. Andrews, 1069
Wrangel island, 1750
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275
Radiotelegraph service, 1749

Melchior, Dr., on value of German mark, 2645

Mellish, Mr. Justice, 1275

Melville, Sask., railway restaurant, qu., 2038

Members. *See* House of Commons

Memorials, War. *See* Baker, Lieut. Col.; Battlefields; Historic Sites; War Graves Commission; War Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Immigration

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Merchants' Bank. *See that title under* Banks and Banking

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, seconder, 15. Change of government; Baron Byng of Vimy, 16; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; encouragement of agriculture, commerce and industry, 16-17; immigration; labour, 17; financial burdens; political parties, 18
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786, 1333
M. (Mr. Church) 1396

Meredith, Sir Vincent, 1128

Messengers and Stenographers, qu., 1376

Metal File Cabinets, 1252

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service, magnetic observatory, 1501

Mexico
Postal rate to, qu., 3364
Trade with, 699, 700, 2989

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Hamilton post office building, 1246
Military expenditure and policy, 1152, 1579
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1152, 1579
Expenditure and policy, proposed reduction, 1579
Services co-ordination, 416
National Defence bill, 665, 666, 737, 744, 745
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, industrial disputes, 667
Royal commission on pensions, 386

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Audibility of debate, 385
Criminal Code Amdt., fines, payment, 2832
Customs revenue, qu., 607
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Edmundston
Post office, qu., 608
Public building, 1242
German reparations, qu., 375
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
St. John terminal facilities, 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Welland ship canal, 2753

Migratory Birds, 1684

Military Forces, preparedness. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Servicee

Military Hospitals, 1261, 1341, 1344, 3287-9, 3345. *See also* Pensions Com. report; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1339-48

Military Service. *See also* Pensions Com.
Medical inspection, 3317

Military Service Act, powers under, 780

Military Service Act, 1917, Repeal bill (Mr. Woodsworth
1r., 424; order for 2r., stands, 493; M. for 2r., 639; Mr. Speaker rules bill out of order, 644

Militia and Defence. *See also* National Defence bill
Adjustment of War claims, 1155, 2098, 2974
Air force, 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Ammunition, 2085
Shipment from Great Britain, 1156-63, 1337
Small arms, 1979
Annual drill, 1137, 1139, 1144, 1146, 1151, qu., 1285, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2835
Amdt. (Mr. Power) to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1174, 1578
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Expenditure for 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1261
Quebec, qu., 1287
Arsenals
Danger of attack by aeroplanes, 2085-98
High explosive shells, 1170
Lindsay, 1165, 1171, 1979
Site, purchase of, 2087-8
Quebec, 1165, 1171, 1978-9, 2085
Amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091; agreed to, 2098
Amdt. (Mr. McBride) to reduce vote by $110,000, 2091; neg., 2098
Customs duties, 1978
Rivière du Loup, qu., 1181
Burstall, General Sir Henry, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Cadet camps, 1147, 1973, 2202
Militarism, 1974
Cadet services
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce vote by $100,000, 1972; agreed to, 1978

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by, $21,000, 1978
Defensive forces, 1135
Demobilization expenditure, 1155, 1163
Department
Estimates, 415, 586, 1578, 1610, 1972, 2974, 3498
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Salaries and contingencies, 415, 586, 1985
District auditors, 1145
Engineer services and works
M. Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Expenditure
Policy and, 1174, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2202. *See also under this title,* Arsenals, Naval Service
Reductions proposed by minister, 1578
Reduction of, 1135
1890-1913, qu., 1285
1911-22, qu., 1287
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
General staff, 1145
Generals, 1145
Gwatkin, General, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Lindsay arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372
Lord Grey on military protection, 1136
MacBrien, General, 1151
Reported utterances of, 1662
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Military districts, 1580, 1775
District No. 12, 1602
London, 1983
Toronto, 1983
Military holiday, 1146, 1338
Military hospitals, 1341. *See also that title*
Militia council, qu., 2039
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1245
Munitions. *See also under this title* Ammunition
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-63
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Ordnance arms and lands
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Pensions. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Permanent force, 1136, 1147, 1152, 1580, 1982
Estimates, 1982

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Permanent force — *Con.*
Expenditure, 1140
Royal Canadian Artillery, 1982
Strength of, 1136
Ten years' service or more, qu., 2637
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065
Quebec arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Rental of buildings, 1764
Royal Military College, 1985
Schools of instruction
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1985
Service overseas, 1140-80
Shed on Cartier square, Ottawa, qu., 2038
Staff, 661
Pay of, amdt., (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $10,000, agreed to, 1982; amdt (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item by $25,000, neg., 1982
Tobin, Lieut. Col., and 29th Battalion, 1975
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Training camps, qu., 2584
Transport and freight, 1986
Amdts. (Mr. Hanson) to reduce by $60,000 and (Mr. Spencer to reduce by $10,000, 1987
War claims, adjustment of, 1155, 2098, 2974
Warlike stores, 1137, 1154-63
Sale of, 1171-3

Milk. *See also* Dairying Industry
Competition with Klim, 981
Condensed, tax, 2492, 3264-5, 3271, 3409
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Herds supplying. *See* Accredited herds
Paper caps for bottles, 3114
Products, taxation, 3263-4

Milking Machines, 3270

Mill Feeds, adutleration of, 1012, 2490. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Agricultural implements, price of, 1476
Agriculture
Condition and prospects of, 1475, 2163
Plant pathologist, 593-4
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2736
Banks, interest rates, 3601
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Budget, 2294. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war indebtedness; failure

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
to meet larger proportion of cost during the war; public debt; revenue and expenditure; encouragement of basic industries; agriculture bled white, 2294; monopolies and political contributions; labour unions; extracting profits from the consumer, 2295; insufficient tariff reductions; agriculture languishing; price of gasoline; Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Meighen on the tariff, 2296; the tariff and mergers; increased prices of textiles; white lead, protective duty added to price; sales tax, the poor man hit, 2297; free food, boots and shoes; protection and wages; average income tax by classes; cost of fostering home industries, 2298; income tax, introduction of; loan companies, 2299
Canadian National railways
Branch lines, 1476, 2772
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Census
Completion of, 1363
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Civil Service, overmanning, 401
Dairy industry, 980
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Estimates, 401
Expenditure, necessity for economy in, 401, 1475
Export liquor warehouses, Saskatchewan, 767, qu., 1211
Legality of, qu., 1660
Fish culture, 2169
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Fort William-Port Arthur terminal elevators, qu., 1210
Hudson bay railway, completion of, 2784
Immigration
Foreigners, loyalty of, 2163
German, 3052
Policy, 2163
Indians
Education and health, 1228
Round lake school, 3537
Liquor
Export warehouses, 767, qu., 1211, qu., 1660, 3001
Importation into Saskatchewan, qu., 2037, qu., 2303
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Loan companies, renewal of loans, 1476
Parsons, W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Quebec harbour advances, 1475
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1198
Grain transportation, 2756
Saskatchewan liquor export. *See under this title,* Liquor
Soldier land settlement, land purchases, 2139
Terminal elevators, overages, qu., 1210, 2837
Welland canal
Estimates, amdt. to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758; neg., 2764
Grain transportation, 2756
Wheat Board bill, 3385, 3181
Woollen goods, duty on, 3136

Milling Combines, 304, 2633. *See also* Wheat Board

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Agriculture dept., officials, 654
Budget, 2239. A six country; new fiscal policy needed; amendment; no solution; loss of faith in political parties, 2239; economy; tariff inconsistencies; unfairness as between manufacturer and farmer; free raw materials and protected product; sales tax, 2240; farmers and the income tax; agriculture the mainstay of the country, 2241
Fishways in White Mud river, 2167

Milton, speech of Hon. Mr. Murphy, at, 2562

Mineral Resources Bureau. *See* Imperial Mineral Resources

Mineral Waters, tax on. *See* Taxation

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Geological Survey; Natural Resources
Assay office, Vancouver, 1236
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237
Clay products, 1234
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Lignite Utilization Board, 3524
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Mineral rights. *See* Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt.
Miners' strike, district No. 12, 1058
Mines dept.,
Estimates,, 685, 1233
Salaries, 685
Statistical branch, 1366
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Ore dressing plant, 1236

Mines and Minerals — *Con.*
Publications, 1234-6
Resources, 12
Investigation of, 1234
Reduction in vote, 1236-62
Road and materials, 1234
Select Standing Com., 1398
Tar sands, 1236
Yukon, mineral discoveries, 1276

Ministers and Directorships, 241-243
M. (Mr. McMaster), 1084; neg., 1131
Bank directors, 1091
Bank of Montreal, 1129
Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
Borden, Sir Robert, 1089
Directors of large corporations, names, 1128
Government's attitude, 1095-1117, 1124
Great Britain, practice in, 1089-99, 1107-1128
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088, 1100, 1111, 1113, 1129
Interlocking directorates, 1086, 1100, 1115, 1129
Judges' Act, 1088
Merchants' Bank, 1085, 1096, 1121
Practice in other countries, 1090, 1096, 1101, 1114
Tariff beneficiaries, 1088
White, Sir Tomas, 1089, 1102

Ministers of the Crown
Salaries, 1093, 2895
Trips to Europe, 14

Minority Candidates. *See* Elections

Minority Government. *See* Elections

Minors, sale of drugs to. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Miscou-Shippegan Islands, service, 2029

Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 46, qu., 471

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3002
Carriage or transportation, amdt., 3008
Canadian National railways
Deficits, 1910
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Public ownership and operation, 1907
Rails and car repair contracts, 1694, 1709, 1961
Reference to by Mr. Meighen, 21, 207

Monckton Papers, purchase of, 1673

Moncton
Intercolonial headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Railway shops, 1709

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Currency; Finance
Gold standard, 1291
Purchasing power of, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603, 2629. *See also* Address; Budget
Mark, German. *See* Germany

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Montpetit, Professor. *See* Genoa Conference

Montreal (city)
Bank of. *See* Banks
Canadian National railways' employees, 1288
Census figures, 1366
Clerks of the peace. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Cold storage warehouse, 819
Customs and excise employees, 1288
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392-4
Income tax office, qu., 607, 1288
Merchants' Association, 1392
Ordnance stores building, repairs, 1245
Post office employees, 1288
Post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, staff, 1342
Suburban steam service, 135
Wages of workmen, 1465

Montreal (port). *See also* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu., 2631
Employees, qu., 2992
Expenditure to date, 1488
Facilities, 1472, 1473
Grain shipments through, 1489
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Revenue, 1465
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-1209, 1315-34

Montreal Gazette
Canadian National railways, 1923
King-Crerar alliance, 206
Montreal Harbour Commission, resignation, 1481

Montreal Harbour Commission, 1289, 1335. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Harbour master, Capt. Landry, 1481
Paint purchased, qu., 602
Policemen, qu., 2992
Resignation of commissioners, 1478-81
Tugboats, qu., 600

Montreal Harbour Commission Advances bill
Res., 1335, 1488; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 3r., 3199

Monty, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill

Monuments. *See also* Battlefields; War Memorials
Historic sites, 119, qu., 469
New Brunswick, historic sites, qu., 469
Parliament hill, qu., 936

Moore, Mr. Tom, and immigration, 3053

Moosejaw public building improvements,

Morgan, J. P., & Company, 1131, 1133

Morganatic Alliances. *See* Alliances

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Canadian Northern railway, qu., 368
Wheat Board, 2926

Morphine. *See* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2699. Comparative prices of wheat and farm implements in Saskatchewan and North Dakota; shifting burden of taxation, 2699; exports of farm implements; competition in foreign markets; protection of industries; customs tariff inadequate to raise revenue, 2700; excise duty on manufactured goods; expense of running the Government; to much overhead, 2701; comparative development of Canada and the United states; freight rates and Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702; export rates on manufactured goods and agricultural products; prices of hides, wool, boots and shoes and clothing; exchange value of wheat and commodities, 2703
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1425-6
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Sales tax collections, qu., 375
Saskatchewan liquor exports, 3005
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 435

Morrissy, Mr. John (Northumberland, N.B.)
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Provincial wharves, 1992

Mothers, Widowed, pensions to. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Accredited herds, 649, 999
Diseases, 969
Valuation, 1003
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1012
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 1282, 3041, 3043, 3195
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1013
Agricultural lecturers, 1024
Agriculture department
Deputy Minister's salary, 653
Employees, 651
Estimates, 644, 1718, 3504, 3520
Lynton, Mr. T. J., 588
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 645, 651, 1013
Officials, 654-5
Professional men, 589
Salary increases, 588, 657
Saunders, Dr., 590
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 1004
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102, 2734-43, 2806
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2548. Fulfilment of election pledges; Liberal platform of 1893, 2548; tariff pledge; British preference; reciprocity, defeat of, 1911; free trade, 2549; unrestricted reciprocity; cry of annexation; opposition of manufacturers to proposal, 2550; Canada's tragic mistake; protection; infant industries; protection for the farmer, 2551; not a protectionist budget; a substantial step in right direction; Liberal platform of 1919; revision of Progressive platform, 2552; excise duty on manufactured articles; revenue, 2553; free trade and revenue duties; motor cars; Mr. Crerar's pre-election statements; gradual reduction of tariff, 2554; elimination of protective feature; Regina speech; time inopportune for drastic action, 2555; Department of Agriculture; accredited herds; tuberculosis in cattle, 2556; cold storage; experimental farm system, 2557; staff; Civil Service Commission, 2559; patronage, 2560
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 2998
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Cattle embargo, 970, 979, 1021
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 998, 1024, 2557, 3521

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. — *Con*
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2834
Dairies, inspection of, 1006
Dairy produce, grading, 652, 656
Dairying industry, 982
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology
Botanical section, 816
Insect pests, 815
Exhibition grants, 649, 979
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 804, 812, 1014, 2557
Illustration farms, 3521
Fertilizers
Inspectors, 692
Manure, exportation of, 1021
Grasshoppers, 3520
Health of animals. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Contagious diseases, 967
Hog cholera, 1008
Compensation, 1028
Tuberculosis, 2556, 3521
Hogs, grading of, 1025
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2784
International Institute of Agriculture, 969
Klim, competition with milk, 981
Liquor, export of, 2998
Live stock industry, 978
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Grazing and feeding, 1719, 3522
National live stock records, 1027
Provincial governments, overlapping, 997
Stockyards, 1030
Wolves, destruction by, 998-999
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Mixed farming, 998
Oleomargarine, 654
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1804
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3358, 3425-32, 3487
Pure bred sires, 1032
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement in regard to, 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Root Vegetables, sale and inspection of, 1282, 2724, 3142, 3194, 3369, 3486
Rust investigations, 594
Saskatchewan liquor export, 2998
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Spruce bud moth, 595
Wheat Board, 377, 2940
Wheat Board bill, 3382
Wool industry, 997

Motor Cars, Theft of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Motor Trucks for transportation, 134

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Moving Pictures. *See* Trade and Commerce

Mowing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3363

Municipal Prison Farms, 1277. *See also* Prison Reform

Municipal Taxation, payment of by Government, 1256

Municipalities
Unemployment relief, 1069

Munitions. *See* Guthrie; King, Mackenzie, Militia and Defence; War

Munro, Mr. E. A. (Fraser Valley)
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1793
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1537

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Building trades, 583
Canmore and Drumheller coal miners' dispute, 1058
Civil Service, report of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 554
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1054
Cost of living, 1058
Employment offices, 1058
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour department
Classification of employees, 494, 575
Director of technical education, 578
Economy and work, 465
Estimates, 1970, 3526
Outside employees, 493, 494
Permanent and temporary employees, 460-1
Staff and salaries, 458-9, 562, 575
Statistical work, 580
Wage investigators, 462
Labour Gazette, 1058
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, M. to reduce item by $100,000, 1972

Murdock, Hon. James — *Con*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Clothing and necessaries, M. to reduce item by $21,000, 1978
Engineer services and work, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., M. to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item by $10,000, 1982
Nova Scotia miners, 46, 1054
Labour department officer, 585
M. (Mr. Irvine) 505
Printing Bureau, 1970
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1701
Unemployment relief, 1074, 1719, 2022, 3526
Policy of government, inquiry, 3491
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Whitley councils, 1061
Winnipeg strike, correspondence with Mr. Andrews, 2042

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Militia expenditure and policy, 1582
National Defence bill, 677
Post Office department
Employees
Bonus, 2801
Salaries, 691, 2801, 3504
Estimates, 1711, 2799
Inspectorates, reorganization, 1507
Outside service, 2799
Railway mail service, 2800
Reorganization, 2800
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800, 2801
Subletting, 2802
Yukon, parcel post, 2802

Murray Bay-Tadoussac service, 3035

Musk Ox in northern Canada, 2785

Mutton, imported, qu., 610

Mutual Insurance. *See* Insurance

Nanaimo, B.C Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Nanton, Sir Augustus, 1128

Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289

Nassau Dam, qu., 2457

National Battlefields Commission. *See* Battlefields Commission

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence. *See also* National Defence bills
Department of
Ashton, Major General, 661
Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, 661, 742
Canadian air force and civil aviation, 1722
Currie, Sir Arthur, 659, 743
Elmsley, Major General, 661
Gwatkin, Major General, 742
MacBrien, Major General, 661, 742
Morrison, Sir Edward, 661
Naval students in armories, physical drill, 1741
Services, co-ordination, 91, 97, 1747

National Defence, Department of, bills respecting
1. No. 15. 1r., 363-4; order for 2r., discharged, 547-8
2. No. 27. Res., 644, 657; 1r., 2r., com., 681; com., 733; 3r., 787; Senate amdts., 2806
Sections and subjects discussed:
Air Service, 658, 677
Amalgamation of services, 658
Appointment of officer to exercise powers of deputy, 737
Controller, 741
Defence Council, 746
Deputy Minister, 737
Desbarats, Mr. J. B., 737
Federal laws, enforcement of, 680
Holder of position abolished may be appointed to another, 741
Militia, 658
Naval Service, 658
Officers, retirement of, 661, 742
Officials, 736
Orders in Council, 661
Powers of Minister and deputy, 746
Regulations, 746
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 658
Secret service, 670-9
Services included, 733

National Gallery, 2011

National Industrial Conference, unemployment insurance, qu., 1375

National Livestock Records, 1026

National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Status. *See* Canada

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, 187
Conservative alliance with, 2095. *See also* Naval Service
Naval policy and, 1849, 1877

Natural Resources. *See also* Forestry; Mines and Minerals
Alienation of, 2245, 2992
Coal lands, 3465, *See also* Coal
Development, 269
Foreign ownership of, 2243. *See also* United States
Investigation of mineral resources, 1234
Northern Canada, in, 2779-99
Water powers, 1051. *See also that title*
Western provinces of, 88, 89, 100, 116, 154, 168, 223, 229, 339
Aerial patrol, 1722
Agreement with Government of Manitoba, 1018
Claims of prairie provinces, 1017
Conference with premiers, 1017
Tabled, 1769
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Transfer of, M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence, 1509

Naturalization. *See also* Dominion Elections Act

Naturalization Act, 1388, 1390
Disabilities of British-born under, 1389-91
Expenses, 1671, 2024
Further legislation, inquiry, 3103

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Residence (Mr. Archambault) 1r., 1062
2. Method of application (Mr. Copp) 1r., 3436

Naval Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval College. *See under* Naval Service, Royal Naval College

Naval Defence. *See* Naval Service

Naval Fortifications. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval Service. *See also* Marine; National Defence
Aurora, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1898. *See also that title*

Naval Service — *Con.*
Canadian navy, members stranded, 3365
Cruisers and destroyers, expenditure, qu., 2039
Department
Deputy Minister. *See* National Defence
Estimates, 1843, 1862, 2043
Reduction in, 2371
Naval council and officers, qu., 1774
Salaries, 418, 1735, 1745
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, officers, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 665, 678, 1736, 1740, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Hydrographic service, 1736, 1746
Naval college, 2047, 2203, 2458
Naval defence
Contribution of dominions, 1742
"Five trawler policy", 1741-5
Naval policy, 2043-84
Naval volunteers, 2058
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1305
Protection of fur seals, 1844
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, qu., 366, 1843, 1862
Aurora, cruiser, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Debate postponed, 1742-5, 1900, 1072
Dreadnoughts, contribution of, 1876
Esquimalt naval station, 1740
Estimates, 2043
Gift of ships to Canada, 1880-7, 2050
Halifax, protection and service at, 1740
Naval reserve force, 1739
Naval volunteer force, 1740
Niobe and Rainbow, 1736
Patricia, 1736, 2051
Patriot, 1736, 2051
Policy adopted, in 1913, 1876
Resolution of 1909, 1873
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Submarines, 1845
Training, 1740
Travelling expenses, qu., 3156
Trawlers, 1740
Units, cost, etc., qu., 965
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827
Royal Naval college, Esquimalt, 2044
Closing of, 2047, 2203, 2458
Tidal surveys, 1736
Transfer of services to Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 3611
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
War service badge, 1754

Navigation. *See also* Marine
Aids to, 1498
Detroit river, 1498
Life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Rainy river lights, 1499
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Schools of, 1492

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence; Naval Service; Royal Canadian Navy

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 169. Congratulations to preceding speakers; Miss Macphail, 169; comparison of parties; British Columbia and protection, 170; Mr. Crerar, 170-171; Orientals in British Columbia, 171; personal position and platform, 172-3; unemployment; wider markets, 174; railway rates, 175; the tariff; free trade and protection, 176; Chinese eggs, 177; butter and oleomargarine, 177-8; coal mines in Vancouver Island; fuel oil importations, 178; Hon. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Clements; vote in Cumberland district, 179; railways and government ownership, 180; necessaries and luxuries, 182; immigration, 182-3; Asiatics, competition with; soldier settlement, 183; inheritance tax; eight hour day; old age pensions; removal of Dominion Elections Act from statutes, 184
British Columbia
Coastal services, qu., 3152
Fisheries, cost and revenue, 2306
Fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 860
Post offices, qu., 824
Public buildings, 1258
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2307. Free trade and protection: a question of geography, 2307; the tariff, a compromise; economic position of British Columbia; support of government during session; expenditures in Vancouver and Victoria; rural constituencies neglected, 2309; political arguments for Conservative members; fruit industry and dumping clause; Oriental aliens; exclusion of, 2310; acquisition of British Columbia timber areas by Japanese; immediate action demanded; the workingman and the

Neill, Mr. Alan W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
eight hour day; lumber industry and freight rates, 2311; protection of coal mining industry against fuel oil; importation of coal from Japan; fishing industry; reduction in gasoline practically no benefit to fishermen; dairy industry; fruit industry; dumping clause; industries of Comox-Alberni, 2313; country districts suffering injustice; views of constituents, 2314
Canadian Freighter, Japanese coal imports, qu., 963
Civil Service reform, 3100
Courtney post office building, 1258
Criminal Code, carriage of calves under three weeks' old, 2831
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1438
Debates, official report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Election day a public holiday, 2812
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1354, 1439, 1602-6
Amdt. 1156, neg., 1163
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3012
Fuel oil, British Columbia, qu., 728, 2312
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
House of Commons, accoustics, 3544
Immigration
Methods, 3057
South-eastern Europe, from, 3057
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Intending immigrants to make application) 2207
Indians, medical attention, 1219
International Labour Conference, qu., 824
Japanese in British Columbia, 2310. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 521
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M., 1777, 1836
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3016
Oriental Aliens
Japanese, acquisition of timber areas in British Columbia, 3210
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1539
Paper mills, 3113
Pensions Com., final report, 3332
Point of order
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rule 19, offensive words, 1361

Neill, Mr. Alan W. — *Con.*
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1469
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt., 3407
Special War Revenue Act
Sales tax, 3269
Stumping powder, 3268
Statistics, co-ordination of, 581

Neill, Mr. C. E., 1128

Nelson post office revenue, qu., 2040

Neutrals and Non-Combatants. *See* Limitation of Armaments

New Brunswick
Floods, 3492
Harbours and rivers, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce vote, 1998
Immigration and, 2165
Public buildings, 1239
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293, qu., 1774
Salmon rivers, fishways, 2167
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1344
Wharves
Provincial, 1991
Tidal waters in, qu., 2209
Transfer of, qu., 2305

New London, Conn., seaport, 2611

New York Central Railway, 128

New Zealand
Butter. *See* Oleomargarine
Government ownership of railways, 181

Newfoundland
Canada-Newfoundland steamship service, 2027
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Reid-Newfoundland railway, 2027
Trade between Prince Edward Island and, 226

Newfoundland-Labrador Boundary
Reference to Privy Council, 1276
Doherty, Hon. C. J. reported engagement of, 2572
White, Mr. James, technical adviser, 3495

Newmarket, speech of Prime Minister at, 34-35

Newspapers
Censors, 1069
English, comment on Grand Trunk arbitration, 374, 821
Extracts. *See* Speaker, Rulings

Niagara Power Development, 134. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway

Nickel. *See also* Coinage

Nickel Coin Blanks, qu., 3152

Nickel Currency. *See* Currency Act Amdt.

Niobe and Rainbow, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Non-Taxable Bonds. *See* Bonds; Finance

Norman Dam. *See* Lake of the Woods

Normand, Hon. Dr., references to. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Norris, Hon. T. C., Premier of Manitoba
Natural resources, 1017
And freight rates, reported statement on, 1213

North Sydney quarantine station, 1238, 2021

Northern Islands and Waters
Patrol. *See* Naval Service
Policy respecting, 1750

Northwest Rebellion
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions. *See* Pensions
Smith, Mr. Leo, pension to, 3523

Notices of Cancellation. *See* Dominion Lands

Nova Scotia
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Air station at Dartmouth, 1724
Coal industry, protection of, 2412
Coal strike, 461. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1269, 1765
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Liberal party in, 2606
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Pensioners in, qu., 615
Public buildings, 1238
Shipbuilding, 1387
Supreme Court, vacancy, 3436
Unemployment, 1075-6

Nova Scotia Miners, qu., 605, 1054. *See also* Labour
Inquiry, 597
McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
M. (Mr. Irvine) 497, 539, 545

Noxious Gases and Chemicals, use of. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Observatory. *See* Dominion Observatory

Occupational Diseases. *See* Labour

Ocean
Ports, 1464-86
Tonnage, 2008
Vessels
Quebec, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-95, 1205

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

O'Connor, Mr. James, Snowflake, Man., dismissal, 1674

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C.
Payments to, qu., 2037
Revision of statutes, 1718

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

O'Hara, Captain, 1490

Oil. *See also* Natural Resources
Duty on oil drilling machinery, 2726
Fuel Oil, 344, qu., 728
Competition with coal mining industry, 2312
Importations, 178
Tank at Louise basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Leases, speculation in, 1046
Mackenzie and Peace river, cost of surveys, 1044

Okanagan Valley, fruit growing, 163. *See also* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause; Fruit

Old Age Pensions, 184, 1070, qu., 1375. *See also* Pensions
And mothers' pensions, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303-5

Oleomargarine, 2205. *See also* Agriculture; Butter; Dairying
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, res., 1794
Children fed on, 178
Competition with butter, 177
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Great War Veterans' Association, 1798
Importation and Manufacture, qu., 613, qu., 1506
Discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) 1720, 1776, neg., 1840

Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Local Council of Women, Hamilton, 1835
Materials, importation of, qu., 704, qu., 727, 3270
National Dairy Council, and, 1791
Regulations under Act, qu., 1702
Retail Merchants' Association and, 1797

Oleomargarine Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res., 3358, 3425; 1r., 3435; 2r., 3487; com., 3489; 3r., 3489

Oliver, Hon. John, Premier of British Columbia. criticism of by Vancouver Sun, 2236, 2237

One-Fourth Vote. *See* Interim Supply

Onion Grades, 2744. *See also* Root Vegetables

Ontario
Alienation of natural resources, qu., 2992
Canals, 2779. *See also that title*
Flags on public schools, 1265
Harbours and rivers, 1999
Historic battle sites, 119-120
Hydro Electric Power Commission. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1245
Appropriations not required, 1259
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1258
Rural population, loss of, 301. *See also* Budget; Population
Taxation of, 131
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Ontario Athletic Commission, cadet camps, 1973

Ontario Temperance Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Health
Chinese, 2018
Cocaine, 2019
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1377
Enforcement of Act
Prosecutions, 2017
Japanese, 2017
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Morphine, 2019
Oriental traffic in, 1529, 2017. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Production and export of, 2019
Prohibition and, 2017
Smuggling, 2020

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1841, 2823; 1r., 2826; 2r., com., 3013; 3r., 3025; Senate amdts., 3607

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. — *Con.*.
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of right, 3020
Dealing in drugs, 3013
Deportation, 3013, 3024
Penalties, 3013, 3014, 3020
Whipping, 3015

Opposition. *See also* Progressive Party
Attitude of, 60-61. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Position of. *See* Interim Supply
Representation in Parliament, 40
Status of leader of, 73

Orchards, protection of. *See* Entomology; Fruit Industry

Orders in Council, qu., 935
Canadian National railways, management, 192
Government by, 38, 141, 660, 662, 2518, 2536, 2562, 2880
Intercolonial railway operation, 107
Number passed, qu., 934, qu., 935

Ordnance Lands, local improvements fronting, 1681

Orient, trade with, 85. *See also* Trade

Oriental Aliens, 967
Australian legislation, 1536
Birth rate, 317
British Columbia in, 167, 171, 316, 332, 855
Resolution of legislature, 1513
Restrictive legislation, 1510
Canadians, disabilities in Japan, 1511, 2208
Chinese, 1510, 2026 3437
Arrival of at Vancouver, 3604
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Coal mined by, 2407
Coolie labour on British ships, 2042
Demands for exclusion of, 1513
Education, cost of, 317
Fisheries, engaged in, 345, 855
Franchise and, 483, 485
Fruit growing and, 1535. *See also* Fruit Industry
Gentlemen's agreement, 1511
Immigration, 319, 2161. *See also that title*
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776
Inquiry for opportunity to discuss, 967, 1461, 3104
Japanese
Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776

Oriental Aliens — *Con.*
Rights of Canadians in Japan, 1511, 2208
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148
Written application by intending immigrants, 2207
Japan, treaty with, 1511
Japanese, qu., 1399, qu., 1459, 1510
Acquisition of timber limits in British Columbia, 2310
Competition in British Columbia, 2279
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Labour, competition with, 317
Land occupation by, 1534
Number in Canada, 1512
Motion (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1509
Amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) for "effective restriction", 1567; agreed to, 1577
Canada's right to legislate, 1550
"Effective restriction", 1567
Opium and Narcotic drug traffic, 1529, 2017

Osler, Sir Edmund, 1128

Ottawa
Cartier square Militia dept., shed, qu., 2038
Daly building, purchase of, 1252
Daylight saving, 1282
Dominion observatory and geodetic survey building, 1265
Local improvements fronting ordnance lands, 1681
New departmental buildings, 3541
Noon gun, 1756
Ottawa Gas Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed
Ottawa-Kingston highway, qu., 1904
Parliament buildings, 2014. *See also that title*
Proposed donation of Rideau canal to, 2764
Public buildings, 1245, 1252, 1265, 1755
Char service, 1756
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, including roads and bridges, 1267
Rental of buildings in, 1252, 1764
Rideau hall, maintenance, 1756
Telephone service, 1757
Water, 1266

Ouimet, Mr. Joseph Rodolphe (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Introduction of, 323

Outside Service. *See* Civil Service

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Elevators

Pacific and Great Eastern Railway, 342

Pacific Naval Powers. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Palais Station, Quebec, 1068

Palestine, mandate over, 1716

Panama Canal, 191, 1326-9. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5

Paper Control Inquiry, 1673

Paper ror magazines, taxation, 3108

Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Civil Service examinations, 871
Insurance premiums, 3253
Labour dept., organized and unorganized labour, qu., 2303
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Quebec bridge, 1068
Quebec riots, qu., 1508
Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370

Parents, support of by children, 1310. *See also* Pensions; Widowed Mothers

Paris Agency, 2025

Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Parliament
Fall session, 3608
Opening of, 1
Prorogation of, 3616
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183

Parliament Buildings
Architects' fees, 2014
Cost to date, 2014
Estimates, 2014
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
House of Commons Chamber, accoustics, 1751, 1755, 1996, 3613. *See also that title*
Lighting, 1755
Tower, 2016

Parliament Hill monuments, qu., 936

Parliamentary Counsel, 2572

Parliamentary Guide, 2024

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Restaurant
Com. appointed, 326
Loss in, 184

Parry Sound
Lighthouse inspector, qu., 827
Postal receipts, qu., 938

Parsons, Mr. W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Party Representation, 214

Party System of Government, 2339. *See also* Address; Budget

Party System of Politics, 117-118, 214, 215. *See also* Address; Budget

Passenger Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Passport Office, 2066

Patent Record, 2026

Paternalism. *See* Pensions Committee

Patricia, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriot, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage, 2608. *See also* Budget; Civil Service; Speeches on Address
Appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Census enumerators, appointment of, 1368, 1372
Civil service, 1663
Civil Service Commission, 2559, 2563
Intercolonial railway and, 106
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Peace River block, 330

Peace Treaties. *See* Limitation of Armaments; Treaties

Pears, Vice Admiral Sir Edmund, 2061

Pearson, Mr. John A., Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Pearson Institute, Toronto, 3457

Pease, Mr. E. L., 1128

Peat. *See also* Fuel; Natural Resources
Committee, 1505
Deposits, experiments and production, qu., 1505
Investigational work, 1235

Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276

Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844

Penitentiaries. *See also* Justice; Prisons
Appointments, 1277
Death of inmates, qu., 3362
Dorchester, prison reform, 1278
Estimates, 1276
Supplementary, 1670
Infectious diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Inmates
Foreign and native, 1279
Increase in number, 1277, 1279, 1670
Inspection by grand juries, 1743. *See also* Prison Reform
Kingston, overcrowding, qu., 3362
Patronage, appointments, 1277
Population, increased, 1277, 1279, 1670
Prison reform. *See that title*
St. Vincent de Paul, employees and number of convicts, qu., 2804

Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, (Infectious diseases) 1r., 545; 2r., 787; com., 787; 3r., 967

Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1132, 3043; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3148

Penny Banks, depositaries for money received, 1132

Pension Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3402; 1r., 3405; 2r., com., 3439; com., 3459; 3r., 3463; Senate amdts., 3612
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for pension, 3445
Blinded men, 3456
Bonus payments continued, 3451
Deserted mothers, 3439
Disability at or prior to discharge, 3452
Disability attributable to, incurred or aggravated during military service, 3453
Pension to widow, 3447
Power to cancel pension of prostitute, 3451

Pension Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed — *Con.*
Residents in Canada, 3446
Time within which application must be made, 3445
Total and helpless disability, 3446
Widowed mother, 3439

Pension Commissioners, Board of
Amalgamation with Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept., 1339-40
Charges by G.W.V.A. against, 2994, 3041. *See also* Speeches on Address
Memorandum of Chairman in reply, 2994
Royal Commission to investigate, 3156, 3304, 3312, 3327, 3336, 3345, 3352, 3355-6
Expenditure, 1349
Imperial pensions, 1347-51
Medical examinations, 1343
Salaries and contingent expenses, 1339, 1349
Secondary boards, 1350
Staff, 1351

Pensions. *See also* National Defence bill; Railways
Civil, 1711
Commutation of, 390, 1281, 1349
Crimean war, 3315
Disabilities, 390
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Fabre, Madame, 2024
Fenian raid, 3315
Grand Trunk railway employees, 2041. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Imperial Forces, M. (Mr. Ladner) 864, 1347-51
Increased, 184
Investigation. *See under this title,* Roya Commission
Lightkeepers, 1496
Maternity benefits, 1070
Mothers, qu., 1375
Deceased soldiers, of, M. (Mr. Power) 1313
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Nova Scotia, payment in, qu., 615
Old age, 184, 1070, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303, agreed to, 1305
Returned soldiers, 320, 327. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Royal Commission on, suggested, 386. *See also* Pensions Board
Sickness, 1070
South African war, 3315
Total expenditure on, 1349

Pensions — *Con.*
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
M. (Mr. Power) 1305, 1313
Widows, 1070
Wrenick, Mrs., 3457

Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment of Returned Soldiers
Special Committee appointed, 496-7
Change in names, 596
First report, 726
Final report, 3286
M. (Mr. Marler) for adoption, 3286
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) to refer back, 3308; Withdrawn, 3349
Recommendations, expenditure under, 3522

Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Dues, exemption from, 1500. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Fees to pilots and regulation of, 1499

Pleuro-Pneumonia. *See* Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals

Ploughs, duty on. *See* Agricultural Implements

Pocket-Knives, Competition, 2646, 2876. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated; Customs Act; Germany

Police Commissioners, bribing of. *See* Criminal Code

Political Alliances, "Morganatic", 2095. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party

Political Contributions, by Monopolies, 2295. *See also* Election of 1921

Political Patronage. *See* Patronage

Polls. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Pollution of Streams, 2168

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Population. *See also* Budget; Census; Immigration
By ages, qu., 1632
Drift towards the cities, 2153, 2302
Increase under Liberal and Conservative govts., 2362, 2365
Loss of, 2439-40, 2449
Rural. *See under this title,* Rural
Ten years, in, 2516
Need of increased, 2148-58, 2275

Population — *Con.*
Oriental in Canada, 1512. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Rural, 2564-5
Decline in, 2153, 2156, 2158, 2384, 2439-40, 2449, 2683
Loss in Ontario, 2369, 2683
Movement to cities and towns, 2153, 2302, 2403
Urban, and, qu., 376
Infant mortality and, 2634
Slow growth of, 2158
Yukon territory, 1681

Pork Imports, qu., 611

Port Arthur
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co. claim, 1677

Port Dalhousie, 1493

Port Hood breakwater, 1768

Port Nelson, dredging, 2006

Portage La Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2004
Exhibition grant, qu., 1931
Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3457
Trenton harbour bill, 3494
Wrenick, Mrs., pension, 3457

Portland Terminus, 2611
Competition with Canadian ports, 104, 2611. *See also* Grand Trunk Railway; British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)

Ports, United States in preference to Canadian, 353-4

Postal Conference, 7, 15

Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Post Office
Department
Appointments, 3073
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving salary of $600, qu., 1067
Estimates, 1711
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu., 3599
General superintendent of postal service, 1711
Married women employees, qu., 1658

Post Office — *Con.*
Department — *Con.*
Money Order branch, qu., 1285
Outside service, estimates, 2799
Postal employees, 3075
Printing and stationery, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 69, 3504
Drop letter rate, 1250
Letter rate, Canada-Great Britain, qu., 3364
Mail, carriage of, qu., 825
Mail contracts
Canadian National railways, qu., 2038
Canadian Pacific railway, and, qu., 2040, qu., 2213
Gascons-Quebec, qu., 2213
Grand Anse, qu., 938
Lachenaie, qu., 2805
Richmond and Wolfe, qu., 1505
Rigaud-St. Rédempteur, 1776
Sudbury, qu., 1285
Money orders tax, 2857
Montreal
Employees, 1288
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599
Post offices and business done, qu., 1065
Postal receipts, qu., 938
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm, 1775
Sturgeon falls, qu., 1285
Post offices in British Columbia, qu., 824
Railway mail service, 2797
Reorganization, 2799
Revenue, qu., 2040
Richmond and Wolfe post offices, qu., 1507
Ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscription, qu., 3599
Rural mail routes, qu., 3152
Savings banks, reduction in interest rate, qu., 1932
Sherbrooke inspectorate, qu., 1507
Subsidized steamships and carriage of mails, 2028
Toronto, revenue, qu., 368, 1250

Potatoes
Conference of growers, 3367
Cost of growing, 2665
Duty on, 239, 2601
Grading machines, 3126
Market for, 225
Marking and grading. *See* Root Vegetables
Prices of, 94
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Shipping cost. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Trade with United States, 336. *See also* Budget

Potlatch Institution. *See* Indians

Poultry Industry, 226, 807

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Admiralty Court, vacancy at Quebec, 1275
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
Fishing schooner race, 3510
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. (Halifax) payments to, 2772
Militia
Annual drill, amdt. to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1173, 1174, neg., 1631
Engineer services and works, 1980
Expenditure and policy, annual training, 1611
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3443
Pensions
Mothers of deceased soldiers, M., 1313
Widowed mothers, M., 1305, 1312
Point of order — not permissible to read evidence to controvert member, 3540
References to, 1339
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3396
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 398

Power Development. *See* Electrification; Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Prairie Provinces
"Annexation of", 1020
Forestry in, 1046
Natural resources. *See* Western Provinces

Pratt vs. Delphine, 302

Preference, trade. *See* British Preference; Trade; United States

Premiums, Insurance tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Prescriptions, refilled. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Preservation of Industries Act, 2648

President Harding, St. Lawrence river waterway, 1326

Press. *See also* Canadian Press; Newspapers
Censors, 1068

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3503

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937
Budget, 2577. Tribute to Finance Minister, his difficulties and responsibilities; the

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tariff, 2577; proposals in harmony with Liberal policy; new taxes; inheritance of debts from former governments; effort to lower cost of living; economy, 2578; national debt; militia or naval expenditure; expansion of external trade; decrease in exports; restoration of normal conditions, 2579; Canadian market insufficient for natural products and manufactured goods; trade with Great Britain and the United States; Fordney tariff; transportation; interior systems of communication, 2580; direct intercourse with foreign countries; duty of the department of Trade and Commerce; consuls and trade agents; information; trade commissioners; qualifications, 2581, fairs and exhibitions; serious problems; the future; new political groups; development of Canadian national spirit, 2582
Civil Service Commission report, qu., 826
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, 1298
Imports and exports, 1911-1922, qu., 1661
Militia and Defence
Annual drill
Expenditure 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries in Quebec, qu., 1287
Expenditure 1911-22, qu., 1287
Stationery, purchase of by Government, 1288

Pribyloff Islands, protection of fur seals, 1844

Prices. *See also* Budget; Cost of Living; Finance; Trade
Price-fixing combinations, 2428, 2437
Regulations of, 2504

Prime Minister's Bereavement, reference to death of brother. *See* King

Prime Ministers' Conference, 42. *See also* Naval Service
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168
Correspondence, 1068
Empire naval defence, 1629, 1883, 2082
Canada's contribution, 1742
Resolution respecting, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Report, 5
Tabled, 8
Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Prince County, illegal fishing, qu., 371

Prince Edward Island
Harbours and rivers, 1270, 1988
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Natural resources, 339
Potato-growing, 225, 337
Public lands, 229
Railway, 229, 337, 1249. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065

Prince Rupert
Alien property, custodians of, 3601
Post office building, 1257
Post office revenue, qu., 2040
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Rental of buildings, 1257
Vessels constructed at, qu., 606

Princess Mary, marriage of, 39

Printers, immigration of, 3055

Printing. *See also* Printing Bureau; Publications
Canadian National menus, qu., 1931
Customs and excise, 1674
Joint Committee on, 211, 326, 1132
Public archives, 1673

Printing Bureau
Government printing, 1373
Government publications, distribution of, 1971
Legislation, 1972
Plant
New, 1970
Repairs and renewals, 1970
Statutes, 1972
Supreme Court reports, 1274

Printing and Stationery
Criminal Code, 1717
Interior, 1680
Post Office department, 1711
Statutes, 1717

Prison Reform, 1277-8; qu., 1773, 2397
Atlanta penitentiary, 1278
Dorchester penitentiary, 1278
Inspection by grand juries, qu., 1773, 2397
Jail farms, 1277-9; qu., 1773
Youthful offenders, qu., 1773

Prisoners, Contagious diseases of. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Address in reply, 250. Congratulations, etc., parliamentary groups and class representation, 250; manufacturers and the tariff, 251; agricultural conditions, 252
Experimental farms, 806, 810

Private Bills, Committee, 374
Bouchard, Mr., substitution for Mr. Stein, 2035
Vien, Mr. substitution for Mr. Ouimet, 2355

Private Bills Discussed
Canadian Pacific Railway Company Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1606, 1856
Canadian Transit Company, 1746, 1770
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490, 3495
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Co., 1353, 1439
Amdts. (Mr. Neill) 1156, neg. 1163; 1354, neg. 1357; 1602, neg. 1606
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 1577
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Railway Company, 1577
Niagara River Bridge Company, 1486
Ottawa Gas Company, refund of fees, 1657

Private Bills Undiscussed. *See* Journals of the House

Private Secretaries. *See* Privy Council

Privilege, questions of. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeals, 139
Salaries and contingencies, 410

Proclamation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Progressive Party, 295. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Council of Agriculture; Crerar; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Alleged split, denial, 2458
Alliances of, 2095-7
Attitude towards Government, 2233, 2507, 2842
Big interests and, 2393-4
Budget debate and, 2692
Canadian Pacific, and, 130
Class legislation and, 224. *See also* Address; Budget
Liberal negotiations with, 34, 48, 51, 240-1
Oleomargarine, attitude on, 2380. *See also that title*

Progressive Party — *Con.*
Ontario in, 2301, 2893-4
Origin of, 2512
Platform, revision, 2552
Redistribution, attitude towards, 1364-70

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017

Property, alien enemy. *See* Aliens

Proportional Representation, 59. *See also* Dominion Elections
M. (Mr. Good) for adoption of alternative vote method, 1633
Residential qualification, 1301

Prorogation of Parliament, 3616

Proscription. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip frauds)

Protection, 143, 228. *See also* Address; Budget
Boots and shoes, 102
Manufacturers and, 2435-40. *See also* Budget
Policy of, 1088
Tariff and, 170, 2110. *See also* Tariff

Protocols. *See* League of Nations

Provinces. *See also* Natural Resources. For individual provinces, *See their titles*
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Unemployment relief, 1069
Western. *See that title*

Provincial Rights, infringement. *See* Lake of the Woods bill

Ptomaine Poisoning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Public Accounts. *See also* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Committe, report, 1460, 3359
Date of closing, 1264-66
Non-productive assets, 1467

Public Archives
Estimates, 702, 1673, 2025
Monckton papers, purchase of, 1673

Public Buildings, 1755. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 3545
Appropriations and expenditures for 1921-22, 1259-60
Chambers, Mr., 1244
Char service. *See* Ottawa

Public Buildings — *Con.*
Coal, importation of, 1759
Estimates, 1238, 1258, 1755
Expenditure, accounts not closed, 1262-66
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Flags, qu., 599, 1264
Generally, 1260-5
Heating, 1755-1758
Immigration, repairs, 1757
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
New, 1255, 2461
New Brunswick, 1239
New departmental designs, 3541
Nova Scotia, 1238
Ontario, 1245-59, 1258, 3544
Alleged neglect of, 1248
Ottawa, 1245-52, 1265, 1755. *See also that title*
Parliament buildings. *See that title*
Penitentiaries, 1277
Quebec, 1245
Rental and purchase of, 1764
Calgary, 1254
Ottawa, 1252
Prince Rupert, 1257
Waterbury, Mr., retirement of, 1244

Public Debt, 2106, 2225, 2370, 2496, 2501, 2895. *See also* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans
Taxation and, 2459

Public Expenditure, 1249, 2276, 2860
Capital expenditure on harbours and rivers, 1472
Comparison by departments, 1137
Debt, and, 2557
Dominion and provincial overlapping, 2461
Economy in, 1475. *See also* Address; Budget
In 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
Income and, 2104
Reduction of. *See* Address; Budget; Militia and Defence; Naval Service

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Natural Resources

Public Ownership. *See* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res. 1661, 3025; 1r., 2r., com., 3025; com., 3148; 3r., 3149

Public Services, nationalization of, 2324, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Bridges. *See that title*
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, ques., 1902, 2458, 2584
Department
Carty, Captain, 1062
Chief Architects' Branch, qu., 963
Estimates, 1238, 1755, 1988, 3531
Estimates branch, 1270
Expenditures, 1249
Minister, selection of from British Columbia Government, 2238
Salaries, etc., 692, 747
M. (Mr. Boys) reduce item, 695, 699
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Miscellaneous, 2008
New public buildings, 1256
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Public buildings. *See that title*
Roads and bridges, 2007
Burlington, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Unemployment relief, 1082
Yukon territory, expenditure in, 1275

Publications, Government. *See also* Editorial Committee
Co-ordination and economy, 1374
Demand and distribution, 1344, 1971
Geological survey, 1237
Mines, 1234-6
Printing and translation, 1373. *See also* Printing Bureau
Printing, unnecessary, 1374

Publicity Agent. *See* Labour

Pulp and Paper Industry, 2322. *See also* Natural Resources; Paper Control
British Columbia in, 175
Export duty on pulpwood, 2667

Purchasing Commission, 2674
Coal, for public buildings, 1758
Estimates, 2025
Goods purchased, origin of, 2042
Suggested abolition of, 2674
Warlike stores, sale of, 1173

Purchasing Power of Money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Money

Putman, Mr., C. V., qu., 935

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, 309. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 309; Progressives and the party spirit, 310; leader of the Opposition; immigration; tariff; railway problems, 311; Intercolonial railway, 312; elections and campaign literature, 315

Budget, 2282. Election issues and results; congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions; no time for drastic changes; Liberal platform of 1919, 2283; interprovincial trade; geographical, physical and climatic difficulties, 2284; reciprocity with the United States, 2285; tariff reductions, 2286; trade with Germany; sales tax; the amendment, 2287; political pledges and promises, 2288; Liberal platform of 1919; record of the Opposition party, 2288; Union government; public honour; War Time Elections Act; tariff commission; intercolonial railway; promise of Mr. McCurdy to restore headquarters to Moncton, 2289; the Progressives, 2290
Canadian National railways, ties, qu., 934
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Civil Service, returned soldiers, 3088
Condensed milk, tax on, 3265
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425-34
Rural postmasters, 3080

Quadruple Pacific Treaty, 3160

Qualification of Voters. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Quarantine. *See also* Health; Immigration
Detention at Partridge Island, 2021
Estimates, 2021
Immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Stations
Grosse Isle, repairs, 1245
Halifax, repairs, 1238
North Sydney, repairs, 1238
St. John, repairs, 1239-40
William's Head, improvements, 1255

Quebec (City)
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Arsenal, 1979, 2085, 2091
Customs dues, 1978
Canadian National railway terminals, 1475
Champlain market station, 1475, 2399
Newspapers, political policies of, 1480

Quebec (City) — *Con.*
Palais station, 1068
Plains of Abraham, 1467
Riots, 676, 3089
Compensation for damage, qu., 1508

Quebec (Port). *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Appropriations for, 1486
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert and, 1474
Elevators, 1471, 1483
Grain shipments through, 1466, 1471
Harbour Commission, 1283, 1464. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Parc St. Charles Co. Ltd., proposed payment to, 1469
Political patronage, 1478
Revenue and expenditure, 1471

Quebec (Province)
Attitude of towards Opposition, 168-9, 187, 206-7, 290. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address
Attitude towards West, 2912
Board of Pensions Commissioners, representation, 1350
Canals, 2779. *See also that title*
Census figures, 1366
Chaudière valley floods, 3492
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Election issues and results, 245
Fisheries, 142
Transfer to province, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493, 616, 623
Order in council tabled, 8
Request for order in council, 5
Harbours and rivers, 1998
Harmony with, 14, 270, 291, 362, 2421
Public buildings, improvements, 1245
Public expenditure in, 1468
Public ownership and, 71. *See* Address; Budget
Superintendent of lighthouses, qu., 2584
Unfair treatment, alleged, 2398

Quebec and Western Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé Railways

Quebec Battlefields Commission, 119

Quebec Chronicle, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission
Gravel, Mr. 1477
Inquiry for return, 1283
Tremblay, General, 1477
Watson, Major-General Sir David, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission bill (Further advances)
Res. 1464; reported, 1486; 1r., 1486; 2r., com., 3195; 3r., 3198

Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Accounts branch, Dept., of Militia and Defence (Mr. Vien) 2994
Animal diseases, compensation for, (Mr. Sutherland) 940
Armouries (Mr Baldwin) 1288
Army Service Corps (Mr. Lanctôt) 1905
Auditing, payments for, (Mr. Vien) 2993
Bankruptcy Act, Montreal district trustees (Mr. Archambault) 1183
Binder twine and rope (Mr. Gordon) 1905
Blackfoot reserve, greater production (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 1288
British Columbia fisheries (Mr. Neill) 2306
Calgary, Government office buildings, (Mr. Shaw) 939
Canadian National railways, coal purchase (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Canadian Northern, payments from, 1914 (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry), 615
Chief Architect's branch employees, (Mr. Fournier) 1067
Civil Service
Appeals against classification (Mr. Lanctôt) 1508
Bonus and statutory increases (Mr. Lanctôt) 939
Number and salaries paid, 1912 and 1922 (Mr. Séguin) 1832
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers (Mr. Chisholm) 1508
Permanent employees, 1920-1922, (Mr. Demers) 706
Coal importations
Canadian National by, (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Government, by, (Mr. Logan) 939
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., amounts paid to since 1855, (Mr. Lanctôt) 472
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific, amounts paid to since 1914, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 615
Halifax dry dock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
Harbours, improvements and expenditures, (Mr. Church) 828
From 1900 to 1921 (Mr. McBride) 372

Questions passed as Orders for Returns — *Con.*
Homestead pre-emptions, areas, (Mr. McTaggart) 732
Hotels owned and operated by Canadian National railways (Mr. Coote) 2806
Military districts (Mr. Lancôt) 1775, 2305
Militia and Defence
Buildings occupied (Mr. Lanctôt) 2305
Officers and men at headquarters (Mr. Lanctôt) 1775, 2305
Ministers' trips to Europe (Mr. Lanctôt) 1402
Multigraph machines (Mr. McDonald, Timiskaming) 1508
Montreal
Canadian National railways, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Customs, Income Tax, Post Office, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Drydock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Parry Sound customs collections (Mr. Arthurs) 967
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Séguin) 1775
Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) 1508
Prince Rupert dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec Harbour Commission, advances to Sir Henry Drayton) 615
Railway systems, purchase of bonds (Mr. Baxter) 828
Rental of public buildings (Mr. Lucas) 615
St. John drydock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
School lands, sale of (Mr. Spencer) 1661
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Pensions, 615
Stationery, purchase of, (Mr. Prevost) 1288
Trade agents (Mr. Prevost) 1661
Transcontinental railway, amounts paid, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 165
Vancouver drydock, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
Victoria, drydocks, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
War
Advances to Imperial Government (Mr. Vien) 1288
Material furnished British Govt. (Mr. Vien) 1067

Race and Religious Differences, 14, 270, 291-2, 362, 2421

Race Disqualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act M. (Mr. Euler)

Racing, Fishing schooners. *See* International

Radial Railways. *See* Hydro-Electric

Radiotelegraph Service, 1749

Radium. *See* Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway

Rail Contracts. *See* Railways

Rails, Steel, bounty on, 304-5

Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. bills
1. Return Tickets. (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821; 2r., ref. to Railway Com., 1395
2. Special passenger rates (Mr. Church) 1r., 1460; 2r., 1719
3. Transportation Costs. (Crowsnest pass agreement (Mr. Kennedy, Essex.) 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Applications to, 201-202
Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 937
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
Statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2773, 3491
Chairman of, 233. *See also under this title,* Carvell
Chief Traffc Officer, qu., 1377, qu., 2215, qu., 2457
Coastal boat service, and, 182
Commodity rates, 234
Drayton-Acworth report, 125
Freight rates, 234, 276, 2773. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Intercolonial rates, 193, 312
Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
Official report of proceedings, 2776
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates
Grain on, 300
Increases, 131
Recommendations to by Drayton-Acworth report, 126
Tenure of office, 2777

Railway Transportation Costs, Special Committee on. *See* Freight Rates

Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Speeches on Address; Budget
Advances to, qu., 471
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 872
Branch lines, 1688
Canada Car Company, 1696

Railways — *Con.*
Canadian in United States, 312
Canadian National railways. *See that title*
Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment, No. 1, 1060
Car demurrage, 2981
Car repairs, 1688, 2399
Car shortage, 166
Caraquet and Gulf shore, qu., 1504
Carriage of mails by, qu., 825. *See also* Mail Contracts
Co-ordination of, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget
Deficits, 2314, 2890
Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46, 1921
Duplication and waste, 125
Eight-hour day and, 228, 2316-17
Electric and steam locomotives, 630, 1188
Electrification of, 70, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330, 1940
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Expenditure on in last 25 years, 111
Exploitation, 2245. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address
Freight and commodity rates, 131, 175, 233, 234, 261, 273, 357. *See also* Freight Rates
Coal on, 193
Legislation, qu., 934
Tonnage into Toronto, qu., 936
Government-owned, administration in United States, 67
Harvest excursions, 337
Labour conditions, 2315. *See also* Labour
Loans and subsidies to, 1921
Mileage in 1877, qu., 1183
Nationalization of, 235. *See also* Address; Budget
New Zealand, 181
Overbuilding of, 202, 2569
Paralleling of existing lines, 203
Passes in maritime provinces, 315
Passenger rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills
Increase, 132
Policy, 201, 1905, 1920, 1933
Prince Edward Island, cost of, 229
Problems. *See* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Provincial obligations, 229
Public ownership, 2570. *See also* Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Speeches on Address
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John terminal facilities

Railways — *Con.*
Steel rails
Bounty on, 304-5
Purchase of, 1912
South Africa, 2688
United States, purchase in, 2611. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Vote for, saving in, 384
Wages, 2317, 2417. *See also* Labour
Water transportation competition, 69. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Western provinces, indebtedness for, 229

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals
Department
Estimates, 1133, 1687, 1905, 1933, 2747, 3035, 3518
Salaries and contingencies, 407, 1133
Governor-General's cars, 1688
Loan to the Canadian Goverment merchant Marine, 3035
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Welland ship canal. *See that title under* Canals

Rainbow. *See* Naval Service

Rankin, Mr. J. P. (North Perth)
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1770
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 791

Rates, Special. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 253; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Liberal party and big interests, 253; Mr. Church and Toronto; Mr. Meighen's reference, 254; election campaign, 255; Mr. Meighen's election manifesto, 255-6; attitude of Brantford manufacturers, 257-258; binder twine industry; liberty of the franchise, 258; War Time Elections Act; manufacturers and taxation, 258; basic and key industries, 259; tariff policy to build up country, 260; transportation rates, 261; national railway system; Liberal party and big interests, 262
Budget, 2373. Tariff; "Liberal protectionist"; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2373; amendment; duties of members; Liberal party and protection; free trade, 2374; agricultural implements; reduction of duty on; Brantford factories closed; binder twine factory, 2375; basic industry argument; manufacturing industries and

Raymond, Mr. W. G. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
production of wealth, 2377; United States competition, 2378; key industries; Great Britain's mercantile marine; world trade; protection for the skilled labourer; United States tariff; capital, 2379; Progressive party and oleomargarine; Wheat Board, 2380; revenue tariff giving incidental protection; duty on binders, 2381; International Harvester company; principles of the two old parties; history of Liberalism; Toryism and tyrannical power, 2383
Customs duties on agricultural implements, 3230-1
References to, 27, 255, 263, 2384, 2536, 2705

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Reciprocal Trade. *See* Reciprocity

Reciprocity. *See also* Trade
Australia with, 9, 33, 2900
United States with, 33, 53, 77, 94, 102, 208, 224, 278, 333, 2201, 2234. *See also* Address; Budget; United States

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill

Redistribution, 59, 198, 283, 2330, 2339, 3611. *See also* Proportional Representation
Announcement of Prime Minister, 3608, 3611
Census, completion of, 1363-71
Former, 1369
Inquiry, 733
M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion of, 1719, 1769
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Progressive party, attitude towards, 1364-70

Re-establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Mixed farming, Kingston fair, 992

Refills. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Regina, Speech of Hon. Mr. Motherwell at, 2555

Regional Bureau, International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 3528

Reid-Newfoundland Railway, 2027

Relief Work. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund; Unemployment

Rental of Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Reparations. *See* Germany; War Claims

Repatriation Expenses, 3503

Representation. *See also* Census; Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Unit of, 198

Research. *See also* Industrial and Scientific Research
Promotion of, 235. *See also* Natural Resources
Research Council, lignite plant, 1233

Residence Qualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Retail Merchants Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, resolution on. *See that title*
Oriental immigration, 1513

Retirement Fund. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement

Returned Soldiers. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Pensions; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2638
Blind, 3358
M. (Mr. Church) 3404
Pensions, 3310
Cash bonus to. *See* Soldiers' Bonus
Civil Service salaries, 549
Disabilities, 386 *See also* Pensions
Government's policy, early announcement of, 2637
Housing, 271. *See also that title*
Insurance, 3294. *See also* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.
Pension regulations, 327
Repatriation, 3403
Special Committee on. *See* Pensions
Tubercular, 318. *See also* Hospitals
Unemployed
Hikers, qu., 3153
Inquiry as to Government's policy, 2458
Unemployment, 3290, 3304, 3307, 3331, 3335, 3339, 3345-7, 3356. *See also that title*

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3388; 1r., 2r., com., 3402; com., 3437; 3r., 3439

Returning Officers. *See* Baxter; Caldwell

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Revenue, 2171-2. *See* Address; Budget; Consolidated Revenue Act
Expenditure and. *See* Public Expenditure
In 1877, qu., 1211

Revenue Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477
3. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 3278; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
5. Special War Revenue Act, 1915, Amdt. bill
Res., 3252; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477

Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, statement of, 2489-2490

Richibucto, repair works, qu., 375

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, fuel, maintenance, etc., 1756

Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366, qu., 3600.

Right of Appeal. *See* Opium and Narcotic Act Amdt.

Riley's Army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's army

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Canadian National railways
Canadian Northern, subsidies, qu., 1504
Public ownership, 1942
Canadian navy, qu., 965
Cost of living, purchasing power of the dollar, 1177
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, M., 1296
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22; qu., 1376
Military expenditure and policy, 1176
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177
Expenditure and policy, 1584

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand — *Con.*
Montreal Gazette editorial comment, 1584
Montreal post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Peat, deposits and experiments, qu., 1505
Railway mileage, in 1877, qu., 1183
Railway policy, 1942
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183
Revenue and expenditure in 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1195
Topographical maps, qu., 1631

Riordon Company
Income tax, 60
Collections, qu., 372; qu., 607; qu., 927

Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu., 3361

River St. Lawrence ship channel. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Rivière du Loup
Arsenal, qu., 1181, 1690
Car shops, qu., 1181, 1690

Roads. *See* Highways; Public Works

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Budget, 2179. Reforms long overdue; the amendment; tariff reductions; Liberal platform of 1919, 2180; war time extravagance; restoration of confidence; economy; markets; Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington, 2181; trade with Great Britain and United States; cattle embargo; imports and exports, quantity and value of; uniform development; coal and water power, 2182; tariff policy; German trade; marking of goods, 2183
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Car demurrage, 2981
Complaints of unfair dealing, 2987
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian Wheat Board, advances, 3541. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Payment of, 1369
Registration of Canadians, 1363

Robb, Hon. J. A. — *Con.*
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1363
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Elevators
Licenses to private, 2838
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Government publications, 1373
Demand and distribution, 1374
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50, 2982
Implements, agricultural, duty on, 3120
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1372
Linen yarn bounty, 1361, 3128
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429, 3488
Pratt vs. Delphine, 303
Redistribution and the census, 1363-71. *See also under this title,* Census
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 1366
Steamship services, 2027, 3505
Canada, Australia, New Zealand, 3034
Canada, West Indies, South America, 3026
Freight rates, 2028
Quebec and north shore ports, 3034
St. John-Cuba, 2028
Trade and Commerce department
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3505, 3541
Officials, 700
Trade commissioners and agents, 2989
Trade with Mexico, 700
Wheat Board, 50
Wheat Board bill, 3174-5, 3184, 3188, 3380, 3383, 3386

Robb, Mr. W. D., qu., 728

Robertson, Hon. Senator, 505
Statement on Civil Service, 555

Robertson, P. L. Company, refund of duties, qu., 1774

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (Kings, N.S.)
Root Vegetables bill, potato grading, 3373

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Address in reply, 320. Public ownership of railways; Wheat board; returned soldiers' pensions, 320

Rockefeller Foundation, 61

Rods. *See* Steel

Rome, International Institute. *See* Agriculture

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection of, bill
Res., 2743; 1r., 2747; 2r., ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 2972; com., 3142, 3194, 3367; 3r., 3487

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Militia expenditure, policy, 1587
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3450
Pensions Com., final report, 3343
Soldiers' civil re-establishment
Hospital staffs, 1345
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Venereal diseases, qu., 935

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply, 95. Congratulations to Miss Macphail; decline in prices of farm products, 95; soldier settlers, 96; re-establishment; economy in administration; increase in sessional indemnity, 97

Ross Rifle, 2609, 2616

Roumania, loan to, qu., 1400, 2888

Round Table, 3170-1

Routhier, the late Sir Adolphe, 1275

Royal Assent, 722, 1988, 1995, 3617

Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370, 1982

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *See also* National Defence bill
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 675
Barracks, Fairmont, improvements, 1255
Buildings, 2129
Canadian expeditionary force, in, qu., 2038
Detachments in Arctic regions, 3497
Discontinuance of, qu., 377
Enlistments from A and B squadrons in Canadian expeditionary force, qu., 2038
Estimates, 2129
Income tax office, Hamilton, 1253
Indians, relief to destitute, 1715
Labour espionage and, 670
Lethbridge, Drs. Lovering and Taylor, qu., 1211
Macleod detachment, removal of, 2584
Naturalization, investigations, 1671, 2024
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, reports, 1289, 1377
Pensions, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Removal from British Columbia, 173, 184, 327, 522

Royal Canadian Mounted Police — *Con.*
Salaries, 775
Secret service, 670-9
Unorganized territories in, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to confine to, 829; neg. on div., 843
Winnipeg strike, 671
Zaneth, Corporal, 671

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Royal Military College, 1985

Royal Naval College, 2047, 2203, 2458

Royal Trust Company, 1085

Rubber Goods, manufacture, 2469

Rubber Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Rural Depopulation, 301, 2470. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Population

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Russell, Mr. T. A., 1663, 2695

Russia
Competition in wheat market, 2157
Consortium to re-establish trade, 1463
Public ownership, 1942
Re-establishment of business in, 1463
"Save the Children Fund", 2516
Wrangel Island, 1751

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. (East Toronto)
Address in reply, 284. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 284; economy in government; Mr. Church's record, 285; protective tariff; Great Britain and the tariff, 286; protection for farmers, 287; Liberal tariff and election campaign, 288; speeches of Prime Minister and Minister of Justice, 289-90; Sir Lomer Gouin and Quebec attitude, 291; sectionalism in politics, 292
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2093
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Canadian National railways, consolidation, 1962
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Dominion lands and surveys, 1038

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. — *Con.*
Dominion Textile Company, 584
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Mines department, economy, 688-9
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2014
Public buildings, heating, 1761
Sales tax, 3269
United States tax on German goods, 3411

Ste. Agathe Sanitarium, 1342

Ste. Anne Hospital, 1342

Ste Anne de la Pocatière, water supply, qu., 2213

St. Catherines Post office building, 1246-50

St. Charles Park. *See* Parc St. Charles

St Charles River Improvements, 2400

St. George, N.B., public building, 1240

St. John, N.B.
Cold storage, 3521
Courtenay bay, 2013
Harbour, qu., 1401
Improvements, 2013
Immigration buildings, 2027
Income tax office, qu., 826
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Port. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Quarantine station, 1239-40, 2021
Terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 639, 844; withdrawn, 851

St. John Ambulance Association, 3387

St. John and Quebec Railway
Acquisition by Canadian National, qu., 1774, qu., 1293
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293; neg., 1296

St. John River
Pollution of by United States mill owners, 2168
Wharves on tidal waters, qu., 2200

St. John Valley Railway, 3039

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel
De Beaujeu bank, dredging, 1495
Elevator dredge, 1494
Maintenance and operation, 1494
Pilotage dues, 1499
Self-propelling hopper barge, 1495
Sorel shipyard, 1494. *See also that title*

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 70, 121, 134, 137, 269, 2266, 2327, 2398. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Quebec Harbour Commission; Transportation; Waterpowers; Welland Ship Canal
Calder, United States Senator, 1206
Climatic conditions, 1187
Coal, conservation of supply, 1188
Co-operation with United States, 2750, 2767
Correspondence with United States Government, 2207, 2583, 2755, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
Cost, 269, 1191, 1195-99, 1203-07, 1315, 1320, 1329
Deep Waterways Association, 1206-8
Electric power development, 1188, 1205, 1317, 1319, 1321, 1326, 1397
Export of power, 1203
Niagara river, 1322, 1327
Electrification of locomotives and railways, 133, 1188, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330. *See also* Electrification; Railways
Finance, 1189, 1195, 1318, 1320
Finney, Col. John, 1189
Freight rates, 1204
Georgian bay canal, 1199, 1204, 1209
Grain production and shipment, 1203
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, 1319
Harding, President, 133, 1184
History of project, 1185
Imperial Government, communication with, qu., 1508
Industrial development, 1318
Information available, 1195
International Joint Commission, 1191, 1199, 1206, 1315-21, 1469
Report, qu., 377
Distribution of, 2357
International partnership, 1191, 1199, 1209, 1315, 1332, 1396
Land adjacent to development, 1200
Long Sault, 1199
Manchester ship canal, 1190
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1314, 1396
Navigation, 1195
Negotiations, inquiry, 786
New York state commission, 1197
Progress report, 2969
Ocean steamers, 1193-95, 1205
Opportunity for further discussion, 1462
Opposition to project, 1184, 1193, 1199, 1202, 1206, 1209
Proposed bond issue, 1318, 20
Public ownership, 1189, 1318-31
Support of western states, 1184

St. Lawrence River Waterway — *Con.*
Surveys and investigations, estimates, 2765
Taschereau, Premier, 1191
Ten Eyck, Congressman, letter re acquisition of land adjacent to development, 1200
Traffic through Panama, Suez and Soo Canals, 1203
Transportation, 1186, 1201, 1208, 1315, 1325, 1327
Treaty with United States, 2207, 2760, 2767. *See also* Welland Ship Canal
United States and, 1396
Water power, 629, 1188, 1197, 1199, 1205
Welland canal, 1205, 1207

St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Co., 1400

St. Louis, Municipal currency, 2506

St. Malo Car shops, 1699, 2399

St. Père, Mr. Edouard C. (Hochelaga)
Address in reply, 281. Immigration, 281, 282; Public ownership of railways; Race harmony, 284; Tariff; unemployment, 282; Wheat Board, 283
Canadian Navigation Company, qu., 1284
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu., 1903
Parliament hill monuments, qu., 936
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827

St. Peters' Reserve. *See* Indians

St. Pierre water supply, qu., 2213

St. Thomas-Niagara Falls Highway, qu., 936

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Sabotage. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Strikes

Safeguarding of Industries Act, 2409, 2423-4

Salaries. *See* Civil Service

Salaries Act and the **Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.** bill; 1r., 363; 2r., com., 746; 3r., 787

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sale of Agriculture Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103

Sales, Mr. Thomas — *Con.*
Binder twine, 257, 2575
Budget, 2574. Sales Tax; Canada a dear country to live in; burden on the poor man; automobiles, 2574; protection; binder twine; success of a free trade industry; agricultural implement manufacturers; successful competition in other markets, 2575; infant industries; farming conditions; distribution and marketing; exchange value of farm products; intermediary between producer and consumer, 2576; bleeding the victims white, 2577
Canada Grain Act, 2838
King vs. Manitoba Grain Co., decision, 1132
Licenses to private elevators, 2838
Canadian National railways, restaurants at Rivers and Melville, Sask., qu., 2038
Customs
Dumping clause, 3420
Officials, 764
Dredging, Saskatchewan, 2006
Elevators
Excess overages, qu., 1401
Private, 2981
Terminal, 2839
Exhibitions, 982
Experimental farms, 799, 807
Grain Commission, 2839
Grain, selling without growers' permission, 2989
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2008
Mixed farming, 981
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2761
Saskatchewan Elevator Company, 2989
Welland canal, grain transportation, 2761
Wheat Board, 3181
Wheat Board bill, 3386

Sales Tax, 2297, 2425, 2661, 2843. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Automobiles, 2177
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2177
Exemptions, 2672, 2689
Dried beet pulp, 2858
Fertilizers, 2858
Increase, 2365
Lumber, 2177
Regulations, 2858

Salmon Canning. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Foods

Salmon Fisheries. *See* Fisheries

Sanitarium. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sardines, export of, qu., 1182

Saskatchewan
Aerial patrol, 1724
Canada Temperance Act Amdt., 2997. *See also that title*
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian reserves, qu., 608
Liquor
Export of, 2977
Warehouses, qu., 1211; qu., 1660
Importations, qu., 2037; qu., 2303
Public buildings, improvements, 1253
Second homesteads, 1042
Wheat marketing, 115. *See also* Wheat Board

Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. *See* Judges Act Amdt. bill

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sault Ste. Marie, Algoma Steel Co. rail contracts, 1704

Saunders, Dr. C. E., resignation of, 590, 3522

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Canadian National railways, right of way and lease agent, qu., 1633

Save the Children Fund, 3516

Savoy, Mr. J. Clovis, qu., 3363

Sawmill Machinery, 3126

Scandinavia
Immigration, 2144
Trade relations with, 2990

Schools. *See also* Education
Closing in West, 152
Lands, 339. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Nova Scotia in. *See* Nova Scotia Miners
Refusal of banks to advance money to, 2627

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scott, Mr. Frank, qu., 728

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Sea-Going Vessels. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Seals, destruction by. *See* British Columbia Fisheries

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference

Secondary amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secord Case. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip Frauds)

Secret Proceedings. *See* Prime Ministers' Conference

Secret Service. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Secretariat. *See* League of Nations

Secretary of State department
Adjustment of War claims, 1672, 2977
Estimates, 601, 1670, 3499
Public archives, 1673

Sedition. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seed Grain
Advances, 1053
Freight on, 3522
Purchasing Commission, 1011

Séguin, Mr. P. A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Forest, Mr. Médard, customs officer, qu., 2355
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu., 1774
Employment and dismissal of, qu., 2355
Lightkeepers, qu., 1904, qu., 2215
Postmasters, 1775
Tobacco experimental station, 1776

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selective Conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Senate
Amendments concurred in:
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 3607
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 3607
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3607
Loan Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
National Defence Department bill, 2806
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act bill, 3607

Senate — *Con.*
Amendments concurred in — *Con.*
Trust Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
Amendments, non-concurrence:
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3611
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Dominion Lands, Cancellation Leases bill
Concurrence, 3616
Conference, 3614
Chief accountant, salary, qu., 2583, qu., 2803
Expenditure, qu., 2583
Free conferences with, 3613, 3616
Indemnity, proposed reduction, 2513, 3509
Reform, 138, 2894
Salaries and contingent expenses, 2026

Senate and House of Commons Act. *See* Salaries Act Amdt.

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Corn-borer, destruction by, 818
Grand River bridge, York, Ont., qu., 1287

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Serums. *See* Accredited Herds; Agriculture

Sessional Indemnity. *See* House of Commons; Members

Settlers. *See* Immigration

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Address in reply, 293. Change in administration; agriculture; railway problems, 283; soldier settlement, 294
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2812
Soldiers bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447

Sexual Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Shaughnessy, Lord
National railway scheme, 89-90, 127
On immigration, 2478

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (West Calgary)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 782
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
Blankets, duty on, 3136
Boots and shoes, M. to reduce duty, 3238
Calgary, post office building, 1254
Canada-Australia, steamship service, 3034
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3003
Date of coming into effect, 3007; Withdrawn, 3008
Canadian National railways
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, 2584
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal lands, transfer of by Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 2214

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt bill, fines, 2832
Expenditure, comparison by departments, 1137
Explosives Act, 1234
Freight rates, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444-8
Grain companies, security of, 2837
Indians
Education, 1227, 3536
Stony Reserve school, qu., 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Military and other expenditures, 1137
Militia and defence
Expenditure and policy, 1590
Permanent force, 1983
War medals, 2976
Ministers and Directorships, 1126
Naval service, 1738
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 3022
Pensions Com., final report, 3305
Amdt., 3349, 3358
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1742, 1745
Railway Commission, Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2775, 2779
Redistribution
Inquiry as to intention of Government, 3611
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719
Reply to leader of Opposition, 3611
Royal military college, 1985
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Alberta hospital, 1345
Tariff commissioner, 1665
Tariff, reciprocal arrangement with France, 2032
Tourist traffic, 1683
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2989
War memorials, 2101
Wheat Board, 3182
Wrangel island, 1751

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply, 294. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; defeat of Meighen Government due to taxation, 294; Progressive party; railway problem, 295, 296; immigration; tariff and protection, 297
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, docking of horses, 2833
Soldier Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 386

Sheep Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock

Shelburne wharf, 1768

Shellfish. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Shells. *See* Ammunition

Sherbrooke
Post Office inspector, qu., 1507
Soldier Settlement Board employees, qu., 1658

Sherman, General William T., war, 1336

Shibley, Mr. A. D., Secretary-Treasurer of Union of Canadian Municipalities, 1392

Ships and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Labour; Limitation of Armaments; Marine; Naval Service; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Unemployment; Vessels
British Ministry of Shipping, claim for hospital ship, 1752
Canada Shipping Act. *See that title*
Canadian navigation companies, life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Coolie labour, 2042
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., steel plates, 1677
Drydocks. *See that title*
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Nova Scotia, 1387
Pilotage dues, 1499. *See also* Canada Shiping Act
Registration of, 1493
Sorel shipyard, 2169
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605, 1283
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, qu., 1062
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steel plates, cost of delivery, 3508
Vickers Company, elevator dredge, 1494
Wooden ships constructed at Victoria, B. C., qu., 364

Shuswap Lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547

Siberia, Service of Mounted Police, in, qu., 2038

Silk Fabrics, duty on, 2662, 3137

Silver. *See also* Coinage; Mines and Minerals
Coins. *See* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Discovery in Yukon, 1276
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Dredging, St. Mary's river, 2006
Good roads, Ontario, qu., 372
Lambton, wreck of, 1497, 3508
Rail and car repair contracts, 1703
Receipt tax, 3262
Sales tax, workmen's clothing, 3272
Sault Ste. Marie wharf, 2006
Unemployment
Insurance, 1075
Rails and car repair contracts, 1704

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1990
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3375

Single Tax, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Six Nation Reserve. *See* Indians

Slaughter Houses, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Smuts, General, International Disarmament Conference, 1283

Socialism, 1290

Soft Drinks, tax on, 2329, 2617, 2852, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Soldier Land Settlement, 83, 96, 147, 183, 252, 294, 305, 318, 327, 345, 3294, 3298, 3307, 3333, 3338. *See also* Address; Budget; Pensions Committee
Abandoned farms, 2132
Building loans, 3475
Cost and results, 2159
Estimates, 2023, 2131
Expenditure, statement of, 2132
Foreclosure, 2132
Homestead rights, 2132
Inflated values, 2133
Land speculation, and, 2136
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
Revaluation of land, 2136-42
Taxes, collection of, 2134

Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bills
1. Mineral rights. (Mr. Malcolm) 1r., 2035
2. Consolidation of Indebtedness. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil)
Res. 3358, 3405; 1r., 3409; 2r., com., 3475; 3r., 3476

Soldier Settlement Board, qu., 608
Amounts loaned, etc., qu., 469
Estimates, 2023, 2131-43
Comparison with last year, 382

Soldier Settlement Board — *Con.*
Loans, 147
Sherbrooke office employees, qu., 1658
Six Nation Indians, 1221

Soldiers. *See also* Pensions Returned Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Bonus, 394, 402, 1618, 2533, 3337
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg. 450
Exchange on pay, qu., 826
Homes, establishment of, 1348
Insurance, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill
Land settlement. *See that title*
Pensions, 271. *See also* Pensions

Soldiers' Aid Commission, 3315-16

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 168, 271, 1617
Building requirements, 1261
Calydor sanitarium, 1279
Department, decrease in activities of, 1340
Doctors, 1343, 1351
Employers' Liability, compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Expenditure on, 266
Reduction of, 1339
Hospitals, 1262, 1341, 1344, 1348
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 396, 1339, 1349. *See also* Pensions
Ste. Agathe sanitarium, 1342
Ste. Anne hospital, 1342
Salaries, 385, 1339
Reduction of vote, 1339-46
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Staff, reduction of, 3602
Tubercular patients, treatment of, 1344
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
Fishermen, to, 1346
Vocational training, 1281, 1340
War Service gratuity interest, 1346

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department bill (Report of Re-establishment and Pensions Committee)
1r., 3597; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610

Soldiers' Re-establishment and Pensions Committee. *See* Pensions Committee

Sorel Shipyard
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605. 1283
Estimates, 2169
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed in May 1921, qu., 1062

Soulanges Canal. *See* Canals

South America Steamship service. *See* Steamship Services

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of
Acoustics of Chamber
Member speaking from centre of Chamber, 632
Member speaking from front seat, 3286
Agreement between Whips as to 11 o'clock adjournment, 173
Amendments, 3284
Imposing tax, cannot be moved by private member, 722
Secondary amendments (amdts. to amdt.) 2473-4, 2519
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial, 1929
Bills
Introduction by unanimous consent, 3597
Military Service Act Amdt., 644
Money, must be preceded by res, 548
Private
No sponsor, first reading postponed, 2102
Refund of fees, 1577, 1657
Reference from Com. of Whole to Special Com., 1395
Repealing legislation, 644
Second reading on day of introduction, 1460
Trade or money, to be preceded by res., 1282
Chair to be addressed, 2415
Clerk Assistant, correctness of record, 1843
Committees
Leave to sit while House in session, 1988
Motion in advance of report of, 1901
Refund of fees, 1577
Special, members opposed to principle of bill not to be chosen, 1502
Congratulations to on 25th anniversary, 3489
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting of, 1717

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Daylight saving, discussion in order, 944
Debate
Closed by mover, 835, 1295, 1836
Relevancy
Criticism of British Columbia Government during Budget debate, 2238
Hon. John Oliver, quotation from Vancouver Sun, 2236
Debates, Official Report
Insertion of documents, 942
Decorum, conversation in Chamber and lobbies, 2640
Election of, 1, 4
Kingston election petition, 2692
Language, "False" or "falsely", 3603
Libellous statements reflecting on honour of Canada, 822
Letters, anonymous, 944
Library of Parliament, 3517
Salaries, 3517
Members
Customary to speak from seats, 632, 3286
May speak only once on motion for 3r., 3487
Must address Chair, 2415
Must address other members in third person, 165
Payment of, 3611
Speaking, not to be interrupted, 2361
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar on Budget) 2473-4, 2519
For concurrence in, notice required, 703
In advance of report of Com., 1901
Non-debatable, 865
Notice given in Votes and Proceedings, 378
Ministers and Directorships, seconder, 1084, 1094
Private members, involving expenditure, out of order, 844
Re-drafted, in order, 844
Newspaper extracts, 821
Orders of the Day
Arguments not permissible, 822, 1721, 1842, 2256, 2995, 3492, 3601
Member may make personal explanation or ask question, 3602-3
Question not debatable, 3602
Reading newspaper extracts, 303, 374-5
Right of members to raise question of privilege on, 2638

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Pairs, 1463
Petitions, irregular, 1929
Privilege
Member may make personal explanation or put question, 3602-3
Member must confine himself to question, 3366
Must affect honour of member, 3493
Right of member to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Prorogation of Parliament, 3610
Questions
Argumentative, 2805-2806
Discretion of Ministers respecting, 1775
Standing as orders for returns, 1660, 1775
Reading of letters, 948
Resolution
Adopted, binding on Government, 639
Affecting civil rights of provinces, 829
Money, should originate with Government, 639
Must be positive, 644
Royal Assent, 1988
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Senate, free conference, 3613
Sergeant-at-Arms to prevent disorder in lobby, 3606
Supply
Concurrence, 1843
Discussion of particular item on motion, 1337
Redress of grievances before going into Com., 1337
Tedious repetition, 944
Unanimous consent, 703, 726, 3597
Bill, introduction of, 3597
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459
War memorials, 2100
Wheat Board, point of order, 2935, 2949

Speaker, Mr., Bereavement of, 496, 596

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Address in reply, 80. Co-operation necessary; agricultural prosperity, 81; tariff for revenue; taxation forms; immigration, 82; unemployment; soldier settlement, 83
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2881. Alleged selfishness of prairie provinces; Budget as it affects the West; protection, 2881; tariff and cost of living; textile industry; protection and prices; price of agricul-

Speakman, Mr. Alfred — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tural products set by export market; policy of give and take, 2882; tariff as means of taxation; commodity tax fundamentally wrong; restriction of export market and reduction of prices, 2883; excise duty on protected goods; depreciated currency; cost of manufacturing in Germany, 2884; agriculture and lower costs of production; transportation; marketing; compromise; reciprocity, 2885; attack on the Progressive party; the amendment; political morals, 2886; idealism in politics, 2887
Dredging, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, 490
Estimates, reclassification, 455
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Imperial Mining Resources bureau, 1237
Indians
Education, 1715
Red Deer school, 1229
Militia, purchasing agents, 587
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1833
Pensions
Committee
Expenditures, 3523
Final report, 3297
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Promotions and salaries in Civil Service, 577
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Sales tax, 3269, amdt., 3269
Soldier settlement
Board, qu., 608
Revaluation, 2141
Special Com., work of, 2141
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406

Special Loans Bill
Res., 3252, 3358; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3476-77

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3252, 3409; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Subjects and sections discussed:
Automobiles, 3272-3
Cheques, stamp tax, 3258
Condensed milk, 3264-3271, 3409
Drawbacks, 3263
Excise tax of two and a half per cent, 3263
Insurance premiums, 3253
Lumber, 3263
Matches, 3262
Receipt tax, 3262

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Subjects and Sections discussed — *Con.*
Sales tax, 3409
Condensed milk, 3264-71, 3409
Exemptions, 3263, 3410
Job printing, 3409
Taxation under, 2116, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Egg inspectors, qu., 727
Entomology, 913-14
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, 406
Militia expenditure and policy, 1592
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Root Vegetables bill, 3142, 3194, 3367
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, royal commission, 406
Stamp tax on cheques, 3260

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agriculture, condition of, 2158
Banks, circulation, interest, qu., 3598
Blankets, duty on, 3128, 3132
M. to reduce, 3234
Budget, 2629. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public men, 2629; Mr. Fielding and the Liberal platform of 1919; conditions in Canada; restricted credit; purchasing power; home market; per capita wealth; labour troubles; after affects of war; statement of Mr. W. Bell; private financing of public production, 2630; capital investment in agriculture and manufacturing; foreign and home markets; returns from agricultural and industrial enterprise; farmers and the income tax; agricultural products; prices and cost of production, 2631; prices of hides and boots and shoes; woollen goods; profits of textile industries, 2632; profits of milling industry; food, shelter, and clothing; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) on the tariff; driving capital out of business; conscription of wealth, 2633; no radical taxation proposed; credit system; urban development and infant mortality, 2634
Calgary milk inquiry, qu., 823
Canadian National railways
Dining car service, qu., 2040
Mail contracts, qu., 2038, qu., 2213
Canadian Pacific railway
Bill, 1608
Mail contracts, 2040

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. — *Con.*
Census, agricultural assets and liabilities, 2159
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1423
Dominion notes, qu., 935
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Farming industry, 809, 2158, 2159
Grain, per capita production, 2159
Grain Growers' Grain Co., alleged contributions to political organizations, 2488
Immigration
Central European, 2158
Land speculation, 2159
Pamphlets, 759
Policy, 2158
Imported liquor, excise duty, qu., 828
Income tax-payers, qu., 3362
Livestock industry, 984
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 590
Militia and Defence
Transport and freight, amdt. to reduce item, 1987
Mixed farming, 983
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 515
Population
Rural, decline in, 2158
Slow growth of, 2158
Post office saving banks, interest, qu., 1932
Soldier settlement, cost and results, 2159
Steamship services, 2027
Welland canal, qu., 3600
Wheat Board, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3380

Sportsmen's Patriotic Association, cadet camps, 1973

Spruce Bud Moth, 595, 815, 2668. *See also* Entomology

Stamp Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act

Standard of Living. *See* Oriental Aliens

Standard of Valuation. *See* Customs

Standard Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Standards, Bureau of, 235, 1372

Stanfield, Dr., Bienfait briquetting plant, 1234

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Accredited herd system, 995, 999
Address in reply, 359. Definition of party names; farmers and protection, 360;

Stansell, Mr. J. L. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
defeat of late government; economy; cattle embargo; railway situation, 361; racial differences, 362
Agriculture dept., estimates, 994
Budget, 2290. "Grit and "Tory"; suggested identity of Liberal and Progressive policies, 2290; tribute to the Minister of Finance; attitude of Progressives, 2291; sales tax; income tax, 2292; constructive criticism; tariff and the masses; protection; adjustment of tariff to changing conditions; revenue, 2292; encourage maximum production; sales tax; increase of burden upon consumers, 2293; income tax,; taxes passed on to consumers, 2294
Canned milk industry, 3264
Civil service patronage, 3087
Commissioner of Agriculture, qu., 609
Experimental farms, 809
Freight rates, Special Com. report, 3596
Live Stock industry, 994
Ministers and directorships, 1124
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1825
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3597

State-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Stationery. *See* Printing and Stationery

Statistics. *See also* Census; Population; Trade
Concentration of, 580
Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Dominion Statistician, Mr. R. H. Coats, 1364-71

Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717

Steamship Services, qu., 614. *See also* Trade and Commerce
British Columbia coastal, qu., 3152
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canada-Newfoundland, 2027
Canada-West Indies-British Guiana, qu., 2356
Canada-West Indies-South America, 2027, 3026
Charlottetown-Pictou-New Glasgow, 3506
Charlottetown-Victoria-Halliday's Wharf, 3506
Competition with railways, 182
Freight rates, 2028
Halifax-Canso-Guysboro, 3507

Steamship Services — *Con*
Mails, carriage of, 2028
Miscou-Shippegan Island, 2029
Mulgrave-Arichat-Petit de Grat, 2029
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Newcastle-Neguac-Escuminac, 2029
Pelee Island and mainland, 3034
Pictou-Mulgrave-Cheticamp, 3050
Port Mulgrave-St. Peters-Irish Cove, 3507
Quebec Natashquan-Bras d'Or, 2029, 3034
St. Catherines Bay-Tadoussac, 2029
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 3507
St. John-Bear River, 3507
St. John-Cuba, 2028
St. John-Digby, 2030
St. John-St. Andrews, 2030
St. Stephen-Deer Island-Campobello, 2030
Sydney-Bras d'Or lakes, 2031
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2030, 3035
Vancouver-Howe Island, 2027
Victoria-Vancouver-Skagway, 2027

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2721. Inconsistencies of the tariff; implement duties; opportunities for manufacturing in British Columbia, 2721; prairie farmers paying tribute to manufacturers and fruit growers; cost of wheat production beyond market value; farming unprofitable, 2722; survey of conditions in West; boot and shoe industry, 2723
Tractors, 3124
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu., 615

Steel. *See also* Railway estimates; Rail repairs
Bounties, 304-5, qu., 3360
British Empire Steel Corporation. *See that title*
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for ship plates, 1677, 2170
Drawbacks, 2175
Industry, subsidies to, 1692, 1696
Plates, 1677, 2170
Delivery of, 3508
Prices, 2411-12
Rails
Competition with Germany, 2412
Contracts for, 1688
Price of, 1680-1709, 2412
Purchases of, 1913
Unemployment, 1077
Rods, refund of duties, qu., 1774
Steel plates, 1677
Damage claim of Dominion Iron and Steel Co., 1677
Settlement of, 2170
Structural, importation of, qu., 1931

Stefansson Expedition, 1750

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Address in reply, 230. Death of Prime Minister's brother; debate on address opportunity for vigorous discussion, 230; importance of aids to agriculture; marketing of wheat, 231; Wheat Board, 232; elevator facilities, 233; freight rates on commodities, 234; bureau of standards, industrial and scientific research, 235; immigration, 236; Bank Act, revision of; unemployment, 237; the tariff question; customs taxes, cost of collecting, 239; tariff, platform of Liberal Convention; speech of Mr. Marler, 240; survey of ministers, 241; Minister of Justice and big interests, 242; minister and directorships, 242-3
Air board, 1722
Air Force and civil aviation
Customs aerial patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol in Railway Belt, 1730
Archives, book binder, 703
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2640. Tariff announcement will allay alarm of manufacturing interests; cheque tax, 2640; discriminatory tax on confectionery; repeal of anti-dumping clause; fruit; marking act and depreciated currency clause, 2641; German situation; depreciated currency, 2642; post war industries and commercial development of Germany; position of France; reparations; physical suffering; Germany's budget deficits; issues of paper currency; unemployment; comparison of conditions in 1915 and 1921, 2643; Germany's foreign trade; adverse balance; Canada's imports from Germany; purchasing power of the mark; internal and external value; Mr. Maynard Keynes; Dr. Melchior; situation in France, 2645; Austria, Hungary; prohibitory tariffs in central Europe; German exports to Canada; pocket knives, 2646; German goods, method of distribution; agents of German manufacturers in Canada, 2647; sale of brokers' goods; enormous profits of German manufacturers; congratulations to Prime Minister on recently bestowed honour; Australian Preservation of Industries Act; direct and indirect taxation, 2648; inaccurate statements issued by Canadian Council of Agriculture; Mr. Crerar's figures

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
as to agricultural exports, 2649; consumption of agricultural products in Canada, 2650; taxation of capital; income tax — who pays?; per capita payment of customs duties, 2691; grievances of western farmers; technical and not fiscal problems, 2652; the tariff; business profits and taxation; United Grain Growers; watered stock, 2653; business principles enunciated in Grain Growers' report, 2654
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian National railways, deficit, 1919
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1858
Cash grants to soldiers, Liberal pledge, 399, 433
Chinese immigration
Agent in China, 2026, qu., 2214
Estimates, 2026
Civil service bonus, inquiry, 2996
Coal, Canmore and Drumheller miners' dispute, 1058
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053, 1054
Congratulations to Mr. Fielding, 3279
Customs Act, depreciated currency, 2642, 3224, 3410
Dredging, 2005
Shuswap lake, 2006
Dumping provision, 2641, 3412
Employment offices, 1058
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Fisheries, salmon canners' license fees, 1748
Ford automobile company, 3274
Forests, depletion of, 1046
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway, 1577
Fruit growers, protection, 2641, 3423-4
German valuation of goods, 2642-48, 3226
Government publications, 1373
Grain Inquiry Commission, qu., 705; qu., 1181, 2842
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 2005
Quebec, 1998
Hides, price of, 3138
Immigration
Commissioner of at Canton, China, qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Foreigners admitted as farmers, 1068
Industrial and scientific research, 235, 1372
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Interior dept., economic adviser, 455
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Job printers, taxation, 3264

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Labour department
Employees, 460, 468
Estimates, 571
M. to reduce item, 562, 579
Salary increases, 562
Liquor importation, 733
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Agriculture Com., 1901
McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Marine and Fisheries
Eddie, Capt., 1492
Ice-breaker, repurchase of, 1490
Lightkeepers, salaries, 1497
Navigation schools, 1492
Steamers and ice-breakers, 1490
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 754
Mennonite emigration, qu., 732
Mexico, trade with, 699
Militia and Defence
Purchasing agents, 416-17
Training camps, qu., 2584
National Defence bill, 739
National Liberal-Conservative platform, trade, 2540
Naval Service
Royal Canadian navy, 1882-91
Royal Naval college, closing of, qu., 2458
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted police, 3523
Nova Scotia miners strike, 1054
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 775, 3017
Oriental aliens, and, 2018
Prohibition, and, 2018
Oriental aliens
Immigration
Chinese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1548, 1573
Pilotage dues, 1500
Point of order
M. in advance of report of Com., 1901
Right of member to complete speech, 3540
Unfinished statement of member ruled out of order, not debatable, 3603
Post office, railway mail service in British Columbia, 2799
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission, Hon. F. B. Carvell, statement, 2777

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3393
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldier settlement, 2024
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 433
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Pension Board officials, 404
Salary increases, 386
Special War Revenue Act, exemptions, 3263
Standards, bureau of, 235, 1372
Steamship services, 2027
Atlantic and Pacific, Canadian ports, 3026
Unemployment
Relief, 1061, 2022
Employment offices, 2023
Tariff and, 3527
Vancouver drydock, 2005, 2008
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners bill, 2996
War, payment of cost of, 2405
Wheat Board, 2931
Point of order, 2933
Proceedings in Agriculture Com., 2931
Special Com. report, delay in concurrence, 2306
Women, the franchise and, 485
Yukon radiotelegraph service, 1749-50

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Minister of Mines)
Alpine Club grant, 1053
Assiniboine river floods, 3491
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Budget, 2216. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; review of agricultural and industrial conditions from introduction of national policy, 2216; prosperity following change of government in 1896; reciprocity; depression of 1914; agricultural implements; tariff reductions; public debt; war conditions, 2217; railways, 2218; tariff proposals; markets; freight rates, 2219; United States, trade with; taxation; sales, income tax, 2220
Canadian national parks, 1501
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
Arival of at Vancouver, 2026, 3604
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Deville, Dr., 1045
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Dominion lands
Homestead re-entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries of staff, 1035

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Surveys, 1037
Expenditure, 1045
Mackenzie-Peace river districts, 1044
Reduction of vote by, $30,000, 1044
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases, bill, 3151, 3465-74
Senate amendments, 3615
Editorial Committee, 1235
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Emigration, record of, 2160
Explosives Act, 1234
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Forestry, 1046
Spruce bud moth, 1049
Tree planting on prairies, 1051
Geological museum specimens, 1237
Geological survey
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Immigration, 3054
Agents, bonus to, 3063
British artisans, 2208
Chinese, 2026, 3604
Doukhobors, 2160
Hutterites, 2160, 3060
Italian, 2171
Medical inspection, 3052
Mennonites, 2160, 3060
Ministers' statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2208
Policy of department, 3051-2
Reception of immigrant, 2160
Shandro, Mr., proposed colony, 2159
Unemployment, 2143, 3058
Immigration and Colonization, estimates, 754, 758, 2143, 3499
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 2991, 3192
Indian Affairs Dept., estimates, 681, 685, 1214, 3536
Indians
Blood reserve, 1221
Devon band, proposed removal, 1216
Education, 1227, 1231, 3536
Edmonton school, 1231, 3536
Stony reserve, 1228, 3536
Expenditure, 1216
General expenses, 1226
Greater production, 1224
Health, 1228
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Potlach institution, 3192

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Indians — *Con.*
Six Nations, 1221
Enfranchisement, 2991
Soldier Settlement Board, 1221
Sydney reserve, proposed transfer, 1215
Interior department
Employees, transfer to, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and supplies, 454
Salaries, 452
International boundaries, 1033
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
Mines and Minerals
Clay deposits, investigation of, 1234
Estimates, 685
Investigation of resources, 1234
Reduction of vote, 1236-62
Officials, 687
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Tar sands, 1236
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1565
Amdt. "effective restriction", 1567, 1574
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Public buildings expenditure, 1262
Research council, 1233
Seat for, in Quebec province, 12
Seed grain advances, 1055
Soldier settlement, 2024
Estimates, 2131-42
Land purchases, irregularities, 2140
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3405, 3475
Water powers, surveys, 1051
Wheat Board bill, 3189
Yukon territory government of, 1034

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Budget, 2597. Progressive amendment, 2597. Amendment; does not express progressive view; budget proposals; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2598; the average citizen and public affairs; taxation; revenue; debt; economy; reciprocity with the United States; direct taxation; freer trade; marking and valuation of currency acts, 2599; tariff reductions; agricultural implements; sales tax; undue burden on people with small incomes, 2600; political pledges; constructive criticism; income tax; business profits tax; inheritance tax; land tax; estimated revenue from, 2601; conditions of

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
western farmers; need of wider markets; Wheat Board; transportation; Hudson Bay railway; branch lines, 2602; purchasing power; re adjustment of taxation; immigration; unoccupied lands, 2603
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2602, 2789
Insurance premiums, tax on, 3255
Macphail, Miss, alleged statement of, 3221

Stewart, Major Duncan, qu., 823

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Brockville and Westport railway, qu., 704
Canadian Ford company, taxes, qu., 3599
Canadian National railways, passenger traffic, qu., 927
Condensed milk, tax, 3271
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Militia and defence, cadet services, 1978
Nova Scotia miners, McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1791
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3391-2

Stewart, Hon. John A. (Lanark)
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu., 1400
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 913
Minister's statement, 912
Public ownership and operation, 1956
Rail and car repair contracts, 1914, 1958
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1427-32
Genoa Conference, 582
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific railways, qu., 2037
Intercolonial railway management, 408
Labour department
Director of technical education, 577
Policy, and building trades, 582
Publicity agent, 466
Supplies clerk, 585
Public Works estimates, 698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1694, 1700. *See also under this title* Canadian National Railways
Railway Commission, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2777
Railways
Administration, 408
Co-ordination, 408
Freight rates, legislation, qu., 934
Policy, 1956

Stewart, Hon. John A. — *Con.*
Railways and Canals dept., salaries, 1134
Rideau canal, 2764
Soulanges canal, 2768
Trent canal, construction and betterments, 2764
Unemployment, car repair contracts, 1690
Welland ship canal, 2747

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Hamilton post office building, 1251
Mineral waters tax, 3278
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1835
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Stock, Transfer, tax, 2117

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stony Reserve. *See* Indians

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 330. Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific railways in British Columbia, 331; oriental question, 332
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 962
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3013
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1516
Prince Rupert post office building, 1257

Strike-on-the-Job. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Strikes. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu., 1285
Postmaster, qu., 1285

Submarine Cables, qu., 3151-2, qu., 3360

Submarine Construction. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Submarines, 1845. *See also* Naval Service

Subsidies. *See also* Steamship Services
Canadian Northern, 189-190, qu., 1504, 1921
Federal, Ontario, qu., 2214
Provinces to, 330
Steel companies to, 1692-96. *See also* Steel

Sudbury mail contract, qu., 1285

Suez Canal, 191. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Sugar
Atlantic refineries, refund, 2850
Beet industry, 2177, 2232, 2273, 2373, 3246, 3251
M. (Mr. Fansher) to reduce duty, 3248

Sugar — *Con.*
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on, 2116-7, 2232, 2273, 2853-5, 3267. *See also* Budget Speeches; Inland Revenue

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Supervisor of Expenditure. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Supplementary Estimates. *See also* Estimates;; Supply
Tabled, 1258

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 378, 385, 429, 451, 493, 548, 598, 644, 681, 747, 791, 873, 967, 1018, 1040, 1133, 1163, 1214, 1339, 1361, 1489, 1578, 1662, 1722, 1747, 1843, 1905, 1933, 2010, 2043, 2129, 2747, 2834, 2975, 3026 3051, 3495

Supply, Committee of
Amendments
Cash bonus to soldiers, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg., 450-1
Defence Forces, remarks of Mr. Clark on motion for Supply, 1335
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 1769, 3489, 3547
Estimates. *See that title*
Procedure, motion to reduce vote, 1579
Subjects and items discussed
Agriculture, 588, 644, 1018, 3504
Cold storage, 818, 3521
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology, 813
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 3521
Fruit, 967
Health of animals, 967, 3521
Livestock, 971, 1018, 3521
Seed, Feed and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718
Air Board, 1722
Air Force and Civil Aviation, 1722
Annuities, 776
Assay Office, Vancouver, 1236
Auditor General's Office, 793
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts Association, 772
Canada Temperance Act, 3499
Canadian National parks, 1051, 1681
Canadian National railways
Advances
Canadian Government railways ($7,000,000) 2779

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Advances — *Con.*
Canadian Northern ($42,800,000) 1905, 1933
Grand Trunk ($25,750,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($15,900,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($800,000) 3520
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Representation in United States, 2026, 2990
Canals
Chambly, 3518
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764, 2769
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges, 2768
Staff and repairs, 2779
Trent, 2764
Welland ship canal, 1687, 2747
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service
Bonus, 3528
Commission, 3064
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Customs and Excise, 762, 1674
Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027
Dominion lands, 1035, 1051
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Employment offices, 1058
Exhibitions, 2026
External affairs, 411, 3508
Finance, 770
Charges of management, 1663, 3495
Paper Control inquiry, 1673
Tariff commissioner, 1663
Forestry protection, 1046
Geodetic survey, 1033
Geological survey, 1233, 1236
Genoa Conference, 1715
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 751
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2982
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title.* Public Works.
Nova Scotia, 1269, 3545
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Health, 775
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
High Commissioner's office, 413
House of Commons, 2026
Housing, 774

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Immigration, 754, 1711, 2143, 3051
Adjustment of war claims, 1711
Chinese, 2026
St. John immigration building, 2027
Salaries, 3499
Indians, 681, 1215, 3536
British Columbia, 1713
Destitute, 1712-14
Education, 1715, 3536
Field and garden seeds, 1712
General expenses, 1712
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Insurance, 791
Interim. *See* Interim Supply
Interim Supply bill, 378, 598
Interior, 452, 1033
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Migratory birds, 1684
National parks, 1051, 1681
Printing and stationery, 1680
Yukon, administration of, 1681
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint Industrial councils, 1060
Justice, 451, 1274
Civil government, 1668, 3495
Exchequer court, 1274
Litigated matters, 1276
Supreme court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Labour, 458, 493, 548, 1053
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Unemployment relief, 1970, 2022
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
League of Nations, Permanent Secretariat, 2026
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677
Live stock, 971, 1018, 3521
Marine and Fisheries, 1676, 3051
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 2169
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2166
Investigation into wrecks, 1492
Life-saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1405, 1677
Salaries and allowances, 1497

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Marine signal service, 1499
Meterological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3514
Registration of shipping, 1493
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Salaries of officers and guardians, 2166
Sorel shipyard, 1494, 2169
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
War claims, adjustment, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 1493
Militia and Defence, 415, 586, 1163, 1578, 1601, 1922, 2974, 3498
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Annual drill, 1163, 1578, 1610
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Cadet services, 1972
Civil government, 415, 586, 3498
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, 1978
Customs duties, 1978
Engineer services and works, 1980
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., 1982
Ordnance building; Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1982
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Royal Military College, 1985
Salaries and wages, 1985
School of instruction, 1985
Staff, pay of, 1982
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Transport and freight, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2098, 2974
Mines and Geological Survey, 1233, 3524
Mines and Minerals, 685, 1234
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval Service, 418, 1735
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Hydrographic survey, 1746

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Naval Service — *Con.*
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Salaries and contingencies, 1745
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Paris agency, 2025
Parliamentary guide, 2024
Passport office, 2026
Patent record, 2026
Penitentiaries, 1670
Pensions, 3522
European war and active militia, 1349
Madame Fabre, 2024
Post Office, 691, 1711
Outside service, 2799
Printing and stationery, 1711
Printing Bureau, 1970
Privy Council, 410
Public Archives, 702, 2025
Public health, 2017
Public Works, 692, 747, 1238
Dredging,, 2005
Harbours and rivers, 3541
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Manitoba, 2003, 3545
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1269, 1765, 3545
Ontario, 1999
Prince Edward Island 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Miscellaneous, 2008
Public buildings
Alberta, 1254, 3545
British Columbia, 1255
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Generally, 1260-4
Immigration buidings, 1757
Lighting, etc., 1755
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
Ontario, 1245-68, 3544
Ottawa, 1265
Parliament buildings, 2014
Rents, repairs, etc., 1238, 1265, 1764
Rideau hall, 1756
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Halifax, 1238
St. John, 1238-45
Williamshead, 1255
Quebec, 1245
Saskatchewan, 1253

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Public Works — *Con.*
Telephone service, 1757
Roads and bridges, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Railway Commission, 2773
Railways and Canals, 407, 3518
Arbitrations and litigation, 2772
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan, 3035
Canadian National railways, 1933. *See also that title*
Canadian Northern advance, 1905, 1933
Canals. *See under this title,* Canals
Governor Generals cars, 1688
Grand Trunk arbitration, 2779
Hudson Bay railway, 1970
Intercolonial, 2767
Port Colbourne elevator, 1687
Railway policy, 1905, 1933
Salaries and contingencies, 1133
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 775, 2129
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Secretary of State, 701
Civil government, 1670
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public archives, 1673
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Seed Grain advances, 1053
Senate, 2026
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 385
Capital expenditure, 1279
Employers' liability compensation, 1348
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Pensions
European war, active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Salaries, 1339
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
War service gratuity, interest on, 1346
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2131
Statutes, reprinting, 1717
Steamship services, 2027, 3026, 3505
Supplementry estimates, 1662
Taxation, business profits, income, 2024
Trade and Commerce, 699, 3541
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Dominion Bureau of statistics, 1363
Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373
Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration, 1372

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Linen yarn bounty, 1361
Printing of publications, 1373
Steamships services, 2027, 3026, 3505. *For individual services see that title*
Terminal elevators, 2978
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2989
Unemployment relief, 1061, 3524-6
Victorian order of nurses, 772
War Graves Commission, 774
Water powers, 1051
Wheat Board, 3541
Yukon territory, 1034, 1275

Supreme Court
Cameron, Mr. E. R., K.C., estimate and expenditure, 1274
Decision. *See* Wheat Board
Estimates, 1274
Library, 1274
Reports, 1274

Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill (Appeal from provincial courts of final resort) 1r., 2456; 2r., com., 3r., 2974

Survey and Map Work. *See also* Interior Department
Co-ordination of, 1986

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic; Geological; Topographic
Water power resources, 1051

Sussex public building, 1239

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Accredited herds, diseases, 1001
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1011, 2490
Agricultural implements, duty, 3134
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1012-1013
Air Force and civil aviation, 1731
Alderson claim, 1002-3
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Blake, late Hon. Edward, 2657
Budget, 2481. After war conditions; tribute to Finance Minister, 2481; election promises not carried out; breach of faith; the amendment; leader of Progressive party making excuses for Government; Hon. George Brown and violation of political pledges, 2482; statement of Prime Minister; Liberal declarations in favour of free trade;

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Finance Minister chastises colleagues; opposing views in government party, 2483; a policy to suit every constituency; tacit understanding between Progressives and Liberals; public statements as to fiscal policy of Liberal party; Mr. Fielding and protection; duty on agricultural implements, 2484; reciprocity agreement; attitude of United States towards Canada; proposed duties under reciprocity, 2485; importation of agricultural products from the United States; world tendency to increase tariff barriers; valuation of currency, 2486; trade with Germany; labour costs; marking of goods; United States legislation to prevent unfair competition; industrial development of the West; sectionalism; two-party system;, 2487; Progressive party, origin and policy; record of the old Tory party; Union government tariff policy; Wartime Elections Act; tariff concessions to western Canada; Grain Growers' Grain Company contributions to political organizations, 2488; resignation of Mr. Crerar from Union government; statement of Mr. Rice Jones; Mr. Crerar's salary as president of United Grain Growers, 2489; oleomargarine; recleaned screenings; adulteration of mill feed, export duty on dairy produce; Mr. Rowell and Mr. Clark on tariff proposals of Union government; protective policy; Premier Drury and land tax, 2491; tax on unimproved land values; free trade; sales tax; condensed milk, 2492; railway situation; debt; inheritance from former Liberal government; Transcontinental railway, 2493; dumping clause; value of German mark; economy in administration, 2494; amendment, 2495
Cattle
Embargo, 1002, 1031
Free carriage of, 1029
Freight on, 1010
Stockyards, 1030
Condensed milk tax, 2492, 3266
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1437, 1455
Customs revenue, qu., 614
Drainage tiles, 3270-1

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Experimental farms, number of, 797, 801, 805, 813, 1015
M. to reduce item, 812
Farm tractors, duty on, 769
Feed Control Act, 1011
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Freight on hay for stock, 1007
Health of animals, Alderson claim, 1002-3-5
Hides, price of, 3139
Hog cholera, 1009
Alderson claim, 1005
Immigration
Bonus to agents, 3062
Unemployment and, 3058
Imports into Canada, qu., 610; qu., 612; qu., 613
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3050
Militia and Defence
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2091
Quebec and, 1982, 2087-97
Expenditures and policy, 1981
Military properties, 1981
Naval Service, co-ordination with, 420
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item, 1982
Milk herds, tuberculosis, 1006
National Defence, department of, 1732-4, 1981
Naval policy, 2073
Royal Canadian navy, 2073
Oleomargarine
Importation of materials, qu., 613; qu., 704; qu., 728
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1816
Materials for, 3270
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3432, 3487
Parliament buildings, purchase of furniture, 1756-7
Pensions Board investigation, 3156
Pensions Committee, 3348-9, 3357
Final report, 3351
Sales tax, 3270
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447
Stallion clubs, 1031
Standard of living, 3139
Sugar beet industry, 3267
Wheat board, 2947
Wool, duty on, 3132-35

Sutherland, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366

Swift Current post office building, 1253

Sydney, N.S.
Pilotage district, 3508
Reserve. *See* Indians

Sydney, N.S. — *Con.*
Steel workers, unemployment, 1076
Unemployment contracts for steel rails, 1688

Tadoussac-Murray Bay steamship service, 3035

Tampa Exhibition, 2026

Tar Sands. *See* Mines and minerals

Tariff, 1290. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade. *For items discussed See* Customs Tariff
Amended resolutions, 2854
Australia, preferential treatment, 2110
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2230. *See also* Budget
Book paper for magazines, 2855
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Changes, 2174, 2851
Cigarettes, 2855
Commission, proposed permanent, 2269, 2339, 2351, 2625
Commissioner, 1663
Salary, 3504
Comparison with Laurier-Fielding tariff, 208
Dumping clause, 2184, 2197. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Duty on boots and shoes, 159-160
Fordney. *See* United States
France, 2032
Fruit, 2197. *See also that title*
Fuel oil, 344, 1761
Immigration and, 2157
Inquiry, 1920-21, cost, etc., qu., 2215
Legislation, history of, 2184, 2429-30, 2655
Liberal policy. *See* Liberal Convention of 1919
Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Prohibitory Central European, 2646
Reduction, 2111, 2114, 2286, 2844
Resolutions, 2118. *For items See* Customs Tariff
Amended, 2851, 2874
Bill, 3476-7
Revision, 2110-14
Former, 2426
Necessity for. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Shoe manufacturers and, 141. *See also* Boots and Shoes
Tractors, 2115. *See also* Budget
Unemployment and, 3527
Valuations for duty, 3413-15

Taschereau, Premier, and St. Lawrence river waterway, 137, 1191

Taxation, 2496. *See* speeches on Budget; Revenue Bills
Amusement, 2395
Automobiles. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Bachelor, 82
Bank circulation, 2117
Beer, ale, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Bond and stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Bonds held in United States non-taxable, 1133; qu., 2971
Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner, salary, 2024
Burdensome, 2242, 2248, 2600, 2661. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Urban population on, 2394
Business profits, qu., 1657, 1658, 2024, 2172-9, 2281, 2562, 2653
Administration of, 2024
British Empire Steel Corporation, qu., 1067
Canadian Ford Company, qu., 3599
Cheque tax, 1036, 2117, 2177, 2269, 2329, 2462, 2640, 2676, 2852, 2856, 3258
Protests against, 2395
Classification of income tax-payers, 1063
Condensed milk, 2492, 3264, 3271, 3409
Confectionery, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857
Commodity tax, 2883
Consumer of, 2507
Customs. *See* Customs Tariff; Tariff
Debt and, 2459. *See also* Public Debt
Direct and indirect, 2386, 2402, 2648, 2707
Effect on trade, 2859
Estimated revenues from, 2172
Evasions, 2395
Excess profits, 2441, 2695
Express money orders and travellers cheques, 2856
Garbage collection tax in Ontario, 1256
Income, 2442, 2686. *See also that title*
Administration of, 2024
Banks, payments by, qu., 1400
Forms, 3485
Members of provincial legislature, 3486
Railway men and commercial travellers, 3485
Revenue and classification, 1063; qu., 1399-1400
Inequalities, 2255
Inheritance tax, 184, 2442, 2510, 2601, 2626, 2686, 2708, 2844
Insurance
Foreign companies, 2462
Premiums, 2117, 3253

Taxation — *Con.*
Land values, 2191, 2405, 2443, 2492, 2510, 2626, 2686, 2695-6, 2844,
Estimated revenue from, 2601
Loan companies, 2299
Luxuries, 2260, 2561, 2696
Modification of, 230. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Municipal, payment of by Government, 1256, 1257
Mutual insurance companies, 3477. *See also under this title,* Insurance
New, 2116, 2177, 2329
Non-taxable bonds, 1133, 2971
Overlapping, 2463
Per capita, 2341
Post Office money orders, 2857
Principle of, 2281
Property, 2443
Provincial, payment to British Columbia govt., 1714
Receipts, 2270, 2853-7
Riordon Company, qu., 372; qu., 607
Sales tax, 2220, 2843. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2260. *See also* Automobiles; Budget
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2117, 2641, 2676
Exempted goods, 2126
Beet pulp dried, 2852
Fertilizers, 2852
Goods on which tax was collected, 1921-22, 1212
Increase, 2393
Mineral waters, 2117
Soldier settlement, municipal taxes, 1257
Special War Revenue Act. *See that title*
Stocks and bonds, 2856
Stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Telegrams and cables, 2117, 2178, 2856
Transient aliens, 2155

Taylor, Dr., qu., 1211

Technical Education. *See* Labour

Telegraphs. *See also* Wireless

Telegraphs and Telephones
British Columbia, 2008, 2012
Canadian National lines, qu., 3360
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, 2012
Prince Edward Island, 2012
Public buildings, Ottawa, 1757
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2007, 2012

Telegraphs and Telephones — *Con.*
Telegrams and cables, tax on, 2117, 2178, 2856
Yukon, cost of, 1275, 2012

Telephones. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Ten Eyck, Congressman, 1396

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* St. John

Territorial Waters, Fishing beyond. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.

Territories, Unorganized. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Textile Industry, 2882. *See* Speeches on Budget
Foreigners engaged in, 2518
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Profits, 2632

Thompson, Colonel Andrew, soldiers' bonus, 403, 432

Thompson, Colonel J. T. C. *See* Pensions Board

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Dairy inspection, 1009
Dairy produce, grading of, 655-6
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Three Rivers Clerk of the Peace. *See* Criminal Code

Threshing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Thunder Bay, icebreaking, 1677

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Immigration, travelling expenses, 757
Militia and Defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
River-gauging and metering, 2011
Trent canal, Nassau dam, qu., 2457

Tidal Fisheries. *See* Quebec Fisheries

Tidal Survey. *See* Naval Service

Timber. *See also* Lumber
Acquisition of British Columbia areas by Japanese, 2311
Gaspé, in, 625
Illegal cutting on Tobique reserve, 1233
Lease of Ontario areas, 2805; qu., 2992
Protection of. *See* Forestry

Tobacco
American Tobacco Company, 2547
Bull Durham, comparative prices, 2546
Cigarettes, duties on, 2394, 2547, 2852-3
Cigars, duties on, 2115, 2853, 2857
Duties, 2115, 2394, 2546, 2891
Experimental station at L'Assomption, 1776
Imperial Tobacco Company, 2546
Industry, protection, 2891
Raw leaf, 2115, 2673, 2853

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu., 1659
Oleomargarine, importation and manufacture, qu., 1506
Richmond and Wolfe
Post offices, qu., 1507
Postmasters, qu., 1508
Rural mail routes, qu., 1505

Tobin, Lieut. Col., Vancouver, letter of, 1975

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. W. F., election promises in Charlotte, N.B., 1994

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd system, 2738
Agricultural exhibitions, 650
Agriculture
Cattle embargo, 973-4
Dept., Mr. T. N. Lynton, 588
Live stock industry, 971
Livestock trade with South America, 648
Salaries, 656
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734-43
Bovine tuberculosis, 2738
Budget, 2591. Duration of previous Parliament; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2591; tariff and agricultural implements; trade relations with Australia; agricultural conditions; mixed farming, 2592; wool and sheep raising; dumping clause; British Columbia fruit industry; United States competition, 2593; tax on temperance beverages; fruit juices; grading hogs for the British market; extermination of hog cholera, 2594; United States system of dealing with disease; eradication of bovine tuberculosis, 2595; horse racing, Federal control of and revenue from, 2596; cattle export; embargo; new taxes; amendment, 2597;
Cold storage, 818
Entomology, orchard protection, 816

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. — *Con.*
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1156, 1161, 1353, 1355, 1604
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Experimental farms, British Columbia, 796
Fisheries dept., 2166
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Fruit growers, protection, 2593, 3424
Health of Animals
Diseases, 968, 2594, 2738
Tuberculosis, 2594, 3521
Hog cholera, 2594, 2738
Horse-racing, federal control, 2596
Immigration of Japanese, 1289, qu., 1459
Marine and Fisheries
Examination of masters and mates, 1491
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 1497
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1785
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2825, 3017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1567
Oriental immigration
Japanese, 1289, qu., 1399, qu., 1459
Patronage, civil service, 3083
Victoria post office building, repairs, 1255-8

Topographic Maps, qu., 1631

Topographic Survey, 1043

Tormentine Reef, buoy, 1499

Toronto
Campaign advertisement, 198-199
Cheque tax, 2395, 2329
Customs house, 198-9, 1246-51
Harbour improvements, qu., 365, 1187, 1467, 1471, 1474, 3541
Imperial convention of teachers, 1673
International yacht race, 3513
Post Office, qu., 108-9, 368
Building, 1246-51
Revenue, 1250
Power plant, public ownership, 123
Prison reform, municipal farms, 1277
Railway facilities, 66
Viaduct, qu., 1660
Railway grades, reduction of, 74
Rate increases, 131
Representation of, 1365
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1343
Steam railway freight, qu., 936
Street railway
Public ownership, 1937
Service, 63
Toronto Suburban railway, qu., 2457
Transportation commission, 130
Unemployment, 86

Toronto Electric Light Company, 123

Tourist Traffic
Banff-Windermere highway, 1681
Highways, 1681. *See also that title*
Visitors to Canadian National parks, 1052

Town Planning, Banff, 1052

Townsend, United States Senator, 1206

Tracadie Lazaretto, 1240, 2021

Tractors, 769, 2354, 3123. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Value $1,400 and less to be free, 2115

Trade and Commerce, 2108. *See also* Customs and Excise; Exports; Imports; Speeches on Budget; Tariff
Agreements and negotiations, 2110, 2172
Agricultural implements, in, 2620-1. *See also that title*
Australia, with, 9, 174-5. *See also* Steamship Services
Austria, with, 2535
Bills to be preceded by resolution, 1283
British Preference and Canadian seaports. *See* British Preference
Canada-Mexico, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Canadian ports by, 104. *See also* British Preference
Channels of, 336-7
Competition, 223. *See* Speeches on Budget
Consular agents, repeal of Act of 1921, 3222, 3477
Consular certificates, 2114, 3222, 3477
Department
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3541
Salaries, etc., 699
Elevators, terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Exchange value of commodities, 2868
Expansion, 2021
Export. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu., 1376. *See also* Imports
Foreign. *See also* Germany
France-Belgium, 3223
Freight rates, effect on, 276
Germany, with, 138, 2203, 2279, 2535, 2859. *See also* Customs; Germany; Speeches on Budget
Great Britain, 2540. *See also* British Preference
And United States, 2369
International, 2862
Interprovincial, 2284

Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Italian, effect of currency valuation on, 2849
Mexico, with, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Necessity for revival, 105. *See also* Budget; Industrial Depression; Speeches on Address
Potatoes. *See that title*
Russian, consortium to re-establish, 1463
Southern Pacific dominions, 2990
Steamships Services. *See that title*
Total
1876-77 and 1921-22, statement, 1376
1900-1921, qu., 1633
Statement, 1376
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2114, 2581, 2989
United States with, 2223, 2449-50. *See also that title*
West Indies. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities; Steamship Services

Trades and Labour Congress
Oriental immigration, 1514
Unemployment insurance, 1081

Transatlantic Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Transportation, 2580, 2611. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Commodity and freight rates, 234
Costs. *See* Freight Rates
Farm products of, 231
Fish, 2166
Loss of, 175
Maritime provinces in, 106-111, 2687-8
Nationalization, 2325. *See also* Canadian National railways
Problems. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 269
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1203-8
Tonnage rates, 234
Water, 1939

Trawlers. *See* Naval Service

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese, 168
Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161
Far Eastern, 3160
Four Power. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Treaties — *Con.*
France-Belgium, 3223
Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Tabled, 3359
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Japan, with, 1511
Lemieux treaty with, 1459
Limitation of Armaments, 3158
Peace treaty with Germany, Lusitania claims, 3599
Pelagic Sealing, 1844
Prevention of use of noxious gases and chemicals, 3159
Protection of neutrals and non-combatants at sea, 3159
Quadruple Pacific, 3160
Versailles, 2848

Treaty of Peace with Hungary and Turkey bill
1r., 3490; 2r., com., 3r., 3547

Tree Planting. *See also* Forestry
Provincial highways, qu., 2039

Tremblay, General, Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton Harbour bill
Res., 3436, 3493; 1r., 2r., com., 3494; 3r., 3495

Trépanier, Alderman, of Montreal, 1392

Trial by Jury, 1388. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.

Trusts and Combines, 2395, 2414. *See also* Address; Budget
Minister of Labour and, 200

Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Tsur, Dr., Chinese-Consul General, 1776

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals
Bloc areas, 3521
Bovine, 2556, 2595, 3521. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Indians, 1225, 1228
Returned Soldiers. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers' Insurance; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Tupper, Sir Charles, and maritime union, 107-108

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply, 273. Congratulations; maritime provinces and the Intercolonial, 274-276; government ownership of railways, 277; tariff questions, 278; natural resources of western provinces, 279
Budget, 2188. Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington; Fordney tariff; relations with the United States, 2189; public debt; income and business profits taxes; economy; British preference; duties on farm implements, 2190; fishing industry; lumber; alcohol for medicinal purposes; sales tax; taxation of land values, 2191; Liberal platform of 1919; capital and labour; immigration, 2192; railways; Transcontinental; opposition of C.P.R., 2193; board of directors; grain shipments, 2194; public ownership; Intercolonial, 2195; regional control of Canadian National railways, 2196
Canadian National railways
Board of directors, 2194
Hanna and Mitchell, Messrs., salaries, qu., 471
Public ownership, 2193
Transcontinental
Grain shipments, 2194
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 2194
Canadian Pacific railway, cost, 2193
Civil Service patronage, 3082
Immigration, agricultural workers, 2193
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Single tax, 2191

Turkey, Peace Treaty with, 3359, 3547

Turtle Mountain Forest reserve, qu., 615

Ukrainians. *See* Immigration

Ultra Vires, Canada Grain Act, 1132

Undesirables, deportation of. *See* Criminal Code; Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Unemployment, 1290, 2331, 2627. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Housing; Immigration; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Agricultural conditions and, 2158
Banff-Windermere road, 1052, 1682
Canada, number in, qu., 3362
Cities, in, 86

Unemployment — *Con.*
Continuance of, 237
Credit system, 219
Economic causes, 1081, 3526
Employment offices, Co-ordination Act, 1058, 2022
German competition and, 2178. *See also* Germany
Farm labourers, 2331. *See also that title*
Housing, 219. *See also* Housing
Immigration and, 225, 2143
Importations and, 210
Insurance, 88, 218, 1070, 1081
Land settlement and, 182-3
Military expenditures, 1144
National conference proposed, 1082
Nova Scotia miners, 1759. *See also* Labour
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Policy of Government, inquiry, 3491
Proposed order steel rails to relieve, 1691
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1912
Relief, 1061, 1719, 1970, 2022; qu., 3152
Camps, 86
Expenditure for, 86, 2023
Report of Ontario Government commission, 218
Returned soldiers, 2458, 3311, 3329-30. *See also that title*
Hikers, qu., 3153
Riley's army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's Army
Seasonal, 87-88
Soldiers, 3524. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, relief, 1347, 1352
Standing Committee, proposed, 1082
Toronto, aid to, 121, 199
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Unemployment situation, 1069-84
Welland canal, 2750

Unimproved Land Values, tax. *See* Taxation

Union of Canadian Municipalities
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392
Immigration, 2155

Unions. *See* Labour

United Farmers of Alberta
Loan system, resolution, 220

United Farmers of British Columbia, 1354
Oriental immigration, 1514

United Farmers of Ontario, 63
Platform, 2393
Protection and, 2440

United Grain Growers' Limited, 2489, 2653
Agricultural implements, 304, 2693, 3119
Crerar, Mr., and, 2489
Political organizations, contribution to, 2488
Report, 2654

United Mine Workers. *See* Nova Scotia miners

United Shoe Machinery Co. of Canada, 1902

United States. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Air Service, 1726
American Bankers' Association, resolution, 2189
Amicable relations with, 91
Bonds held in, non-taxable, 1133
Canadian exports to, 209. *See also* Exports
Canadian-owned railways in, 312
Canadian representation in, 2990
Coal and steel industries, 2419
Coal, importations from, 124, 1759. *See also* Coal
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Duty on Canadian apples, 164. *See also* Fruit
Duty on Canadian potatoes and wheat, 239. *See also* Root Vegetables
Emigration to, 2516. *See also* Immigration
Factories in Canada, 2413-14, 2467
Farmers, competition with, 2527
Farmers' bloc, 69, 210, 988, 2323. *See also under this title,* Fordney
Flag, 1265
Fordney tariff, 53, 93-94, 209, 272, 343, 2112, 2178, 2189, 2219, 2336, 2367, 2409, 2527, 2580
Effect of, 2454
Grand Trunk mileage in, 191
Immigration from, 236, 2147. *See also that title*
Comparison, 3056
Figures, 758
Years' residence in Canada, 236
Imperial pensioners in, 1347
Importations, duty on, 208-209
Importations of British goods through, qu., 375
Income tax, non-resident aliens, 1304
Industries developing Canadian resources, 2667
Insurance companies, tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368, 2546
Iron and steel industry, 2412-13
Magazines, imports, 3109

United States — *Con.*
Medical inspection of immigrants for Canada, 2022
Military expenditure, 1622
Oriental immigration, 1515
Pecuniary claims convention with, 1276
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844
Railway difficulties, 67-70, 129, 1917-18
Railways
Lines in Canada, 204
Purchase of, 2611
Reciprocity, 77, 102, 2111, 2201, 2285, 2368, 2463, 2485, 2511, 2527, 2616, 2694, 2846. *See also* Address; Budget
St. Lawrence and Welland canals, 2749
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1184, 1315 1396. *See also that title*
Treaty, consideration of proposed, 2207
Steel prices, 2412
Tariff discrimination, 2466
Tariff legislation, 113, 988, 2487, 2620-1, 2864. *See also under this title* Fordney
Trade, 2111, 2178, 2610,. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Cattle, 2695
Relations, 2908
War operations, 1336
Washington
Hon. Mr. Fielding's trip to, 2112, 2189, 2300
Wrangel Island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208

Unopposed Motions for Papers
Algoma Indian lands, timber leases (Mr. Simpson) 942
Appraisers, Paris and London, (Mr. Parent) 1068
Avignon, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Bonaventure
Mail contract (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Caisse, Mr. J. J., Montreal post office (Mr. Marcil) 828
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 112th Battalion band instruments (Mr. Martell) 372
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk insurance (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 828
Canadian Northern bonds (Mr. Stevens) 2458
Canadian ships, damage during war (Mr. Bristol) 1183
Caraquet and Gulf shore railway (Mr. Hanson) 1183
Carleton, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Cattle embargo, Hon. Manning Doherty (Mr. White) 616

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Civil Service bonus, (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 828
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal (Mr. Baxter) 2584
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract (Mr. Caldwell) 616
Extra-territorial rights (Mr. Meighen) 1068
Fisheries
Establishment of independent department (Mr. Martell) 372
Transfer to British Columbia (Mr. McQuarrie) 2042
Fort Edward lands (Mr. Martell) 372
Genoa conference (Mr. Boys) 1905
Grand Trunk Railway Company 1921 loan, (Mr. Putnam) 828
Griffenhagen and Associates report (Mr. Séguin) 1633
Holland, Lee, deportation (Mr. Meighen) 372
Hudson Bay, St. John parish patents (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 829
Hudson, Govt. cutter (Mr. Baxter) 3600
Immigration
Foreigners admitted as farmers (Mr. Stevens) 1068
Western lands, on, 616 (Mr. Stevens)
Indian agency, Bear river, N.S., (Mr. Lovett) 828
Inverness Railway and Coal Co., (Mr. Chisholm) 372
Kootenay flats (Mr. Humphrey) 286
Legal costs, payments (Mr. Martell) 2971
McQuarrie, John C., dismissal of, 377
Mail contract, Rigaud-St. Rédempteur (Mr. Ouimet) 1776
Migratory Birds Convention, infraction, (Mr. Martell), 377
Nanaimo County judge (Mr. Neill) 2042
Nautical assessors (Mr. Church) 1633
Newspaper censors (Mr. Archambault) 1068
Nova Scotia
Barristers, payments (Mr. Martell) 707
Miners, McLachlan correspondence (Mr. Stewart, Leeds) 616
Order of Grain-Baggers (Mr. Stevens) 2806
Page, Mr. H. W. A. claim (Mr. Neill) 2042
Palais station, Que. (Mr. Parent) 1068
Parc St. Charles Company (Mr. Marcil) 372
Paspebiac post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post Office department (Mr. Séguin) 3600
Purchasing Commission, origin of goods (Mr. Raymond) 2042
Quebec
Bridge (Mr. Parent) 1068

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Fisheries (Mr. Marcil) 616
Harbour Commission (Mr. Meighen) 372
Sardines for export (Mr. Grimmer) 1183
Shigawake post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Sorel shipyards, dismissals, (Mr. Hanson) 377
Tobacco experimental station L'Assomption (Mr. Séguin) 1776
Tug Pekin (Mr. Maclean, Prince) 1289
Victory bonds, (Mr. Putnam) 942
Winnipeg strike (Mr. McMurray) 1068
Yukon territory
Royalty on minerals (Mr. Black) 616
Transfer of mineral claims, (Mr. Black) 616

Universal Postal Union, 3173

Universities, Physical drill and military training, 1615

Unrestricted Reciprocity, Hon. Edward Blake on, 2677

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Immigration; Population

Vancouver
Anti-Japanese riots, 1511-16
Assay office, 1236
Ballantyne pier, wages of workmen, 1465, 1469
Board of Trade drydock, 2009
Customs aerial patrol, 1730
Drydock, 1255, 1484, 2005, 2009, 3542
Board of Trade telegram, 2009
Expenditure in, 2309
Free port, proposal, 2470
Harbour, 1473. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Commission bill
Mounted Police barracks, Fairmont, 1255
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building repairs, 1255
Railway duplication at, 74-75
Shipment of grain from, 235
Sun, criticism of Hon. John Oliver, 2237
Unemployment conference, 1069
Unemployment relief camps, 86

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 798

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act Amdt. bill (Port Warden and Shipping Master) 1r., 1929; 2r., com., 2821; 3r., 2996

Vancouver Island coal mines, 178

Vancouver Sun, criticism of Hon. John Aliver, 2236-7

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables
Dumping clause, 2372. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Production of near Montreal, 1019

Versailles, Treaty of, 2848

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Aurora. *See* Naval Service
Britisher, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck of, qu., 1210
Canadian Farmer, 2311
Canadian Freighter, qu., 963, 2311
Canadian Inventor, 2312
Canadian Prospector, 2311
Canadian Winner, 2311
Champlain, qu., 1400
Con Rein, 1382
Foreign ships of war, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
James Whalen, 1677
Lambton, wreck of, 1492, 3507
Mildred McColl, 3598
Niobe, sale of. *See* Naval Service
Ocean-going, 1471. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Patrician. *See* Naval Service
Patriot. *See* Naval Service
Pekin, 1289
Phalarope, patrol boat, 1503
Plamonder, dredge, 2006
Quebec, in and out of, 1471
Scottish, 3514

Vickers Company, 320, qu., 936
Claim, 2975
Elevator dredge, 1494

Victoria, B.C.
Drydock, 2009. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Govt. expenditure in, 2309
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1497
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building, 1255
Wooden ships constructed at, qu., 364

Victoria Bridge. *See* Bridges

Victoria Memorial Museum
Geological specimens, 1237
Potlach institution, 1377. *See also* Indians

Victorian Order of Nurses, 772
Unemployment, relief of, 86

Victory Bonds. *See also* Finance
Exempt from taxation, 263
Five year maturities, qu., 2993

Vidal's Point Park, 1052

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3467
Senate amdts., 3615
Duty on apples, 164
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1161
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Military expenditure and policy, 1145
National Defence bill, 661
Mounted police, 675
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Point of order, Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Royal Canadian Navy, 1868-89
Soldiers' bonus, 440
War, advances to Imperial Government, 1288
Wheat Board, 2969

Vimy Memorial, 2098

Vitamines, 1781

Voters, qualification of. *See* Dominion Election Act; Euler; Rinfret

Wabana Ore, 2412-13

Waddington, Mr., 398

Wage Cuts. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Wage Investigators. *See* Labour

Wages. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Tuberculous cattle, 2742

Wallace Shipbuilding Company, 3542

War. *See also* Militia and Defence
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Canadian and United States armies, operations, 1336
Claims, adjustment of, 1155, 1672, 1677, 2098, 2977
British Admiralty, 1752
Details of estimates, qu., 1288
Hospital ship, claim for loss, 1082, 2975
Militia and defence, 2974
Naval service, 1752
Repatriation, dependents of soldiers, 1711

War — *Con.*
Conscription and, 2570. *See also that title*
Conscription of wealth, 2725
Debts, 90, 174. *See also* Address; Budget; Public Debt
Demobilization, expenditure for, 1155, 1163, 1171
Equipment, 2616
Expenditures, 2228
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
Foreign ships, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Imperial War Graves Commission, 2099
Indebtedness, 2294
Kemp, Sir Edward, 1169
Laws of. *See* Limitation of Armaments
Medals, 1752, 2975
Mewburn, Hon. S. C., 1169
Mobilization of unfit men, 2608
Munitions, shipment of from Great Britain, 1154-63
Newspaper censors, 1068
Overseas ministry, 1169
Pensions. *See that title*
Preparation for, 1335. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Profiteering, 2221, 2247, 2395, 2440, 2455. *See also* speeches on Budget
Reparation claims, Lusitania, 3599
Results, 91, 2588, 2861-2, 2895
Scandals, 90
Taxation and, 2567. *See also that title*
War memorials Commission, 2098

War Finance Corporation, 54

War Graves Commission, 774, 2098

War Measures Act, 662, 663, 1362

War Purchasing Commission, sale of warlike stores, 1171

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2738
Apple-growing industry, 3419
Boy Scouts, 773
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 863
Budget, 2400. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reactionary and mysterious budget, 2400; the tariff; protection and indirect taxation; drydock on Pacific coast; purpose and principle of protection; invisible government; Canadian manufacturers a Bourbon; free trader when purchasing; pro-

Ward, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tectionist when selling; raw material and finished product, 2401; subsidizing of one industry means penalizing of another; immense wealth and dire need; results of indirect taxation; cumulative effect of tariff taxation, 2402; agricultural conditions in western Canada; rural depopulation, 2403; railway situation; land speculation; expenditures on agriculture contrasted with amounts paid to manufacturers; exports the source of wealth, 2404; Professor Ely on taxation; national debt; speculators and unearned increment; tariff from cradle to grave; land tax; payment of war costs; binder twine industry, 2405; basic industries, 2406
Canadian National railways
Directors, employees, represented, 2794
Yorkton branch line, 2139
Experimental farms, 811
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2168
Generals Burstall and Gwatkin, retirement, qu., 1211
Income tax, cost of collection, 2025
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Rideau canal, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, estimates, 2130
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Soldier land settlement, 2136
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, employees, 3602
Supply, opportunity for members to speak, 1985
Welland ship canal, 2764

Warlike Stores. *See* Ammunition; Militia and Defence

Warships and Torpedo Boats, qu., 827

Wartime Elections Act, 14, 258, 350, 352, 473, 2229, 2289, 2488. *See also* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Address in reply, 349. Progressive point of view; farmers not asking for special privileges, 349; excessive freight rates; immigration problem, 350; protective tariff and the manu-

Warner, Mr. D. W. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
facturers, 351; banking system, 352; Wartime Elections Act, 350, 352
Agricultural fairs, 651
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2204. Tariff, disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister, 2204; small reductions; oleomargarine; dairying industry; protective duties on woollen goods and shoes; income tax; lack of purchasing power, 2205; british preference; agricultural implements; sales taxes; automobiles and the tariff, 2206
Canadian representation in United States, 2025
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1429
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Exhibition grants, 983
Experimental farms, 809
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2797
Indian education, Edmonton school, 1231
Northwest rebellion pensions, 3523
Oleomargarine, Manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1829
Pensions Com. final report, 3338

Washington
Canadian representation in. *See* Canadian Representation in United States
Conference. *See* International Labour Conference; Limitation of Armaments
Visit of Finance Minister to, 2112, 2181, 2189, 2300

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers, 71, 124, 2182. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Aluminum Company of America, Cedar Rapids, 71; qu., 728; qu., 1375
Canals, on, 2747
Development of, 223
Electric energy, 133. *See also* Electrification
Exportation from Niagara district, 137, 1188
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Joint board, 2805; qu., 2970
Regulation Act, 1921 Repeal bill, 2991, 3199, 3435
Niagara river power development, 137, 1188
Railway electrification, 1940. *See also* Electrification

Water Powers — *Con.*
St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers, on, 629
St. Lawrence river, M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1205, 1314. *See also that title*
Surveys, 1051
Welland canal, 2747

Water Transportation, 70, 73-74. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canals in United States, 68

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission
St. Lawrence river, 1183. *See also that title*

Watson, Major General Sir David, 1477

Ways and Means, Committe of, 362, 599, 1842, 2104, 2854, 3104, 3246, 3409, 3476, 3604, 3607
Amended resolutions, 2854
Interim Supply bill, 599
M. for (Mr. Fielding) 2104
Resolutions, 2118; amended, 2854
Supply bill, 3607

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Welland Ship Canal. *See* Canals

West Indies
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Subsidized steamship services and freight rates, 3026, 3032
Trade with. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities

Western Provinces. *See* Budget; Natural Resources; Speeches on Address
Agricultural depression, 1475
Flags on public schools, 1265
Marketing of grain, 114. *See* Wheat Board
Natural resources, 7, 12, 22, 41, 148, 279, 328, 1017. *See also that title*
Interest of other provinces in, 23, 340, 355, 1017
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against, 1254

Weston post office, 1259

Westport Railway. *See* Brockville and Westport

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Baddeck, 1269
L'Orignal, qu., 1212
Provincial, New Brunswick, transfer, qu., 2305

Wharves — *Con.*
Provincial wharves and tidal waters, 1991
Sault Ste. Marie, 2006
Selkirk, 2004
Tidal waters in, 1991, qu., 2209

Wheat. *See also* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Competition with Russia, 2157
Cost of production, 114
Dumping of. *See* Customs, dumping clause
Duty on, 239
Early seeding in West, 115
Exports to United States, 209
Fordney tariff and, 210.* *See that title under* United States
Free trade in, 2528
Freight rates on, 300. *See also* Freight Rates
Kubanka, 2454
Marketing, 46-47, 53, 115, 151, 231, 2453. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address; Wheat Board
Prices of, 152
Shipments through Vancouver, 235
Transportation, 233. *See also* Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
United States demand for, 333

Wheat Board, 31, 283, 338; qu., 472, 1118-20. *See also* Agriculture and Colonization Com.; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Grain Commission; speeches on Address
Agriculture Com. report of:
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland) to M. for concurrence in, 2951; neg., 2969
Concurrence in report, delay, 2306
Canadian Council of Agriculture memo, 377
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Fixation of prices, 2588
Kay, Mr. privilege, 872
Participation certificates, qu., 2304
Re-establishment of, demand for, 72, 115, 146, 152, 158, 232

Wheat Board Bill. *See* Canadian Wheat Board Bill

White, Mr. James
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276, 3495

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Budget, 2352. Congratulations to Finance Minister; election pledges, promises and arguments; tariff proposals; proposed permanent tariff commission,

White, Mr. J. F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
2352; western agriculture; freight rates; climatic conditions; Wheat board; agriculture and protection; importation of farm produce; wider markets; free trade; farm tractors; tariff and manufacturers' profits; trade with Germany; unemployment, 2354
Experimental farms, 810
Lake Huron, marine allowance, qu., 1930
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 406

White, Sir Thomas, resignation of directorships, 1089, 1102

White Lead, duty on, 2297

White Slave Traffic, Suppression of, 3497

Whitley Councils, 1061

Widowed Mothers, Pensions. *See* Pensions' Committee

Wife Disertions. *See* Pension Act Amdt. bill

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Highways, approved, qu., 2040

Windermere Road, 1051, 1682

Windsor, N.S. removal of derelict in channel, 1493

Windsor, Ont., Canadian Transit bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Wines and Spirits. *See* Customs Act Amdt. bill

Winnipeg
Strike, 1068
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 671-9
Trials, cost of, qu., 1182
Unemployment, 86

Winnipeg River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Winnepegosis Wharf, 3545

Winter Ports in Canada. *See* Intercolonial Railway

Wireless Telegraphy. *See also* Radio
Lighthouses and, qu., 370
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu., 1063

Wives, Foreign-born, of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Wolves, destruction of livestock by, 990, 998-999

Women
Alien born. *See* Dominion Elections Act
Representation in Parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Voting in last election, 185

Wooden Ships, qu., 364

Woodmen of the World, 1905

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Address in reply, 92. Congratulations to Miss Macphail, 92; changes in political parties; attitude of Progressive party; greater markets for farm products, 93; tariff revision; farmers not concerned with politics, 94
Budget, 2183. Tariff; history; classification; reductions; sales tax; added burden to consumer; dumping clause, 2184; free raw materials and high duties on finished products, protection on farm implements, 2185; duty on clothing, woollens, etc.; automobiles; Ford car; effect of 25 per cent duty; drawback system; farmers and protection, 2186; speeches of the Prime Minister in 1920; manufacturers free traders in raw materials; protection as it affects the consumer, 2187; agricultural implements, 2188
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1582
Expenditure and policy, 1582
Sales tax, 3264

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 84. Economic disturbance, 84-85; demand for markets; home market; unemployment, 85; unemployment insurance, 88; production, factors of; equipment; transportation question, 89; tariff revision; national debt and taxation; war fortunes and war scandals, 90; Defence department; relations with United States; war legacies, 91; reconstruction, 92
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2242. Conservatives and Liberals, origin and policy; extension af franchise to ordinary people; agriculture and business interests not identical; labour view; sales tax unduly burdensome to family man, 2242; civil service pay;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
immigrants to pay taxes and feed the railways; an administration bankrupt in ideas; no economic changes proposed; drifting and borrowing; "mortgaging the homestead"; foreign ownership of natural resources, 2243; concentration of wealth; railway exploitations; alieniation of lands and resources, 2245; mergers and watered stock; consolidation of financial organizations; grain trade and, 2246; the Great War and profiteering; financing, 2247; burden of taxation; repudiation; capital levy; income tax, 2448; profits and property rights vs. human welfare; labour and capital, 2250
Cadet camps, 1973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, employees' wages, qu., 3598
Canadian National railways
Directors, representation of employees, 2798
Steel cars, qu., 2213
Civil Service, 3075
Bonus, 3533
Industrial councils, 1061
Patronage, 3097
Salaries, 2243
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sedition and Criminal Conspiracies) 364, 865, 1395, 3104
Debates, inaudibility of, 1755
Disarmament, 1143
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Immigration Act Amdt. (Bill 16) 364, 864, 1388, 3104
Immigration, British artisans, 2208
Immigration-Criminal Code bills
Report of Special Committee, 3281
M. to refer back, 3282
Income tax, taxpayers, qu., 1399-1400
International Labour Conference, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour
Industrial engineer, 494
Mounted Police and, 670-1
Military policy and expenditures, 1143
Military Service Act repeal bill, 424, 639
Ministers and Directorships, 1127
Mounted Police in unorganized territories, M., 829, 841
National Defence bill, 670
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 516; qu., 605

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Oriental labour on British ships, 2042
Post Office employees' salaries, 2801
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1486
Railway Commission, representation of labour, 2776
Russian relief, 3516
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Unemployment
Relief, 3526
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1069-84
Unemployment Service Council, 2803
Winnipeg strike, Andrews correspondence, 2042

Wool. *See also* Agriculture; Livestock
Blankets, duty on, 3128
Duty on, 2415
Prices of, 985, 997
Woollen clothing, prices and labour cost, 2205, 2350, 2632. *See also* Speeches on Budget

Workmen. *See* Labour

Workmen's Compensation Act, 88, 1381

Wrangel Island, 1750, 1751
Russian title to, 2208

Wrecks. *See* Marine and Fisheries; Ships and Shipbuilding

Yacht Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

York County, Ont., representation, 1365

Yorkton, Sask., Speech of Prime Minister at, 2730

Young, Arthur and Company, qu., 365, 1490

Yukon Territory
Administration of
Cost, 1681
Justice, 1275
Expenditure, 1275
Expenses, population, qu., 2456
Government of, 1034
Mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Telegraph line, 1749
Union for judicial purposes with British Columbia, 1275

Zaneth, Corporal, 671